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PREFACE

to the

READER.

The Learned Author of the following Treatise, having read a Sermon, Preached at Tiverton, in the County of Devon, Concerning the Lawfulness and Use of Organs in the Christian Church, occasioned by the late Erecting of an Organ in the Church of that Parish; and the Answer to it, set forth by an unknown Author, entitled A Letter to a Friend in the Country, concerning the Use of Instrumental Musick, in the Worship of God, &c. Wherein he found this Practice of our Church, after a popular manner represented as Jewish and Popish, inconsistent with the Purity and Sincerity of the Gospel Worship, and introduced without sufficient Warrant, either from
the Scripture, Apostolical Practice, or present Authority, &c.

He was concerned at the Abuse and Misrepresentation, having a just esteem for the Reformation, and for the English Constitution, which is by far the best Part of it, and so approved of, by the most eminent Foreign Divines, as will appear by their Opinions concerning it in the following Discourse.

As to its being a perverse Imitation of the Jewish Practice, and inconsistent with the Purity and Simplicity of the Gospel Worship: He has so fully and closely Answered the Allegations of the Adversary, that 'twill be a vain Attempt to make a Reply to him. But from so silly, as well as false and groundless an Aspersion, as its being Popish, he thought it not worth the while to Write any thing in its Vindication, since 'tis no other than an old base and scandalous Objection, against the innocent Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, which has been Answered over and over again, to the Confusion, though not Silence of a restless Party.

However, since he was pleased to favour me with a Copy of his Treatise, which, it seems, partly through my Occasion and Request, but more through the Impor-
tunity and Solicitation of some Friends, he has oblig’d the World with, with Li-
berty to prefix a Preface to it, in Vin-
dication of that Sermon, from the Af-
persions and Mistakes, as well as Mis-
representations of the Anfwerer. I shall
beg leave of the Reader, to detain him
a little, from his perufing the Treatife
it felf, while I briefly Reply to his moft
material Obje&ions, and rectifie some
Miftakes and Abufes which will be found
therein, in Defence of this innocent and
useful Practice of our Church. But I
shall not think my felf obliged to fol-
low him in every needless Excursion
from the Subject in Hand, into the whole
Controversie between us and the Diffen-
ters; or throw away fo much Time as
it would take up, to Reply to every tri-
fling or contemptible Remark, or those
captious Questions which are made in
it.

The Anfwer seems fo Artificially to be
formed, that it may be read without con-
fulting the Sermon, or comparing them
together, otherwife some imperfect Ci-
tations, and other abufive Reflections
there in would be too apparent.

And ’tis to be observed, That it sup-
poses all along a Separation of Instrumen-
tal from Vocal Musick in the Service of
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God; whereas, the drift of the Sermon, is to join them together, and to shew, That the one is more Orderly and Harmonious and Beneficial for the other. And after all the tedious Harangue is made, there is no tolerable Reason given, why, if we do allow of Vocal Musick, we should not also allow Instrumental, which does so very much improve the same, and mainly conduce to cheer the Mind, to excite the Affections, to help out and assist the Voices, and to keep them from the greater Discord in our Devotion.

But to be more particular, the Answerer begins with a fly but false Suggestion, to make it a little the more popular, That the Organ was Erected at a time when the Poor were ready to Starve, and when there was a stop put to Trade by the Prohibition of Clipt Money, &c.

Now in that very Year, when the Organ was Erected, the Poor had the most ample Provision made for them in the Parish of Tiverton, that ever they had. The Poors Book at that time amounting to 946 l. 14 s. 4 d. ½, which was above 100 l. more than ever they had before in one Year: Besides, in publick standing Donations Yearly, they have about 400 l. more, and in private Cha-
Charities very considerable to my own knowledge.

Neither was the Erecting the Organ any Expence at all to the Parish, as 'tis infinuated; for the far greater part of the Money risen to defray its Expence, was by Subscriptions; and the remaining part was taken out of Money in Arrears due for Church Rents, which without Sacrilege could not be employ'd but for the Churches use; and that being a very decent one, and needing but little reparations, the Parishioners thought fit to employ a part of the Surplusage towards the Erecting of the Organ, which had been Sacrilegiously pulled down before.

So likewise the Sallery of 30 l. per Annum for the Organist, goes Yearly out of certain Rents and Dues belonging to the Church, without being a burden to the Parish.

What the Answerer says concerning the Dedication to the Bishop of Exon, is very trifling, and needs no Reply.

And his several times accusing the Author of the want of Charity, and making many sightful Reflections upon Protestant Dissenters, is very groundless, for he cannot find any such thing throughout his Sermon, nor such Instances of
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the eructation of his Gall, nor of the stirring up of his Spleen, in the Course of his Life, as he would insinuate.

But methinks it should be very strange that the Answerer should accuse the Author of the want of Charity, or any one else, when his Pamphlet from the beginning to the end, has so very little of it, 'tis scarce any thing else but a malignant Investive against the Church of England; and a scandalous Intimation, which is another way of accusing her, as being Popishly affected, and that her Rites and Ceremonies partake of the Innovations and Superstitions of the corrupt Church of Rome. Abundance of this sort of Dirt is thrown upon her at every turn; but 'tis easily rub'd off. And tho' there is really nothing in the Accusation, nor any tolerable ground for such a Report, however it comes to pass, that among the unthinking, injudicious and deluded Multitude, it is frequently given out as a popular Argument against any thing in the Service of our Church, which our Adversaries dislike, or rather, which they would seem to be offended at, more out of a pretence to keep up a Separation, than that any Offence can be justly taken at the things themselves.
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And that this is no uncharitable or groundless surmise, is evident from their Aversion to Alterations, in the time of the Sessions of the last Convocation, as they were before in that of 1660. And the Conference at the Savoy, when they might have been satisfied in any thing, could they have agreed in what would have satisfied them; besides a total Subversion of the English Constitution, which is at this time in an especial manner, and always has been since the Reformation, the greatest Bullwark of the Protestant Religion against Popery, of any in the whole Christian World. And 'twas sadly apparent what great advances Popery made in the late times of Anarchy and Confusion, when this excellent Constitution was subverted, and thro' the Policy of the Church of Rome, her most Zealous and Religious Defenders were traduc'd as Popishly affected, and by their Instigation cut off, because in truth they were the most irreconcilable Enemies to the Tyranny and Corruption of that Church, as any People whatsoever: Witness, besides the Royal Martyr himself, the incomparable Arch-Bishop Laud, * who; if Times would have fav'our'd him, had Zeal and Courage, and Learning, and Interest enough to have driven

* Called by Mr. Long the Papists Scourge and Horror.
driven Popery out of any Kingdom in Christendom: And for certain the return of it in this Kingdom, will for ever be prevented, whatever is pretended by ill designing Men, if the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church be but maintain'd with a like Resolution and Christian Bravery, as he maintained them, when he adorned the See of Canterbury.

The sticking close to which, is the readiest Course that can be taken to keep out Popery, and nothing else will be able to do it. For notwithstanding the Out-cry of Popery be at every turn made against our Church Service, (which is one of the grossest and foulest Slanders that ever was invented or credited, and could proceed from nothing so much as an ill Design against her, * or from great Ignorance of what Popery is) were this excellent Constitution destroy'd, Popery in all probability would soon destroy the Protestant Religion quite, and we should be clearly over-run with the Tyranny, as well as Superstition of that corrupt Church, which at present do-miners over so great a part of Christendom, and threatens Ruin and Desolation to all the rest.

We see too much what would be our own Case, by the barbarous Persecution of
of the Protestants in France, Savoy, &c. notwithstanding the Edicts, and Oaths, and Declarations of those Princes to the contrary, if we should through the subtilty of the Court of Rome, be persuaded by any of our Diffenters to alter our English Constitution, or so much as admit of the desired Comprehension, under the plausible pretence of Union; but in truth it would be a means of dividing and weakning us the more among our selves, than we could hope to win from abroad. 'Tis plain we might gratifie our Enemies thereby, but we shou'd never oblige our Friends, nor strengthen our Interest, nor one jot the less be calumniated as Popish.

But that the Church of England is free from any such Imputation of Poverty, is so clearly and candidly evinc'd by the learned Dr. Hooper, the present Dean of Canterbury, in his excellent Treatise on that Subject, at the end of the London Cases, that it will be needless for any one to say more to it; for those that will not be convinced of the contrary by his Reasons, do but expose their Ignorance to the World, or what is worse, their Prejudice or ill Design.

Among other things, which some of those who dissent from us dislike, and against
against all Honesty and Reason make to be a part of Popery, is the Practice of Instrumental Musick in our Church Service: But 'tis a very ridiculous Argument to say so, because the Church of Rome uses it, and very uncharitable and unjust; while the generality of Protestant Churches abroad (as well as ours at home) which are anywhere established, have the use of it, as well as that, and have had so ever since the Reformation. Our first Reformers were certainly wiser than to account that for Popish, and to be quite abolished, which was as useful then in the Christian Church as before, and which they did Reform where they found it grossly abused, but did never think fit to abolish the use of it, or account it a piece of Popery to be cast off.

Those excellent Men were not possessed with such a Spirit of Opposition, as against all Sense and Reason to run away from every thing in Divine Worship, which the Papists did use or allow; this would be bad indeed, and a much greater Error than that which they pretend to avoid; for then they must disown God, and his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, because the Papists believe them; then they must lay aside the Hierarchy, because the Papists maintain it; and have no Places, nor
nor Times set a part for divine Worship, nor set Forms of Prayer to address themselves by to the great God of Heaven and Earth, because the Papists have them; nor indeed have any Decency or Comliness in the House of God, because such are to be seen in the Church of Rome.

No, 'tis the Corruptions and Superstitions of the Church of Rome we are Reform'd from, and 'tis not requisite we should be still a Reforming what is thought Decent, Regular, Primitive and Edifying in our Church.

And I Challenge any, even the most Bigotted Dissenters from the Church of England, to shew any one Superstitious Rite, or corrupt Doctrine of the Church of Rome, which is allowed or maintained in our establish'd Church.

They may accuse the Surplice for being such, but with what shew of Reason to satisfy an unprejudiced Man? Why, they may as well account a Black Gown to be Popish, or a Judges Scarlet, being the Garb of the Whore of Babylon; or Rev. 17. * a grey Cloak, because it is worn by some of the Friars. And so for the *Cross after Baptism, for there is no such in it, the Ministers making that Sign as a significant Ceremony, that in Token hereaf-
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Fed from the time of the Apostles, &c. continued in use in the time of Constantine the Great, and therefore could not be an Invention of the Papists. 

Opus. p. 326. Mr. Long's Calv. Redivivus; p. 72.

ter, the Child which is Baptized, shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified, &c. is no more Popish than the speaking those Words is Popish; nor those decent and significant Rites and Ceremonies, which our Church Governors have thought fit to appoint, for the more orderly and solemn Performing the Service of God in his Church, are no more Popish than the Time and Place of Prayer, nor the kneeling at it; nor that very Form of Prayer which our Saviour taught his Disciples. And the use of Instrumental Musick is no more Popish than the use of Vocal is, since they are both made use of in the Protestant, as well as Popish Churches, and both for the same excellent Ends, namely, for the more lively and affectionate Praising of the Goodness of God, and the more effectual raising their Minds in Devotion towards him, as well as to regulate the Voices of the People, and to make them the more Harmonious.

And nothing is more evident, than that the generality of Protestant Churches abroad, as well as ours at home, do use Instrumental as well as Vocal Musick in the Worship of God. I give Instances in the Lutheran, as most of the Foreign are, which are planted in Germany, such as the Dominions of the Elector of Saxony, the
the Duke of Brandenburg, the House of Lunenburg, and many imperial Cities, in the large Territories of Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Russia, &c. Also in the few Churches which were Reformed according to Calvin's Model, in part of Switzerland and Holland. The Reformed in France I do not mention, because they have been all along so kept under, as not to be able to obtain an Establishment according to Primitive usage and their own Desire, otherwise they would have had the Hierarchy, and I Question not a like Decency in their Church Service, as other Reformed have.

This they Zealously Petitioned for in the time of Cardinal Richleius Administration. * But that great Minister was too Politick to admit of their Petition for an Hierarchy, foreseeing that such an Apostolical Institution, and those Decencies in Divine Worship, would make their Church too Beautiful and Regular, and soon draw many from the Romish Establishment to their Communion.

Now this use of Instrumental Musick so universally obtaining in most, if not all National Protestant Churches, being a proper help to excite and enliven Mens Minds in Devotion, as well as to regulate their Voices, as most unprejudic'd Peo-
People find; it is no great matter if some few of singular Humours, and unreasonable *Scruples are dissatisfied about it, and dislike such a Practice. For 'tis impossible to please every Body in any one established Church whatsoever.

The Rules for Decency, however Innocent and Instructive, will not meet with such an universal Approbation but some will be prejudic'd against them, and then 'tis much, if through the Craft of others, they be not easily brought to dissent from them. There is scarce any one part of our Church Service, though never so excellent and edifying, but some or other dislike it, and some dislike all; shall we therefore lay aside our Book of Common Prayer? 'Tis very unreasonable surely, unless there were a better substituted in its room; and such a one I believe, neither this Age nor the next will be able to produce.

But to please whom shall we be persuaded to lay aside or alter our Church Service? Why, some few, who will not otherwise join with us therein. I am well satisfied could that heal or remove the Schism that is among us, it would have been done a long while since. But our Church Governours know too well, that the Spirit and Genius of the dissent,
is of such a Nature, that nothing will satisfy that Medly of People, and the different Parties concerned in it, otherwise their Charity is so great, that they would have condescended to the Satisfaction of the meanest Party. But then again, their Prudence does direct them to consider, there is a far greater number of People, which make a more considerable Body of the Catholic Church, which would be offended if that Service, and this excellent Constitution were laid aside; and who then should be rather satisfied? Those who are for a regular and decent Church Service, according to the Primitive Pattern, as that of the Church of England is, or those who being Biassed by some unreasonable Scruples oppose the same, and are really for no such thing.

And what does it matter if some few inharmonious Souls do dislike the Organs in our Church, as some others through Prejudice dislike our Church Service; and both through extreme Ignorance, or an ill Design, account them Popery. Will it be reasonable to expect our Governors should so far neglect their Duty to the Church, and their regard to the most considerable Body of Protestants, to gratify these few, by altering the
the one, and laying aside of the other? When at the same time, by such a silly Objection of Popery, (which is given by many as a common Term of Reproach to any thing which they do not like in the Church) they must also accuse all Foreign Churches of the same Guilt, while all of them well approve of our Church Service, and of Instrumental Musick too. And it is very little to the purpose to Object against the universality of this Approbation, as the Answerer does. Because some very considerable Dutch Churches have no Organs in them, as that at Leyden for Instance, and some others, though they may be supposed to be of Ability to procure them. But I am credibly inform’d, that there are Eight Churches in that City, and only one without Organs. Why, there are none in the Popes Chappel at Rome, and yet this is no Argument that they are not approved of by the Pope in the Romish Church.

All this Out-cry of Popery is nothing else but Artifice and Delign against our Church, without any tolerable Reason, or justifiable Grounds to support the Imputation, chiefly raised and somented and encouraged by the Papists themselves, that they may by means of that, Slander,
Slander, Distract and Divide us, and make us become an easier Prey to them. This is so very evident, that in that little Tract, called Foxes and Firebrands, set forth by Dr. Nelson, it is undeniably so. 

It being a Specimen of the Danger and Harmony of Popery and Separation; wherein is proved from undeniable matter of Fact and Reason, that Separation from the Church of England, is in the judgment of Papists, and by sad Experience, found the most Compendious way to introduce Popery, and to ruin the Protestant Religion. By this means Popery does by degrees continually get Ground; and our Protestants not uniting among themselves, for want of joining in our excellent Church Service, will not be able to hinder the Progress of it for the future. 

And to speak freely, an ungrateful but certain Truth; I concur with some worthy Men in believing, *The Imputation of Popery may be clearly laid at the Dissenter's Door, and we have no reason to account any thing Popery in the Kingdom, nor to fear any Danger of it, but from those few who are professed Papists themselves, or such as too near agree with them in Principles and Practices, *and who are, and always have been their prime Agents and Instruments;
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Of Q. Eliz., called a dutiful Advertisement to beware of the Puritans by the Papists, and of the Papists by the Puritans; discovering the great Coherence and agreement between both the Sects, in manifold and divers regardable both erroneous and perillous Positions, &c. See this at large, proved in the Compendious History of all the Popish and Fanatical Plots and Conspiracies against the established Government in Church and State, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, from the First of Queen Elizabeth, to 1684. By the Reverend Mr. Tho. Long of Exon.

Which Church is by far the greatest, if not the only Support of the Protestant Religion and Interest, and consequently the greatest Enemy the Church of Rome has in the World. 'Tis look'd upon to be so, by those of that Communion, and therefore is it become the Object of its greatest Fury and Envy; to destroy which is its greatest aim, and if by any means it can be effected, they may truly think they have done the business of the Reformation.

This Church had beyond others of the Protestant Profession, a great advantage in the Reformation, for when Luther, who first began to reform the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, and to separate from it, had made a great step that way; he notwithstanding left a great many things unreformed, which were offensive and could not be justified by Primitive An-
quity, such as the two great number of Ceremonies, and almost all the external Worship in the Church of Rome; Auricular Confession, the use of Crucifixes in Devotion, but without Adoration; the absurd Pictures of the Trinity, and the Doctrine of Consubstantiation, determining the Mode of the real Presence, instead of the absurder Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Afterwards Calvin carried on the Reformation at Geneva, to which Place he was invited by the Citizens, A.D. 1536. when they had expelled their Popish Bishop, who was also their Temporal Lord, and refused to re-admit him, unless he would disclaim Popery, upon whose refusal they took the Government of Church and State into their own Hands, which soon occasioned great Disorders and Confusions. And upon this, to gratifie the Magistrates, and yet to keep the Authority of the Church; he suits his Model of Government to the exigence of the Times, and upon this account, was in a manner necessarily obliged to make a direct opposition to Popery, the great Measure of his Reformation, for which Reason he laid aside the Hierarchy, notwithstanding its being Primitive and Apostolical, be-
cause he must not come near the Popish Government.

But yet he plainly approves of it, and very sharply rebuked those English Men who did dissent from it. *If any (says he) be found, that do not reverence such an Hierarchy, (i.e. such as is in England) and subject themselves to the same with the lowest Obedience, I confess there is no Anathema, whereof he is not worthy.*

However his Model was never received in the Church of England, nor suited to it, and his assistance was not accepted by Arch-bishop Cranmer, who with Bishop Latimer, Bishop Ridley, Dr. Taylor, and our other worthy Reformers, had the Honour of Martyrdom, for the sake of that transcendent Part of the Reformation, which they had established among us.

This was so admirably well contriv'd as to be in the moderate way between that of Luther, and the other of Calvin. They did not carry matters so high, as this latter, by running from one extreme to the other. That because the Church of Rome was over-run with Abuses from the Hierarchy; and its Service burdened with a vast number of Ceremonies, and the outward Ornaments of the Church, being so extravagant,
gant, had almost destroyed the inward Beauty of it, and turned its Worship into Shew and Appearance, and made to affect more the outward Senses of the People than their Hearts and Minds; therefore he did not seek to reform those Abuses so much, as to destroy the Ancient Government of the Church, and utterly to abolish all its Rites and Ornaments.

Which, says the Learned Puffendorf, proved a main Obstacle to the increase of the Protestant Religion, and caused an aversion and Animosity in the common People against that sort of Reformers, and increased their Zeal for that Religion which they had received from their Ancestors.

Neither did our Reformers fall so low in their establishing the Reformation, as Luther at first did, by retaining too much of the Popish Service, and making very little Alterations in outward Matters. But they kept an excellent Mean, and a regular Disposition of the whole Constitution, according to Primitive usage, before Popery had Corrupted it. Their Business was to Reform the Christian Church from Popish Superstition and Error, and not to fashion it according to their own Humour and
Fancies, or for the pleasing of others, to make a direct Opposition to Popery the measure of the Reformation. But the Method they took, was by Examining into what was most agreeable to the Sense of the Scriptures, and the Opinion of the Primitive Church, concerning those Rules for Decency, Order and Edification, which these only recommended in general to the Governours of the Church: But the particular appointment of such things, was left to their Prudence and Care, so as to fit particular People and Nations, only they were to be careful so to manage the Affairs of the Church, as not to do any thing in contradiction to those general Rules of the Apostle: *Let all things be done unto edifying.* And *Let all things be done Decently and in Order.*

Agreeable to which, those excellent Men our English Reformers, settling the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of our Church, did not fly so high, as not to allow the Papists to be right in any thing, nor go so low as to comply with them in any one Superstition and Corruption, which two Extremes the other Reformers fell into, but ours keeping the middle way between them, did by their moderate and discreet Proceeding, pro-
duce our incomparable Establishment, which we are now blessed withal, beyond any other Protestant Church.

For which Reason, ours is look'd upon as the Center of Union, and Harmony of all the Protestant Churches in the World. And so accounted by the most eminent Foreign Divines, whose Judgment and Opinion of it, I should here set down, but left I be too tedious, I will mostly Refer to them in the Margin.

Casaubon, a very learned French Man, says, *The Church of England comes nearer the Form of the flourishing Christian Church of old, than any other. It hath taken a middle way betwixt those Churches which are amiss, either through Excess or Defect.* If my Judgment doth not deceive me, the most sound part of the whole Reformation *is in England.* And by its being in England, he means plainly that part of the Reformation which is Established by Law in the Church of England. This I quoted in the Sermon, but *tis strangely wrested by the Answerer* to a contrary meaning.

His learned Country-man the famous Bochart, who was the Glory of the French Reformed, speaks very great things in the Praise of the Church of England, not only
only as his own Opinion, but of all the Pastors of the Reformed Religion in France.

To the same effect speaks Peter du Moulin. See also what Characters of Commendation are given of it in those three Letters written to the Bishop of London, by Monsieur le Moyne, Monsieur l'Angle, and Mr. Claude, concerning the Nature of our present Differences, and the unlawfulness of Separation from the Church of England, Published by Dr. Stillingfleet, in the latter end of his History of Separation.

Monsieur le Moyne, in his Letter to Dr. Brevint, and Published by Dr. Durel and Dr. Durel himself.

To which I will add, what Monsieur Romee a French Ambassador in England, once told King James I. when he saw our solemn Rites and Services: That if the Reformed Church of France had kept the same Order among them, which we have, he was assured, that there would have been many Thousands of Protestants more than now there are.

If we look farther abroad, and take the Opinions of the Learned from Geneva. In the first place, Calvin gives a very
very ample Testimony in Commendation of the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship in the Church of England.*

Next to him Beza, in his Letter to Arch-bishop Whitgift. Spanhemius, Professor at Geneva, in his Letter to Arch-bishop Usher, A.D. 1638. And his Successor John Diodate, in his Answer to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, when they desired his Opinion about their Proceedings.

If we look into Holland, we have the two famous Vossius's, the two Junius's, Grotius, and other excellent Men, giving the like Testimony. And these are the Men of the greatest Note, who have been of Calvin's Reformation.

Then for the Lutheran Churches, they are all for us, we have their Approbation and Agreement in Discipline and Worship, as Denmark, Norway, Sweed-land, &c.

Chances, concerning the Rites and Offices of the Church of Eng-land, 1690.

So that we may well say with Arch-bishop Bramhal, All Protestants, both Lutherans and Calvinists, did give unto the English Church the Right-hand of Fellow-ship. But yet no Luther, no Calvin, was the Square of our Faith, &c.

And

*At large set forth by Mr. Long in his Calvinus Redivivus.
And is it not now very strange, That this excellent Church, so great an Ornament to the Reformation, and so much applauded and commended by all Foreign Divines, whose Articles and Canons, and Homilies, and Rubricks, so plainly directing, its being truly Orthodox in Doctrine, Government and Worship, and so expressly declaring against the Superstitions and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, from which it is so well Reformed, should by the Artifice, and Design and Perswasions of that corrupt Church, be notwithstanding represented as Popish, and by some Ignorant, and other Hypocritical design- ing Men, be look'd upon as such? This is strange indeed, and what amazes all sincere Protestants, both at home and abroad to consider of it.

So much I have thought fit to say in a general Vindication of our Churches Rites and Service, and the use of Instrumental Musick, from the Imputation of Popery, because these things are many times hinted as suspected of it in the Answer. But I shall now attend to what it lays more particularly.

Several Pages are taken up with Remarks and Observations upon the Argument for this Practice, from the Light
of Nature, or the natural fitness of the thing: And for saying, The early and general use of Instrumental Musick, seems to argue such a way of Worship to proceed from the Dictates of natural Religion. But methinks this obvious distinction will be able to Vindicate that Particular from so great a Clamour; and shew the Instance is brought by the Answerer out of Dr. Taylors Doctor Dub. to be little to the purpose. That by the Light of Nature, or the Dictates of a natural Religion, I do not mean such a Primary, and Necessitous Preceptive Dictate, as is perpetually Obligatory upon all People, and upon all Occasions, Necessitate Precepti, as the Phrase is; but that it is Secondarily so, and directive to all Nations: The natural fitness of Musick prompting them to the use of it, at least to a general Assent and Approbation, as the effect abundantly shews that it does.

And to this agree the Writers which I have met with upon this Subject, Dr. Hammond mentions how early it was used by Moses, Miriam and the Prophets, Annot. in Pr. 150. upon a Religious account. And as to the Heathen Practice, he quotes Homer, giving an account of the Greeks usage of Musick in the Praise of their Gods, &c. And
And just before he has these Words. The universal usage of Instrumental Musick, among all Nations that we read of, gives Cause much rather, to assign it a Place in the natural Religion, which the common Light of Reason directed all Civilized Nations to, in attributing Honour to God, than to number it among the Ceremonies of the Mosaical Law.

Dr. Wetennal, Bishop of Cork speaks much to the same effect. To these I add two others, Mr. Baxter calls it an Help partly Natural, and partly Artificial, And Dr. Hickman, in his Sermon at the Anniversary Feast of the Lovers of Musick, says, That God is to be Worshipp'd with solemn Musick, is so ancient and so universal an Opinion, that it may well be looked upon, as one of the Prime Notions of a rational Soul, one of the fundamental Laws of Nature, which like the Worship of God it self, we receive not by Imitation, but by Instinct. It was not inculcated into us by Education, but we sucked it in at our very Birth, or rather it was infused into us at our Creation. And as the Opinion, so the Practice of it is universal too, and therefore the Psalmist directs his Precept not to the peculiar Church of God, but to All Lands, to serve the Lord with gladness.
nels, and to come before his Presence with a Song.

To which I will add the Words of a very eminently Learned Man, who speaking of Instrumental Musick, says, *It has the Advantages of being Recommended by Natural Religion, and of having been required by Divine positive Institution,* 

I suppose I need not seek for better Authorities to justify the drawing an Argument from the Light of Nature, for this Practice in the Christian Church. However, I can by no means allow the Case of Sacrifices, Dancing, and Circumcision, to be of a like validity in point of Argument, as he pretends: For, to his first Instance, in the Case of Sacrifices, I reply, That tho' Sacrifices be discontinued in the Times of the Gospel, because the use of them is abolished; and the reason of their being abolish'd, is because of the great Sacrifice of our Saviour on the Cross, of which they were but so many Types and Figures. This Substance being come into the World, leaves no Reason for those things, which were but the Shadows of him to continue. The same Reason cannot hold as to Instrumental Musick; which is granted by our Adversary, to have been established in the Worship of God under
under the Law. But we cannot find either any Reason for its discontiuance in the Times of the Gospel, or where the use of it is Abolish’d, or spoken against by our Saviour, or his Apostles, to warrant its being unlawful now: They all Communicated in the Jewish Church, where that was used. And as long as the use and expediency of it holds good, as it will do in all Ages, being an allowed proper Help to raise the Spirits in Devotion; it is altogether as reasonable it should be continued in the Times of the Gospel, as well as it was under the Law. * There being such a Sympathy between Sounds and Passions, as are by Turns the Natural Effects and Causes of each other: And if so, then true Devotional Musick will excite or heighten our Devotional Passions, and for that Reason is to be continued still, while Sacrifices losing their proper use, are Abolished.

His 2d. Argument, to invalidate the use of Instrumental Musick, is by making it as lawful to justify Dancing in the Worship of God, as that. And the Reason he draws from the Antiquity of the one, as well as the other, because Miriam and the Women Danced, as well as plaid with Timbrels in the Service of God. And
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And David Danced before the Ark, and devout Men among Gods own People did Praise him in the Dance, &c.

They did so in their Proceffions, when they welcomed the Ark, which did signify Gods Presence among them, at its being removed from one Place to another. And as they went to meet Saul, when they had the additional Honour of being admitted among the Prophets:

And since the Modes and Circumstances of Reverence in Devotion are alterable, fo as they may serve particular Occasions; Where would the Absurdity lie, if now, on some Solemnities, a Grave, Sober and Religious Dance was instituted and allowed by good Authority? Truly. I do not see, neither does the Answerer advance any thing to prove it absurd; but by styling it a Capering Devotion, as among the Corybantes of old. And altho' he adds a Confidence of saying: That no Man of Thought will allow such a Conclusion to pass for Warrantable: He may find the Author of the following Treatife, who perhaps has as close and consistent Thoughts as any Man in the Kingdom, is of another Opinion, and gives such a Reason for it, as I C pre-
presume he will not be able to Con-fute.

His 3d Argument is by making Circumcision as allowable now, as Instrumental Musick, because of its Antiquity, and the general Consent of Nations for it. To which I reply, That tho’ all or most Nations did use the Rite of Circumcision heretofore; and the Jews most particularly, having an express Command from God for it. As before Abraham the Father of the Faithful was enjoyned in it in token of the Covenant between God and his Seed; yet this was painful to the Flesh, far from being adapted to their Natural Tempers, as Musick was, only to be observed by a Temporary Command, and to last no longer than the Jewish State was to last.

The Institution of which, was to give Admission to the Jewish Proselytes, and to distinguish them from other Nations, in imitation of which, the Egyptians, Phenicians, Syrians, Arabians, Ethiopians, and other Gentiles, might take up the same Practice, and yet be no Argument for its continuance still, neither does any one say, that I know, That consent of Nations is an Argument of validity, when it is nothing else but Imitation, and therefore the refutation of Mr.
Mr. N. from Dr. Taylors Duct. Dub. lib. 2. p. 371. is very needless. For the Instituted Rite of Circumcision among the Jews, which might be imitated by the Gentiles, was to cease of course in the times of the Gospel, when another initiating Rite, viz. that of Baptism was appointed to succeed in its Place: But Instrumental Musick was not to cease, nor to have any other Rite to succeed it; neither was it made use of at that time in the Jewish State, or Heathen, nor since in the Christian; meerly because of the consent of Nations for it: But because it had the Institution of God at first, the prescriptions of all Ages since; no where forbidden; and by Experience found to be a great help to Devotion, being adapted to the Tempers of Men, and to which they have a natural Inclination; wherefore it may be as useful and fit for the times of the Gospel as before; and being plainly practised by the generality of all Nations, Christian and Heathen, may without any false Logick be admitted as an Argument for an universal Practice, and for better Reasons to be observed than Circumcision.

The 2d Argument made use of, in Defence of the Organ, needs no Vindication
cation from the Exceptions of the Answerer; neither do I see an Absurdity in saying, That the inspired Prophets introduced into the Church among the Jews, the use of such Instruments as were thought fit by them, being so Divinely Inspired, to raise the Spirit of Devotion among the People, &c. Being so Divinely Inspired, shews sufficiently it was a Direction from God; and therefore he needed not have Carped at the Expression; [As were thought fit by them] had he not left out the following Words [being so Divinely Inspired].

But then for a sure Retreat, he says, Show us a Command in the Gospel, for the use of Organs in publick Worship. So say the Anabaptists, Shews us a Text to command the Baptizing of Infants in the New Testament. And a Man who Marries one too near of Kin to him, may say the same thing, Show me a Text in the New Testament against it. But I conceive a few Words will take off the edge of the Objection, and shew there is no need of a Text directly to command either of them. For the Reason of a Law continuing, and that Law being no where forbidden, either directly, or by necessary Consequence, it is still in force, and then the Conscience is bound to
to the observation of it, according to a known Rule of the Canonists, Ratio Legis est nexus Conscientiae. This is agreeable to the Practice of the Church in those several Instances, as well as that concerning Instrumental Musick. The admitting Infants into the Jewish Covenant by Circumcision, was a positive Law of the Old Testament, and for the same Reason, Infants not being forbidden to be admitted into the New Testament Covenant by Baptism, are as capable of receiving the Sacrament of Baptism now, as they were of Circumcision then; the Reason of it being still the same. And if this way of arguing from Scripture by just and necessary Consequence be not allow'd, then Infants are in a worse Condition since the coming of Christ, than they were before; and the Gospel Privileges are now straiter and narrower to them than before, which is very absurd to affirm. So the State of Marriage within the Degrees and Limitations of Lev. 18, &c. is not expressly Commanded in the New Testament, yet is of force still, and the Reason of it is taken from the Old Test. because it remains still the same, the Old Testament, as to Moral Precepts, being as much the Object of our Faith and Practice as the
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New: ’tis both together, and not one singly makes the Rule we are to walk by.

In like manner Instrumental Musick in the Worship of God, being expressly Commanded in the Old Testament, and not being forbidden in the New, and there being still the same Reason for its continuance, does shew the Lawfulness and Expediency of it now, although there be no express Text for it in the New Testament. To exact a particular Command or Precept in Scripture for a Practice of this Nature, is as reasonable (says the Bishop of Cork) as to require a Text for having convenient Churches, or decent Places to assemble in, for having Seats in Churches, or Cushions to kneel or lean upon, or for any such useful accommodation, and honest Advantage of Divine Worship. So if we do not allow Scripture Consequences; * How shall we prove Women ought to receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper? or that the Sabbath is to be changed from the Seventh to the first Day of the Week, &c.

But then ’tis said, That Organs or Instruments of Musick were permitted the Jews, for the sake of their Weakness, to stir up their Minds to perform their external Worship with some Delight; and for this St. Chrysostom is Quoted, and the

Author
Author of the Questions and Answers; in Justin Martyrs Works, for saying this use was to Persons in a State of Childhood, after the manner of the Law. To the same effect Isidore Pelusiota, Clem. Alexand. &c. And in the Reign of David, 'tis intimated, That God suited such means to the Infant State of the Church. To which it may be Answered, That these Fathers do not by their Allegorizing the 150 Psalm, argue against the use of Instrumental Musick Absolutely, but shew rather the true use of it is, because of the Imperfection and Weakness of Humane Nature, and that God condescending to a regard of the same, did not only permit and allow Instrumental Musick in his Solemn Worship, but expressly commanded it.

And the Command was delivered by David and the Contemporary Prophets to the Nation of the Jews, yet it is obligatory still, (at least by way of Direction to the Governors of the Church) in like State of Affairs, thro' all Ages and People, because the Reasons hereof are not Temporary, but likely to last as long as the World does. So we may make our Appeal to what St. Chrysostom says as the Reason of it, with which agrees Clem. Alexandrinus, that it was Instituted and

C 4
Commanded rather than permitted, for the sake of Mews Weakness, to stir up their Minds to perform their external Worship with some Delight. And as he goes on, 'For that God had a Mind to bring them to a great deal of Diligence by such Allurements. For God considering their Sordidness, and Sloth, and groveling Nature, contrived by this means to awaken them, mixing with the labour of Attendance the pleasingness of Melody. Much like this speaks St. Basil, and from such Authorities as these it was urged, to be as useful under the State of Christians as of the Jews, 'because they have sometimes the same Deadness and Dullness, and spiritual Indisposition in the Service of God which the Jews had, which lack to be shaken off. And since the Members of the Christian Church, in the performance of their Worship, labour under the same defects of these sorts, therefore they stand in need of some such Helps and Assistan to move their Affections, to raise their Devotion, to shake of their Drowsiness, and to inspire their Thoughts with Cheerfulness and Zeal, with Love and Veneration when they make their Address's unto him in Prayer and Thanksgiving. Neither
Neither does this use for those reasons, in the least reflect upon the Wisdom of our Saviour, by not enjoining of it, as it is not very handsomely insti-
nuuated. For our Saviour himself, and his Apostles, did not disallow of, nor speak against the Practice of Instrumental Musick, when they Communicated with the Jews who used it in the Temple; as certainly they would have done if they had disliked it, or thought it improper for Christian Worship. Neither did the Primitive Christians declare their dislike of it, or judge it unlawful. But the State of the Church did not admit of it at that time, when Christianity was under Persecution, nor Instrumental Musick, as the Answerer Mistakes me, no more than the Jewish did, when under the Babylonish Captivity, they hung up their Harps upon the Willows, and refused to Sing the Songs of Sion in a strange Land, to those who carried them away Captives.

And 'tis no wonder, that in the Primitive Times of Christianity, there should be a discontinuance of it. For we know the outward Modes and Circumstances of Divine Worship, must give way to the exigencies of the Times, and have been ever Modelled and altered accord-
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Duty of singing, p. 464.

ing to the outward State of the Church. And this is the Reason why Instrumental Musick so slowly came into the Church, both Jewish and Christian. At first the State of neither would admit it, when the Jewish Church arrived at a settled Estate, it came in thereto by God's appointment. The Christian Church remained longer under Persecution and in an unsettled Condition; and hence it comes to pass, that as the Primitive Christians took up only the most simple way of Singing, such as their Condition would admit, so the advances to Art were more leisurely, and came on by such gradations, as Providence has given way and occasion for.

Serm. p. 15.

And therefore I said, To the Bene esse and Flourishing State of the Church, the use of the Organ, with respect to the suitableness of the Times, and usefulness of the Thing, does abundantly conduce. The latter part of the Sentence the Answerer leaves out, and then he takes occasion most notably to descant upon his own Fancy. I shall not speak of the Fathers Allegorical Expositions of Ps. 150, without the Literal meaning sometimes, which the Answerer mentions in three Pages, because their Sentiments and Mistakes in this Matter are Discoursed in the Treatise following. Clem. Alex.-andrinus
Mnus particularly is observed somewhere, to have spoken against Church Musick, but he does it not in pursuance of the Principles of the Christian, but of a Philosophical Religion then in Vogue; somewhat like that of the Quietists, or of our Philadelphians, who are for a mental Religion, abstracted from all that is external or sensible.

I come now to the next thing to be taken notice of, which is, The Antiquity of Instrumental Musick in the Christian Church. To say when, or by whom it was introduced therein at first, is not certainly known, and for that Reason it is thought to be the more Ancient and more Early received, for it being generally used in Divine Worship by Jew and Gentile, it pass'd insensibly into the Practice of Christians, as many other innocent Customs, in which they were bred up, ordinarily did. But to make it favour of Popery, the Answerer likes those Authors who alledge it was introduced into the Christian Church by Pope Vitalian, about the Year 656, or rather, that it may not want the Mark of the Beast in the Revelations, it was say the Magdeburg Centuriators, A.C. 666.

He is well pleased if it can be thought to be of Popish Extraction, therefore he
he mentions it twice, but yet confesses

Some think that this sort of Musick was not of so early an use in the Christian Church. 'Tis no great matter who is of this Opinion, but there be Authors of good Credit, who make it to be of a much ancieneter use by several Centuries of Years. The present Subdean of the Chappel Royal, hath these Words, We may and ought to look upon it, as the necessity of the first Christians, rather than their choice, and that they had not withral to be at the Charge of those Aids and Ornaments to their Religious Worship, rather than that they withheld the Expence because they thought it unlawful, or unbecoming their Assemblies.

For no sooner did the Church begin to Flourish, but they grew into Use and Esteem: And we read of St. Ambrose, who lived about the latter end of the Fourth Century, soon after Constantines Time, that he joined Instruments of Musick with the publick Service in the Cathedral Church of Millan, where he was then Bishop; which Example of his was so well approvd of, that by degrees it became the general Practice of other Churches thereabout, and has since obtained in almost all the Christian World besides.

Others
Others have referred this to another Cause namely, that as Inspiration in singing Psalms, (which was doubtless an extraordinary Gift common to the primitive Christians) began to cease, Instruments and Skill were brought in its Room, even as Learning and ordinary Means took place instead of those extraordinary Gifts.

The Bishop of Cork says, St. Ambrose took up a more Artificial and Melodious way of Singing from the Easterlings. And Dan. 3. 5. will inform us that the Eastern Practice, had the Sound of the Cornet, Flute, Harp, Sackbut, Psaltery, Dulcimer and all kinds of Musick in the Worship of their Idol Gods.

In the time of St. Ambrose flourished St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, who both mention the use of Instrumental Musick as Advantages to the Weak in Devotion, regarding humane Infirmity. And St. Augustine being a Contemporary of St. Ambrose, and who as some say, joined with him in Composing the Te Deum, which at this day is sung in our Churches, might in all probability be so much moved, as he says he was with the melodious Hymns in the Church, of St. Ambroses Composing and Improvement.

* Lib. Conf. 2. c. 6. *'Tis said he Composed 37 or more. And St. Hilary, St. Gregory and St. Bernard did Compose! many others for the Service of the Church.
Justin Martyr, or whoever was the Author of the famous Questions and Answers Bound up with his Works, Quoted by *Scaliger* and †Eusebius, mentions the use of Instrumental Musick in the Church for the same Reason which St. Chrysostom and St. Basil did before; which Book is Confess'd by all to be very Antient, and to be Writ, some say, in the Fourth Century, the Bishop of Cork says in the beginning of the Third: These Authorities must needs shew that Instrumental Musick was much earlier in the Churches Service than Pope Vitalianes Time, and so could not be introduc'd by him.

However, 'tis not to be expected we should find this Religious use in the very Primitive Times: But that can be no Objection against such an use of them now, for Christianity was not got then to that Height and Grandeur as to admit of such an Ornament, and we need not stand much upon the early Use of it, since its sober use is of so great an Advantage in Christian Assemblies, now the Art is brought to a greater Perfection than formerly. And since some Men of great Estates are at a vast Charge to adorn their Houses, and to have the helps of Musick for civil Purposes, it is some-
what unreasonable they should judge
the Expence Burdensome in Sacred ones.

Whensoever, or by whomsoever this
Advantage was at first Introduced into
the Christian Church, and made use of
inter Sacra, it was certainly done out
of a great deal of Wisdom, Zeal and
Devotion. And they did therein, but
that for which they had so good a
President as David, who did the like
in the Jewish Church, and what greatly
tends to Edification.

For Musick may be such, and of that Ef-
cacy, as to carry the Mind as it were in-
to Extasies, filling it with heavenly Joy for
the Time, and in a manner severing it from
the Body (as says our judicious Mr.
Hooker) the Harmony of Sounds, if we
lay aside the Consideration of Ditty, and
Matter framed in due sort, and carried
from the Ear to the Spiritual Faculties of
our Souls is by a native Puissance and Ef-
cacy, greatly available to bring to a per-
fect Temper whatsoever is there troubled,
apt as well to quicken the Spirits, as to
allay that which is too eager, sovereign a-
gainst Melancholy and Despair, forcible
to draw out Tears of Devotion. The
Prophet David, having therefore singular
Knowledge not in Poetry alone, but in
Musick also, judged them both to be most
"
necessary for the House of God, and left behind him to that purpose, a number of Divinely Indited Poems, and farther added Melody both Vocal and Instrumental; for the raising up Mens Hearts, and sweetening their Affections towards God, &c.

And why may it not be still an Ornament to Gods Service, and an help to our Devotion, while it makes our Church an Emblem of the Heavenly Quire, which is represented as praising God after this manner, compare Rev. 14. 2, 3. with 1 Chron. 16. 5, 42. It cannot be presumed we should have read in Holy Writ of Citharists and Harpers in Heaven, if such Instruments of Musick were offensive to God on Earth; or say there is no Musick in Heaven: Yet as one well observes, there is a kind of Heaven in Musick, and such as raiseth the Soul to Angelical Exaltations.

'S If the Temple Worship, (says the Reverend Dean of St. Pauls, speaking of Isaias Vifion just before) 'be a fit precedent for the Worship of Angels; why may it not be a precedent for the Worship of Christians, whose Worship as pure and as Spiritual as it is, falls vastly short of Angelical Worship, &c.
But yet observe what he said before; Musick whatever it be, or how well soever performed, is of no use or value in Religion, but as it serves the true ends of Devotion——And again, All true Christian Worship, whatever the externals of it are, is the Worship of the Mind and Spirit. It is the Mind only that can praise God, tho' the Tongue must Sing his Praises. The best composed Hymns, the most musical Instruments, the most charming Voices, are but lifeless mechanical Sounds, till they are animated and inspired by the Devotion of the Heart——As far as the Harmony of Voices, or Musical Instruments serve this end, of moving the Affections of the Mind towards God; they are excellent helps to Devotion; and 'tis only their subserviency to the Devotion of the Mind, which gives them any value, or allows them any place in Religious Worship.

So that we may speak against Vocal, as well as Instrumental Musick in the Service of God, if it does not help us in Devotion. And 'tis but a foolish Fancy, to think that Organical Musick is a part of Popery, for it is no more such than Singing is.

And, notwithstanding the Scoffs and Reflections are made on the Men of that
Employment, by the Enemies of Church 
Musick, we are told, that *Robert Test-
wood, and John Marbeck, two Singing-
Men at Windsor, were as early Prote-
stants as any, and as constant and heart-
y in the Reformation; the one suffered 
Martyrdom for it, and the other was 
Condemned to be Burnt, but obtained 
his Pardon for his great Industry and 
Ingeniousness, in being the first who 
Composed an English Concordance.

Having now given some account of 
the early use of Instrumental Musick in 
the Christian Churches, and shewn, 
That it can neither be Popish nor Jew-
ish, tho' used in the Jewish and Popish 
Worship. It was used in the Christi-
an Church, before Popery had corrupt-
ed it, and before the Reformation, and 
since, in almost all Nations and Coun-
tries. It came first into the Temple Wor-
ship by Divine Institution, and into the 
Christian Church, upon just and reason-
able Grounds, as being a proper Help 
to Devotion, and a great Ornament to 
Christian Worship. It was no part of 
the Mosaical Law, to be abrogated by 
the coming of our Saviour. It is very 
advantageous for the stirring up the 
Affections, and raising in the People a 
more Heavenly Temper of Mind, when 
they
they are about the sacred Offices of Prayer and Praise to Almighty God. It
will strike a Reverence and Awe upon their Spirits, and keep their Minds in
a grave and serious Temper. It will both raise and calm our Passions, as oc-
casion requires. *True Devotional Mu-
sick, will excite or heighten our Devotional Passions; Why then should any Man
think it improper for the Worship of God?
&c.

* St. Cryfofom is of Opinion, That
Organs, or Instruments of Musick, were
to stir up mens Minds to perform their
external Worship with some Delight.

In the Old Testament it served to
stir up the Spirit of Prophecy, as in the
Case of Saul, When the Prophets came
down from the high place, with a Psalter,
and a Tabret, and a Pipe, and an Harp
before them, and they Prophesied. i. e.
Their Minds (says the Bishop of Cork)
being hereby quickened, and their Inten-
tions raised towards God, the inspired
Principle in them began to move in the
Divine Praise. It is remarkable, That
Instrumental Musick alone, is there made use
of, as a means to awaken their inspired
Souls, &c.

Where you find that Learned Man,
makes use of the same Expression in a
manner, which is so much Carped at by
the Answerer, when also to raise the great-
er Cavil, he makes a notable Remark
of false Grammar, of [these] instead of
[this] But 'tis to be observed, he first
leaves out the remote Antecedent, viz.
Instruments of Musick, to which [these]
in the Sentence plainly refers. So also
to shew his Criticisms, he finds fault
with this Expression, In the use of In-
strumental Musick, that it will regulate
untuneable Voices. For the same Rea-
son he may excuse the unprofitable Ser-
vant in the Gospel. But this is trifling
with a Word.

Notwithstanding, there may be many
other uses of Instrumental Musick, which
it might be proper to mention here;
for it singly, and without Voice or
Psalms joyned thereto, served for raising
the Soul towards God, for quieting tu-
multuous Passions, and begetting a se-
date serious Temper, fit to receive Di-
vine Impressions, as in the Case of Eli-
sha, being Consulted by the wicked King
Jehoram, who being discompos'd there-
at, and afterwards importuned by him
and Jeboymbhat together, he changed
his Mind, and for the composing it when
disturbed with Passion, said; But now
bring me a Minstrel, and it came to pass
when
when the Minstrel plaid, that the Hand of the Lord came upon him, i.e. the Spirit of Prophecy, or the inspired Principle of his Soul was stirred up in him. Josephus says, being Inspired at the Voice of the Musick. He directs a miraculous Course for their Relief, on which Words the Learned Munster thus speaks; *Bring me a Musician, who by the sweetness of his Instrument, may remove this perturbation of Mind, and appease these tumultuous Thoughts of mine, which suffer not the Spirit of Prophecy to move in me. This is directly contrary to what the Answ-er has thought fit to deliver as his Op-inion, p. 59. where he flatly denies that Instrumental Musick in the alleged Case, was made use of to stir up the Spirit of Prophecy in the Person mentioned.

At other times, it generally served for the raising of mens Affections in the Service of God, for the quickening of Devotion, and preparing their Minds for it, as now it is used in the Christian Churches, Protestant and Popish, Foreign and Domestick. 'Tis much abus-ed in the Popish Churches, but regulated by the Reformation in the Protestant, and if we will be but confident with our selves, the regulating this and other Abuses, is the proper end of

*Dillertemis-bi Psalmten, qui Sc. In-
strumenti Melodiae au-
erat pertur-
turbationes animi & tum-
ultus varius in me sedant Cogitationes qua Prophe-
tia non ad-
mititur Spiritum.
Reformation, and not quite to abolish the use of it, because it has been abused, if so, I wonder what we should retain.

Luther's Opinion was doubtless for Instrumental Musick, but he did not expressly declare for it at that very juncture, when he began to separate from the Church of Rome, and wrote his Formula miss. & commun. pro Ecclesia Wittenberg, because he was not then clear, what in such outward Decencies he would have settled.

But he then professes, He never design'd to abolish the whole Order of Worship then in use in the Roman Church, but to Purge it from the vile Additions, with which it was corrupted, and to shew its Godly use——

'Tis very plain in that Treatise, he never design'd to Condemn Church Musick and Organs, but as they were abused by the Papists, for he allows much more of Musick in the Communion Service than we do, tho' not so much as the Papists use.

And whereas the Answerer says, He is inclined to believe, that he never approved, but disliked it. The Reason of which is, from his Quoting H. Eckard, who was one of his Followers, and Su-
perintendent of the Church of Schwatzburg, for saying, *That Luther num-
bers Instrumental Musick amongst the Badges of Baal, which looks as if he was no Friend to this sort of Musick. But had he Quoted this Disciple of Lu-
thers more fairly in this matter, and not left out what follows, I am inclin-
ed to believe, he might have been of another Opinion: For, Luther having reckoned up a large Catalogue of Abus-
es in the Communion Service, &c. calls Churches, and Altars, and Fonts, and Chalices, and Organs, &c. The Ensigns of Baal, but upon what account? He does not call them simplici so, *Sed si singularis aliquis Cultus illis affingatur: But if there be any singular Worship as-
cribed to them, this quite alters the Case, and for the same Reason he may speak against Churches, Altars, Fonts, &c. as well as against Organs, and so would any one, shoule they be made Idols of, and not as we say, only Utensils for the more orderly, comely and devout Wor-
shiping of God. To which I will add what Sethus Calvisius Quotes him for, in Epist. ad Senselium Musicum. Plané judico, nec pudet asserere post Theologiam esse nullam Artem que possit Musica aqua-
ri. Bp. of Cork P. 434.
So for Calvin's inconsistency in this matter; 'Tis apparent, that he sometimes speaks favourably for it, when he says, *He doubted not at all, but the Christians from the very beginning, Imitated the Jewish Custom in Singing Psalms. Now that we know was with Instruments. And in his Comment on Col. 3. he says, *That it is the Nature of a Psalm, that in the Singing thereof, some Musical Instruments be joined with the Voice.

At other times he speaks against it, and reckons Instrumental Musick among the number of the legal Ceremonies, introduc'd into the Christian Church through inconsiderate Zeal, &c. This certainly is an inconsistency with himself. And from his Temper and Practice, it may without contempt be truly said, That he was a Man of an intemperate Heat and Passion, however great he was as to his Learning and Zeal, in carrying on the Work of the Reformation.

And notwithstanding his Opinion, the primitive Christians in the main were of another, and did not think Instrumental Musick peculiar to the Jewish Oeconomy, and so might well be revived under Christianity.
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Now the Followers of Luther and Calvin, who in all probability, may be supposed to understand their Master's meaning best, have the general use of Instrumental Musick in their established Churches, as in Germany, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, and others of the Helvetick Confession; as well as in England.

And tho' it cannot be supposed, that every Parish Church in those Countries, should be able to have so great an Advantage in the Worship of God; yet their Approbation and Desire of it, is sufficiently shewn by their union with the chief Towns and Cities, where in their respective Countries, their Abilities are great enough to procure it. Mr. Duret says, The Reformed Hungarian and Transilvanian Churches have them; and likewise Trumpets sounding at the Church-doors.

If they have not in those in Piedmont and France, the Reason of it is, their unhappiness, being suppressed and kept under by the Papal Power.

Than that it was not in Scotland, is no more to be wondered at now, than it was not in England in the long Rebellion; none I suppose, will take a President from them in Devotion, who have now a
a third time since the Reformation, cast
of almost all Decencies in Divine Wor-
ship, and for about ten Years last past,
have changed their Glory, from being
an uniform Christian Church, (accord-
ing to the Primitive and Apostolical
Pattern) into the Novelty of a Nati-
onal Conventicle. They have not ’tis
true, like the *French Nimrod, Dra-
gooned the Episcopal established Church,
into a Non-conformity, but they have
done almost as bad. *

But that new Establishment may not
be design’d to stand long, being Built
upon a bad Foundation: And I have
been credibly Informed; tho’ the Came-
ronian Party have carried the Day, and
got Presbytery to be for the present in
the Nature of an Establishment; yet
throughout the whole Kingdom, there
is not one in Five approves of it, or
one in Three is a Presbyterian; and
among the civiliz’d Parts of it, not one
in Ten; and of Persons of the best
Quality and Education, not one in Thir-
teen. I shall conclude this Digression,
in the Words of *Diodate to the
Assembly of Divines at Westminster;
when they had done the same thing in
England, and desired his Opinion of it.
What a sad Spectacle is it, to see that
Church
Church troden under Foot! An horrid thing ye have done, and never before heard of amongst the Reformed Churches! We are struck with Horror at the change of the glorious Face of that Church! May God restore it to its high Estate and pitch of Holiness and Glory again. And give true Repentance to the Abettors and Promoters of that Change, which is so Monstrously for the worse, that they may in time make what Satisfaction and Restitution they can, tho' not fully, yet to the utmost of their Power, for the manifold Injuries they have done.

And tho' I must confess, I am not of Age enough to remember the Transactions of those Times in England, which the Answerer says go to the Tune of forty one, yet I utterly deny any Falsity in the Paragraph of the Sermon, p. 16. Relating the Miseries of them; some of which I have felt: My much Honoured * Father being forced to remove his Family seven times, because of that unnatural War, his Sequestrators threatening to throw his Children out into the High-way: But being all now gone to their proper Place, without making a suitable Repentance, or offering a Satisfaction, I shall leave them to Judg-
Judgment, without mentioning their infamous Names.

And to return, I know not what Reason the Answerer has, for saying, That all the Reformed Churches in Germany, Worship God without Organs.

Many of them 'tis true, are so suppressed and kept under, that they can no more have the benefit of them, than they can of the Hierarchy; nor than the French Protestants could of both, before they were unmercifully Banished out of the Kingdom: But these are in the Churches at Hamburg, Munster, Hessen, Caffel, Dort, Heidelberg, and several other great Places, where Peoples Abilities, and their Governours will give them leave. So likewise they are in Helvetia, as at Bazil, Bern, &c. But that they should be any where in the Greek Churches is much, since they are generally very Poor; for which Reason, in the Eastern Asiatick, they cannot be expected, because they are much Poorer.

I will not here omit, what my * Author speaks of, Zanchy particularly, (because he is quoted by the Answerer, against this sort of Church-Musick) and Diodate, two Followers of Calvin.

The former says; * Manifold and great is the use of this Musick, 1st. That
The Glory of God may thereby be made more illustrious and August. 2dly. The mind of Man is after a marvelous sort affected therewith. 3dly. Our Heart being by this Musick made the more Cheerful, the Grace of God dwelling in us, is stirred up.

The same is the Judgment of Diodate, and many of the later Calvinists, who, tho' it was the Fate of some, of them, to be necessitated to be without Organs in their Churches, have declared their Desire of them. And from this Consent of their Doctors, undoubtedly it is, that Organs are at this Day in use in most Places of the Belgick Churches, and long Time have been, is as evident by the Decrees of their Synods, forbidding this use of them upon Political and Common occasions, out of Divine Worship, and Commanding they should find nothing but Psalms and the Praises of God. And not only they, but several of the Pastors of the Reformed French Churches, who live in Places where they can conveniently have Organs, have also introduc'd them, as the worthy *Dr. Durel testifies touching the Reverend Rochfort, Pastor of the French Church at Rotterdam, and others.

And
And now with what Confidence can
the Answerer say, that the Hungarian,
Transilvanian, Helvetic, and all the
Reformed Churches in Germany, are
those that do Worship God without
the use of Organs? When the direct
contrary is as notoriously evident, as a-
ny thing can be. So true it is, that all
the best established Churches in the whole
Christian World do concur with us here-
in, who are of Ability to make so great
Provision for the better carrying on the
Worship of God in the Assemblies of his
People. That except our Dissenting Con-
gregations, and their Brethren in Scot-
land, there is scarce any where any
considerable Number of Christians Dif-
fent from us, so as not to approve of
Instrumental Musick in their Devotion;
tho' many be so unhappy as not to have
it.

But now our Adversaries being pres-
ved with this plain matter of Fact, can-
not with any Colour of Truth, deny
the frequent use of them in the Churches
under the Helvetick, as well as o-
thers of the Auffburg Confession, (which
Calvin Signed as well as Luther, tho'
they would make the Distance between
them to be ir-reconcilably great) they
would seek to evade the chief Design
and
and use of them, by saying, That altho' the Dutch have Organs in their Churches; yet they pretend not, (as the Author of the Sermon does) that they are to exalt their Devotion, and the more to excite their Affections; but they use them to regulate the Voices of the People, and to direct them in the Tune of the Psalm they are to Sing.

In Answer to which, three things will evidence the quite contrary to be true. 1st. Ex Confesso, he grants in the Case of !Elisba, That this sort of Musick was enjoyned then, for the quickening of Devotion. And again, Instrumental Musick was Commanded by God then and Blessed for the exciting of Mens Affections in his Service now; if so 'tis very absurd to turn off the strek of the Argument upon the Divine Command as he does there, whereas 'tis as clear as the Sun, that the quickening of Mens Devotions, was by the means, and therefore the Design of Instrumental Musick, and not by the Divine Command which enjoyns it.

2dly. The Nature of the thing is always the same; if it had that Efficacy under the Law, to quicken and excite Mens Affections in Devotion, as 'tis certain it had, and for that Rea-
son was enjoyned by the Divine Command, it has not altered its Nature since. And tho' it be granted, there is no express Command for it now, while there is none against it, and the Reason and use of the thing still continuing; it may very well be allow'd and approv'd of, as serviceable for the same end.

But, 3dly. Matter of Fact is directly against this Allegation of the Answerer. For, to shew that the Design of the Organ in the Dutch Churches, is to raise Mens minds, and to quicken their Affections for Devotion, and not solely to regulate the Voices of the People, and to direct them in the Tune of the Psalm. It is notoriously evident; as I have an Account from some who have Lived and Convers'd among the Dutch, and their Neighbours for several Years, and found it to be their Practice. For the Organs to Play their Voluntaries for an Hour commonly before the Service begins, and while the Congregation is filling; and then afterwards when the Organ stops, the People Sing a Psalm, and the Organ does not Play all that while to regulate their Voices, but did before to raise their Affections, and to cheer their Minds for Devotion: This
is done particularly at the Hague, at Amsterdam, at Hambourg, &c. At Hasslen, they have a peculiar kind of alternation in Singing their Psalms. The Precentor, or Master of the Musick, with his Scholars, who are like our Singing-Boys and Choristers, Sing out the first Verse, with all the People, then the Organs Play the Second. The Musicians and People sing the Third Verse as the First, the Organs Play the Fourth as the Second, Some such way they have at Bremen, Cassel, &c.

In many of the Dutch Churches, for the Reasons aforesaid, is the Musick upon their Bells, where they have Forty or Fifty in a Steeple, upon which they play some taking ravishing Tunes for an Hour or more together, before the Church Service begins; not so much for the calling the People together to their Devotion, because they are to be heard but a little way, being small and well tuned for variety of Parts, to play several Lessons upon, according to the occasions of the Solemnity and the Seasons of the Year; but the better to fit them for their Devotion, and to strike a reverential awe upon them when they come to Church, to raise the Passions of Joy or Grief, to enliven their minds when dull.
and heavy, and to compose them when vain and roving, &c.

Next he says, It deserves Consideration, That Organs were introduced into the Dutch Churches by some Magistrates against the consent of the Ministers. If so, they shewed a better regard to the welfare of the Churches than the Ministers did, and deserve Commendation for it. But doubtless the Dutch Ministers, would never have Communicated with the Dutch Magistrates in their Churches, where Instrumental Musick was generally used, if they had thought the use of it unlawful in the Christian Church; neither can we well suppose their Ecclesiastical Synods would ever have suffered it to continue so long as it has done, had they had any interest among their Magistrates or any Authority left in their own Churches, if they had not thought it Expedient also and useful, as well as Lawful in Holy offices, whatever is pretended by our Adversary to the contrary, to favour his dislike of the Dutch Magistrates, for their Adhering to so advantageous a practice, as he Saith against the consent of the Ministers.

I need not now, as the Answer would lead me, prove the Discipline of the Church of England exceeds that of the French Protestants Churches, the Dutch, Scot's
Scot's, &c. than I need prove the Sun shines at Noon day. And then touching the holiness of its Members in Life and Conversation. He seems very partial by insinuating as if the vast number of Debauched, Profane and Atheistical Sots, were of that Communion, and not among the Dissenters. Truly these are a great Scandal to any Party whatsoever, who profess so holy a Religion as the Christian: And I believe all Parties among us need a great Reformation on that account, and have too little cause to upbraid each other. But yet I knew a very noted old Non-conformist Preacher in the West, who having sufficiently experienced the Practices of his own Party for a long time, did some short time before his Death, advise his Children rather to trust a Church of England Man in Dealing than a Dissenter from it.

The preceding Discourse I suppose sufficiently Vindicates the Sermon from the Exceptions of the Anonymous Letter written against it. I have answered the main Objections in the Argumentative part, and rectified several Misrepresentations and partial Quotations which are found therein. Should I have followed the Answerer in all his Excursions and needless Repetitions, I should have drawn this Reply...
to a much greater length; I fear it is too long already. The Arguments and Authorities I have brought together, do I hope, abundantly justify the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in divine Offices to all unprejudiced Readers, and for others 'tis in vain to go about to persuade.

And if my Adversary cannot close with the judgment of his beloved Mr. Baxter in this Matter (who offers the same Arguments I do but with more Strength he says, p. 12. But why with more Strength? Had he spoken these things it might have been perhaps with a greater Tone; but surely the reason is the same when fairly quoted, and at large in the very same Words) I cannot suppose he will close with the Judgment of such great Worthies of our Church as the Judicious Mr. Hooker, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Stillingfleet, Bishop Wettenhall, Dr. Comber, &c. quoted by the Author whose Authorities and Opinions he thought not fit to take any notice of. But by some means or other, the Separation must be kept up, and before there will never be wanting pretences enough for that purpose.

To which I shall subjoin what Dr. Comber says in his Comment on Psalm 98:

Since the Glory of God is manifested to all Lands, they ought all to joyn in Praising his holy
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holy Name, and that by all due means which may express an hearty Joy, particularly by all sorts of Musick, by stringed Instruments, and Voices, and by Wind Instruments also; for Musick is the Gift of God, and tends not only to express, but to beget the Affection of Joy; it doth compose the Thoughts, calm the Mind, and put the Soul into a posture of grateful Seriousness, and therefore we shall find it of as early use in Divine Worship as anywhere else; and since all Ages have used it so, we may use it in more solemn Places, and on more extraordinary Occasions without just offence to any unprejudiced Persons, especially being Commanded in this and other places of Holy Scriptures.

And also the Judgment of Dr. Gaven Bishop of Exon. I know, says that Reverend Prelate, *some have been more at discord with the Liturgy, because they find in Cathedrals, and other great Churches, the use of Musick both Vocal and Organical, have been applied to some parts of it; which certainly is as Lawful as any Meeter, Psalmody, Hymnology, or singing to Tunes, which was never questioned by learned and godly Men for lawful in the Worship of God, publick or private, especially that of Praising and giving Thanks: Nay, there is no scruple but...
that even in Prayer, and the deepest notes of that, viz. Penitentials, both Musick of Voice and Instruments may be so gravely and solemnly applied, as may very much fit the temper of Mens Spirits, and the Spirits of that Duty; when either sad and solemn with Grief, or cheerful and exalted with Joy: Who doubts but David and the whole Church of the Jews served God in Spirit and in Truth, amidst those joyful and Harmonious Noises, they used with Singers and Musical Instruments? The Gift and use of Musick is so sweet, so Angelical, so Heavenly and Divine, that it is pity God should not have the Glory and Honour of it in his Service, and the Church an holy Comfortable use of it. That such an Orient Pearl may not be used only in civil Conven- tions, or abused in wanton Carols and vain Effusions, which is to put a Jewel in a Swines Snout: Certainly the Christian Church hath more cause to rejoice than the Jews had, and we see the Angels at Christ's Nativity began the Church Musick with the heavenly Quire. And having given his Judgment for some discreet Regulations of Church-Musick in the next Paragraph, he concludes, It was only fit for those Mens rudeness to abandon Church-Musick, who intended to fill all things with the Alarms of War and Cries of Confusion.
But in requital for the Citation of Mr. Baxter and the Assembly of Divines for Instrumental Musick, he brings two Church-men directly against it, as he says. The one Mr. Maxwell a Scotch Divine, and the other Bishop Taylor. I have not seen the Book * he quotes of Mr. Maxwell, and so can say but little to it; only I cannot imagine what those Reformed Divines are which he agrees with, that should say, Instrumental-Musick is neither a help to, nor a part of Divine or Ecclesiastical Worship. For I am sure, I have Impartially shewn in the foregoing Discourse, the most eminent and learned Reformed Divines, both Foreign and Domestick to be of another Opinion, and therefore I may doubt of the fairness of the Quotation; or well suppose, without prejudice to the subject in Hand, that every individual Person of Note and Learning, may not have the same Sentiments and good Opinion of it which the generality have.

And as for Bishop Taylor, * He is not directly against it, because he allows Instrumental-Musick may add some little advantages to Singing, and in the same Page says, I cannot Condemn it, if it be used as an help to Psalmody. (But then indeed he says) It is more apt to change Religion into Air.
and Fancies, &c. i. e. When it is not used as it ought be, and therefore against the abuse of Church Musick, and preferring that of the Voice before Instruments, which most People doubtless do; he finds fault 'when it is made so accurate and curious that none can joyn in it but Musicians, who do not sing and express the Words so plainly, that they which Hear do understand, and by this means the greatest benefit and use of Edification is lost.

I shall not enlarge this Discourse by bringing more Authorities in Justification of the lawfulness of Instrumental-Musick in Christian Worship. And I think there needs nothing more be said in Vindication of the use and advantages of it: For I do not find what is written against those mentioned in the Sermon do at all lessen their Expediency. Neither shall I need farther to trouble myself with Answers to the Objections, which I also there mentioned, as commonly brought against Church Musick.

But in Vindication of this Practice of our Holy Mother, the Church of England, from those Four popular Objections which are made against it by the Anwerer. I shall give a brief, and I hope
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hope a full and satisfactory Reply, and to conclude.

One of these we are Threatned with before, and here at first reading being proposed with an Air of Confidence in an Argumentative way, may deceive the unwary Reader, if he takes them upon Trust; but when examined into, will be found to be very fallacious, and to carry more of Popularity than Truth and Weight in them.

The 1st. of them is, That the use of Organs in Christian Assemblies for Divine Worship, is Condemned as unlawful by the Book of Homilies. Now that it is so, is so far from being most plain, as he says, p. 82. That scarce any thing can be plainer to any one that heedfully reads that Homily of the Time and Place of Prayer, Part II. (out of which the Objection is made) but must see the true use of Organs in Divine Worship is not at all Condemned therein; but only the great Abuse and Superstitious use of them, as supposed in the Times of of Popery, against which the Homily is mainly bent.

This Abuse and Superstition, the Church of England is now sufficiently Reformed from; and being so, as it is plainly expressed in the Homily, it is ve-
ry evident, that the use of Organs among other things there mentioned, is so far from being Abolished by the Reformation, or disliked by the Composers of the Book of Homilies, that they are by the very same Homily, which is quoted by our Adversary, adjudged decently to be retained in the Church, as things that God is either Honoured with, or his People Edified by, which I hope, if made good, will clearly overthrow this the most formidable Objection against the use of Organs in the Church of England.

Let us then attend the Place of the Homily, which is towards the latter end of it, and there we shall find, That after it has inveighed very severely against the many Corrupt, Superstitious and Idolatrous Practices in the Church Service before the Reformation; as against the Images and Idols, and numbers of Altars, with an infinite number of Toys and Trifles, to make a goodly outward Shew, &c. which it rightly accounts, a Mocking and Blaspheming of God's holy Ordinance: It comes at length to blame those who refused to frequent the Parish-Churches, because they were scourged of such Gazing Sights, as their gross Fantasie was delighted with, because they see the false Religion abandoned, and the true restored. This it does under the Repre-
Representation of a Woman thus Discouraging her Neighbour on that occasion. *Alas Gossip, what shall we now do at Church, since all the Saints are taken away, since all the goodly Sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like Piping, Singing, Chanting, and Playing upon the Organs that we could before.*

To which the Reply is, But, (dearly beloved) we ought greatly to Rejoyce, and give God thanks that our Churches are delivered out of all those things which displeased God so sore, and filthy defiled his holy House and his Place of Prayer.

Where, observe, the Complaint of the Person, who refused to come to the Parish-Church, was not among other things, that there simply was no Playing upon the Organs there, as the Answerer would insinuate, but expressly that there was not the Like Playing upon the Organs. The Words are; *Since we cannot hear the like Piping, Singing, Chanting, and Playing upon the Organs that we could before.* Where the Word [*Like*] being Craftily left out, the Sense and Meaning of the Homily is quite inverted. For the *Like* use of Singing, and Playing upon the Organs, most apparently refers to the superstitious Use, and abominations.
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minable Abuse of these things, which by the Reformation was clearly taken away; but the Discreet and Sober use of these in God's Service, was never absolutely Abolished, or ever accounted justly so to be; neither was it ever the Opinion of the Church of England in the Days of Queen Elizabeth, (or since) That Organs in Churches are displeasing to God, and filthily defiling his House, as 'tis untruly mentioned by the Answerer in two Places.

For 1st. In the Days of Queen Elizabeth, when these Homilies were Composed, and ordered to be read in Churches, it is to be Noted, that the use of the Organ was allowed and approved of every where; and was in most Parish Churches in England, not only in the greater Towns, but in abundance of lesser ones, in some very small Parish-Churches, where either pious Benefactors, or Peoples Abilities did reach to Maintain them; and this continued so, throughout her long and happy Reign; and afterwards, in the Reigns of King James I. and King Charles I. which Practice is so manifest, that it cannot be denied with any degree of Truth; which certainly nobody could suppose would have been, if it were the meaning of the Homily
Homily to Condemn them, and to account them as Displeasing to God, and filthy defiling his House.

II. It is also to be considered, That if we allow this Reasoning of the Answerer, from the Homily against the use of Organs, by the same we must argue against Singing too, for that is expressly mentioned with it. Since we cannot hear the like Piping, Singing, Chaunting, and Playing upon the Organs, that we could before. Where the Superstitious and corrupt Use of either Singing or Playing upon the Organs, is only adjudged by the Church to be taken away and not the use of either, or both of them to be Abolished. And indeed I think not only from thence, but well nigh as much may be Objected on other accounts against Vocal, as against Instrumental-Music in the Church, since both are equally capable of Abuse: But yet both of them may be of excellent use, if Grave, Discreet, and Regular, and of singular advantage for the promoting the Praise of God, and the Edification of his People, when skilfully joined together.

And then III. The Opinion of the Church of England is the same as to this matter, with what I have said above, as will appear by consulting the subsequent Words.
Words of the Homily, which are these

'This ought we greatly to Praise God for, That such Superstitious and Idolatrous manners, as were utterly nought and defaced God's Glory, are utterly Abolished, as they most justly deserved: And yet, those things that either God was Honoured with, or his People Edified, are decently retained, and in our Churches comely Practised.

Among which things, our Church does reckon the use of the Organ, wherewith God is honoured, and his People edified, and for those Reasons, was it decently retained, and in our Churches comely Practised, both at the Reformation, and in Queen Elizabeth's time, when it Flourished as much as ever, and ever since when it did. 'Tis very strange now, that the Church Practice, which is so clear in this matter, should be so strangely misconstrued and misrepresented, as if it spake against the same thing, which it so decently retains and allows, and finds so great Benefit by.

But to shew farther, That it cannot be the profeft Judgment of our Church to Condemn the use of Organs in it; as the Answerer positively avers it is, from the Homily, altho the obsolete expression of its being delivered from Superstition and
and abuse in the Place of Prayer, seems repugnant to its constant Practice: Take this short Story, 'The Lord Chief Justice Cook, was made a Sheriff by King James 1st. with a design of Displeasure, and upon account of his being of the Republican Party. He to excuse himself insisted on a particular of the Sheriff's Oath not then repealed, and perhaps not yet, whereby he was obliged to Prosecute the Lollards for Heresy. Will the Adversary therefore conclude that he was obliged to Prosecute the Protestants under a Protestant Government, and after so many Laws made in favour of Protestantism, only because this particular had escaped their observation and was not actually repealed? Could he think his not Prosecuting the Protestants prevaricating with the design of the Legislators, who had signified their sense by so many more and clearer Laws than were to the contrary? or could he think, that the sense of the Legislators of the past Age were to over-rule the sense of the Legislators of the present Age in a case of Contradiction?

His 2d. Objection is, 'That if the Obj. ii. Praising of God with Organs be thus Lawful in the Worship of God, then will it for the same Reason be Lawful to
to introduce other Musical Instruments; in the Worship of God, as Harps, Trumpets, &c. The consequence of which is very true; and at present in some Organs, there are such Stops, as represent Drums, Trumpets, and divers other sorts of Musick. And where is the Fault, that so useful an Art is now much improved beyond what it has been?

*Dr. Darell informs us, That at Hefen they Sing Anthems, not only with Organs, but with loud Instruments, and Violins too. At Bern they have Cornets, and Sachuts, which Play in the Churches when they Sing the Psalms. Upon Festival Days they have also Trumpets in Hungaria and Transylvania, which Play at the Church Door, &c.

And what if our Church-Governours think fitting to introduce other Rites too? They may do so, keeping within the Apostles general Rules of Decency, Order, and Edification, and yet not at all Acts repugnant to the Nature of the Gospel Worship. For these Modes or Circumstances of Worship being variable, may be altered with respect to different Times and Places.

But yet I will not call their Piety and Prudence in Question; or be so uncharitable to think, they will ever suffer the
the Church Service to be burdened with such a numerous Company of Ceremonies, as shall be rather an Hinderance than an Help to our Devotion.

His 3d. Objection against Instrumental-Musick, is a Syllogism, wherein the minor Proposition, upon which he lays the stress of his Argument is utterly false, and so being denied, will let the whole fall to the ground. For, The granting Instrumental-Musick to be the most proper means to quicken our Hearts, and to raise our Affections, and to make us the more Devout in the Worshipping of God. Will not in the least impeach Christ and his Apostles of the want of Wisdom in making provision for the Edification of the Church. Altho' we grant that they have not Instituted Instrumental-Musick in the Service of God, for the raising Mens Affections, and quickning their Devotion: And tis a gross Mistake to say, That they did Institute Vocal Musick, as the Answerer supposes most certainly they did, and that Mistake will destroy his Argument.

For the Institution of Vocal Musick, as well as Instrumental, was long before the Writing of the New Testament, and perhaps before the Writing of the Old. We read indeed of no particular Time, when
when either of them was first Instituted, tho' we may when they were first used. Singing seeming to be as Ancient and Natural as publick Worship.

And Instruments must be owned to be helpful to Singing, where an unreasonable Prejudice does not hinder the Understanding. Both were in use before the Law was given; as the Song of Moses, and the Practice of Miriam do testify; but we have no Reason to think this was the first beginning of them, when the one Sung, and the other Plaid.

And both being of eternal use, for the raising of Peoples Affections, and quickning their Devotion, where conveniently they may be had; does not reflect upon the Wisdom of Christ and his Apostles, or the primitive Christians in not having them; but, if he will, it may upon their Poverty, and the Afflicted State of the Church in their Days, when it was constantly under Persecution, this denied those Advantages in the Primitive times, which some Prosperous after Ages had.

The Apostles Admonition, To speak to one another in Psalms and Hymns, &c. does not exclude Instruments, but allows them where they may be had; and then they may well exalt their Affections in

Ephes. 6. 19.

See the Critics. Proper Reference to Instruments, not only; modulations.
in Devotion, according to the Mind of Christ and his Apostles.

I do not here account, and I see no reason I should, that Devotion consists more in Singing alone; than it does with Instruments; neither is one more Ceremonious than the other. Devotion properly consists in neither, not in the Voice or Musick; not in speaking or Singing, but in the Heart and Mind; the Affections of which are hereby raised, sometimes by Vocal sometimes by Instrumental Musick, and most likely by both together, when meet Instruments are added to make up the Harmony, the Efficacy is much greater, and to Minds in any indifferent aptitude well nigh irresistible.

True devotional Musick will excite or heigh ten our devotional Passions; and make us more or less ardent and affectionate, as our Souls and Tempers are disposed, by being more or less freed from, or disturbed with contrary Humors and Passions.

His Fourth and last Objection has little of weight in it, but because he has a mind to ask the Author of the Sermon this Question: Whether according to the
Act of Uniformity, and the Constitution of the Church of England, the particular Pastor of a Parochial Church is allowed to introduce new Rites or Modes of Worship into his Parish Church, over and above what are appointed, &c.

I will give him this short and plain Answer, That I believe he has not: But then I must needs say the Question is nothing to the Purpose, unless he can prove that the erecting of an Organ in a Parish Church where one formerly stood, and never was pulled down by lawful Authority, is the introducing a new Rite or Mode of Worship, which I believe will be an hard task to do.

'Tis certainly a very old Rite which is of more than a Thousand Years standing in the Christian Church. And how long in the Church of England I cannot tell, but we are sure it was a long time before the Reformation, and has continued so ever since, while the Church stood.

And the Prescription of so many Years, for such an use is a sufficient warrant for the doing of it, especially with the consent and approbation, and encouragement of the Diocesan, which is very agreeable to the Constitution of the Church of England. The allowance of which,
is as Authentick altogether as the Singing our Psalms in Meeter. And I heartily wish, when the expence of the War is over, that other Parishes who are of ability would follow so good an Example. I am very confident they will have the like Authority to countenance and encourage them, in so pious and Charitable a Design, which none I suppose will distrust the sufficiency of for their so doing. And I Question not but the benefit and advantage of it will abundantly recompence them for their Charges and Experience in procuring and maintaining it. Our Experience herein must oblige us to acknowledge so clear a Truth. And I can with the greatest satisfaction say, That I verily believe since the late erecting of the Organ in our Parish-Church of Tiverton, and much by the means of it, we have as Regular and decent, and I hope as Devout a Congregation as any in the whole Diocess. And for Psalmody, I may be bold to say, much beyond any that I have been informed of.

And now, I may presume the Reader will be convinced that tho' as the Answer says Something more has been said against the use of Organs in Sacris, than what is Anf. p. 84. to be found among the Objections in the Author's Sermon; yet a very mean Reply which
The PREFACE.

which has been given by one, will shew that what has been farther and more closely Objefted by the Answerer, does not at all invalidate the Lawfulness, Use and Advantages of them in the Christian Church.

After all, I have one thing to Advertise the Reader, that to avoid prolixity as much as I well could, writing not a compleat Tract, but only a Preface to one; I have frequently in quoting the Answerer and other Authors not set down their words at large, but the Sense in brief, referring to them in the Margin; and that without any the least design of Unfairness or Partiality. And in the whole I hope my unknown Adversary cannot say but I have treated him with all becoming Candor and Civility; I wish the Reader could say so too, having kept him so long from the following Treatise.

John Newte.
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For proving the Lawfulness of Church Music now, I desire no more than what is notoriously true in Fact, and not denied by our Adversaries themselves, that it was actually practis'd among the Jews, at least in the Temple Worship, with their Sacrifices and Sacrificial Hymns. Hence I infer, That none who communicated in their Sacrifices and in Hymns Sung on those Occasions, could avoid Communicating with the Instrumental Music, to which those Hymns were Sung; and there-
fore that the Apostles could not avoid it. For the Apostles, who were all made before it was thought lawful to receive any into the new Peculium besides Jews, or Proselytes of Justice, (who are reckoned as Jews by Nation upon that Proselytism) must therefore have been Jews by Nation, and therefore oblig'd upon a National Account to appear Personally before the Lord in the Temple, as all Males were on the three annual Festivals of the Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles, and to communicate in the Sacrifices and Sacrificial Hymns, Sung to the Instruments appointed for that Service. But this they would not have done, if they had known of any new Revelation forbidding it under the new Peculium. Yet certainly they did it long after they had declared against the Imposition of the Law on Gentile Proselytes; and therefore could not possibly have been understood to have condemned Instrumental Musick by those Declarations. St. Paul himself usually contriv'd to be at Jerusalem at those annual Solemnities, not only to bring the Alms of his Nation, which were to be laid out on those who were then assembled in obedience to the Law, but also to shew that himself walked orderly, according to the Law. The last
Act mention'd of him in the Acts before his Imprisonment, and his being sent as a Prisoner to Rome, was his offering the Sacrifice of a Nazarite, purposely to satisfy the many Myriads, who, as St. James told him, were zealous for the Law, and to clear himself from the Scandal of teaching an Apostasy from the Law, and to convince them that he as a Jew, thought himself oblig'd by the Law of the Temple upon the Jewish Nation. It was therefore impossible that he could, in his former Preaching, have condemn'd that as sinful, which he hereby own'd himself as oblig'd to, on account of his Jewish Extraction. So far he was from condemning Instrumental Musick as unlawful, as that he could not condemn the Sacrifices themselves in Jews by Extraction. If therefore our Adversaries will prove even Sacrifices unlawful for Jews by Extraction, they must do it by Testimonies later than this Practice of St. Paul. It must on the contrary appear that all their Testimonies for this purpose, drawn from his Epistles, written before this time, were manifest misunderstandings of his Words, when drawn to a Sense, in which it is impossible that he could intend them, without contradiction to his own Practice. Indeed they can produce nothing to this
purpose, even from the latest of the N. T. Writings. The Christians in the Acts had separated before that time from the Synagogue Worship in many Places. But we find nothing there, nor in any of the N. T. History, that they ever attempted it with relation to the worship of the Temple. St. James the Just, the Bishop of Jerusalem, the Bishop of the Apostles, frequented the Temple Worship, not only then when he advis'd St. Paul to do so, but also afterwards, if we may believe Hegesippus and Josephus. For he was Martyr'd there, and the Church of Jerusalem is represented in the Revelations as having Harpers playing to Hymns. The Archetypal Church in all likelihood, after the way of Prophetick Visions, according to the Customs of the Ectypal. And rather the Christian Archetypal than the Jewish, because there is no mention of bloody Sacrifices, but such as became the new Peculium, when the Temple was destroy'd. Nay, Justin Martyr, admits even in his time, that Jews by Extraction might observe the Law of Moses in their own Persons; on Condition that they would not impose it on the Gentiles. So far St. Hierom's Observation is from being true, that the Rites of the Law were mortiferous after the destruction of the Temple.
Temple. Thus far therefore it was impossible, that there could have been any Revelation to the Apostles, concerning the unlawfulness of Instrumental Musick.

BUT perhaps our Adversaries may say, That the Apostles might allow it to the Jews, such as themselves were; and yet believe it unlawful for the Gentiles, such as we are now. Indeed the Gentiles were, by the Discipline of the Temple, excluded from the Sacrifices themselves, and the Sacrificial Hymns, and consequently from the Instrumental Musick, to which these Hymns were Sung. They were not permitted to come into that Holy part of the Temple, where the Sacrifices were offered. All Jerusalem was alarmed by it, when they thought St. Paul had brought an Ephesian Gentile into that part of the Temple. But the Apostles were so far from adding to the severity of that Discipline, that they not only permitted, but obliged, Gentile Christians to partake of that Musick, as far as it was in their Power to do so, whilst the Discipline of the Temple was kept up by such Jews as were by Principles professed Enemies to the Christian Religion. They admitted Gentiles indeed into the new Peculium, without the Proselytism of
Justice by Circumcision. But plainly on such Terms as oblig’d them to depend on the Terms of Judaism, for the benefits of the Peculium. They were oblig’d to be one Body with the Apostles, to be built and superstrited on them, if they could pretend to any share in the corner Stone. They oblig’d them to be grafted into the natural Olive, if they would have any of the Sap and Fatness of it. This gave a Prerogative and Precedency to the Jews so long as this engrafting lasted, acknowledged by the Apostle himself, when on this account he reckons the Jews first, then the Gentile. For what can that Fatness and Sap of the natural Olive be, but the Mystical benefits of their Sacrifices, and their Temple Solemnities? The Gentiles therefore, as oblig’d to Communicate with the Apostles, must also have Communicated with the Sacrifices and other Solemnities of the Temple, in order to the obtaining those Mystical Benefits, of which the Jews were made partakers by those Solemnities, among others, by their Hymns, seconded with Musick, not only Vocal, but Instrumental. How so, if that Instrumental Musick had been unlawful, even to the Gentiles?
A Doctrine, in itself so incredible, ought in Reason to have very evident Proof before it be receiv'd. And what Proof can our Adversaries pretend to that can be thought so evident? Have they any express Testimonies of the N.T. that Musical Instruments in the Service of God are unlawful, sufficient to counter-vail that notoriety of Fact, avowedly practic'd to the contrary? If this cannot be pretended, have they at least any evident Prohibition of it, that might make it unlawful for the future, when this dependence of the Christian Church on the Jewish Establishment was to expire? I know no Evidence of either kind that themselves pretend to. Well then, will they pretend to any evident Proof of any other Proposition, from whence this must necessarily follow? They tell us indeed, that all the Jewish Law, that was not Moral or Judicial, was in course not only to cease to be obliging, but also to begin to be unlawful, from the Promulgation of the Gospel. But what Proof can they produce for this Proposition, so crudely and so generally express'd? No plain Testimony of the N.T. that I know of. Can they therefore say, that it is at least supposed in the Reasonings of the N.
Where do they find that the Apostles argue, that any thing was to be antiquated under the New Testament for no other Reason, but because it was prescribed under the Old? So far from that, that we have many Examples of the Apostles, and Apostolical Writers, Reasoning from the Old Testament to the New. The Adversaries of Tythes pretend that Tythes are not to be paid to the Ministers of the Gospel now, because they were imposed as a Duty to the Levitical Priesthood.

St. Paul argues directly contrary, that because the Levitical Priests lived by the Altar then, therefore they, who Preach the Gospel now, should also live by the Gospel. He reasons the same way when he proves, that because the Law required that the Ox's Mouth should not be muzzled when he trod out their Corn, (that was the ancientest way of Threshing, in imitation, as it should seem, of their Treading out their Vintage,) therefore the Clergy should partake of the Contributions of the Church, which themselves laid out for the use of the Poor, who were maintained by those Contributions. So he allows the Reasoning against Christians Marrying Persons of another Communion, from the Jews Obligation not to Marry Persons of another Nation, in order
der to their Propogating a holy Seed. So he also Reasons himself, that, as the Jews Cor.vii.14. did allow that the holiness of one Parent was sufficient to entitle their common Off-spring to the Federal holiness of Circumcision; so the holiness of one Parent, by the Rules of Christianity, was also sufficient to entitle the Children of such Marriages to the Federal holiness of Chris-

This he supposes, when he thence infers, that the Believer was under no Obligation of breaking such a Matrimonial Contract, on account of that Objection insifted on for doing fo, that is, of the holiness of the Seed, with which such Marriages were conceived inconsistent. For himself had Circum-
cis'd St. Timothy on account of his Mother who was a Jewess, tho' his Father was a Heathen. No doubt, on account of the receive'd allow'd practice of the Jews, whom he design'd to gratify by doing fo.

On the same Topick his Fellow-labourer St. Clement concludes the Sacredness of the Gospel Ministry, from all the ways God had used for asserting the inviolable Sanctity of the Levitical Priesthood ag

gainst Laical encroachments. How contrary is this whole way of Reasoning, to that used by our Adversaries, on many others as well as this Occasion?

And
And yet it was indeed no other than what was to be expected in their Circumstances, considering the History of those Times. Our Adversaries may be pleased to remember, that when those Scriptures were Written, (on which they ground their contrary way of Reasoning) the whole Church was Govern'd by the Apostles, whose place of Residence, as of a Body, was at Jerusalem. They may remember farther, that the Apostles themselves, as Jews, were possess'd with the same prejudices of Education as the rest of their Nation, in favour of their present Establishment, and against unnecessary Innovations. St. Paul had Persecuted the Church on account of his Zeal. And St. Simeon for the same Reason had got the Surname of Zealot. And St. Peter's concern for the Law he had been bred in, appeared on all occasions. His Hunger could not make him eat what his Education had oblig'd him to believe common and unclean. And he avoided eating with the Gentiles, that he might avoid offence of the Jews which came from Jerusalem. It also thence appear'd how cautious the Apostles themselves were oblig'd to be, in admitting Innovations, if they would maintain the good Opini-
on they were posses'd of, with their own Charge of Jerusalem, who were also, as St. James assures us, Zealous of the Law. We have therefore reason to believe, that they would not admit of any Revelation that was not very clear against the then received Opinions. Whatever their own private Opinions might have been, yet we have reason to believe that they would not have ventured to publish and practice Opinions in favour of Innovation, without such Evidence as as might satisfy others as well as themselves, if they would preserve the good Opinion of the Zealots mentioned by St. James, and keep them with their Zeal from Apostatizing from the Christian Religion, notwithstanding Innovations so contrary to the Opinions they had been bred in. But where can our Adversaries find any Testimony so express in the Writings of the N.T. that all the Ritual and Ceremonial Precepts of the Law were to be abrogated upon the promulgation of the Gospel, that even the Jews by extraction should be discharg'd from the Obligation, under which they had been formerly, of observing them? Whence can they prove that thenceforward it must have been unlawful by the Law of Christianity for them to observe them,
them, the' with no regard to the former divine Legislation, which had impos'd those ceremonial Precepts on the whole Peculium, but, on account of the humane Authority, whereby particular Churches may provide for their Bodies, without imposing on other Churches of equal Authority with themselves? Whence can they prove, that even Gentile Churches, who never were oblig'd by the ceremonial Law, whilst they continu'd Gentiles, might not by the Authority of their particular Bodies, resume any of those Rights if they should judge them edifying in their own Circumstances, without any regard to the Legislative Power, by which they had been formerly imposed? I know very well, our Adversaries of the Separation are posses'd of Opinions very contrary to what I have now discours'd. But if they will be pleased to examine them impartially, they will find no better Authority for them, than the modern Systems since, and the School-men before, the Reformation, and the Reasonings of some Fathers, not near to, nor acquainted with, the Originals of Christianity. But these are Authorities by which they are unwilling to be concluded in other Cases. If therefore they will be true to their Principles, they will do well to lay aside
afide these Prejudices, and see what they can find for those Opinions in the Scriptures themselves, which are the only Authorities they pretend to follow. But when these Prejudices are laid aside, they will not find those things so clearly decided there as they have been used to believe. No, nor in the Writings of the first and purest Originals of the Christian Religion.

AND yet I do not deny but that several of the Mosaical Precepts were indeed abrogated by the Gospel, and so abrogated, as that it is now unlawful to insist on them as they were then imposed. What I design, is only to shew that the general way of Reasoning us'd by our Adversaries, neither has, nor can have, the least Countenance in the Writings of the New Testament. This alone will suffice to shew, that before they can make Application to our Case of Instrumental Musick, they should first shew upon what Consequence it comes to pass, that any of the Mosaick Rites are made unlawful by the Establishments of the Gospel; and then, that this particular of Instrumental Musick is concern'd in that Consequence. This has not been, that I know, attempted by them, tho' absolute-
ly necessary, if they will reason accurately. For this purpose, I shall desire them to remember, that the great dispute of the Apostolical Age, was concerning the Coalition of the Jews and the uncircumcis'd Gentiles into one Society and Communion of Gods peculiar People, in order to the partaking of the same publick Worship on Earth, and their being thereby entitl'd to the Spiritual benefits promis'd by God, as his part of the Covenant, to that peculiar People, which he was pleas'd to own as his, and to receive into his Covenant. For the Principal thing design'd in those new Revelations made to the Apostles in the Acts, was to shew that the Gentiles were to be admitted into the new Peculium, without any Obligation to observe the Law of Moses, as it had been particularly impos'd on the Jewish Nation. That is, without any Obligation to incorporate themselves into the particular Nation of the Jews. This God shew'd by his effusion of his Holy Spirit on Cornelius and his Companions, tho' uncircumcis'd, purposely to let St. Peter know that they were not to be reputed as common and unclean, and incapable of joyning in Holy Offices on the Terms of the new Peculium, on that account alone of their not being Circumcis'd, as St. Peter hath thought before,
before, when he saw the Vision of the unclean Beasts and Reptiles. The design of this, was not to assert their actual Holiness, or being actually of the new Peculium without Baptism, as many of our separating Adversaries have understood it. That was no Dispute at that time; but it was only to let St. Peter know that they were capable of being admitted into the new Peculium immediately by Baptism, without being Circumcis'd. So St. Peter understood it, who took care they should be Baptized, tho' he did not insist upon their being Circumcis'd, which he would never have done, if he had thought them as much excus'd thereby from Baptism as from Circumcision. This Revelation to St. Peter, was that which satisfied the rest of the Apostles, when they Expounded with him concerning his freer Conversation with Cornelius than was allowable by their former Opinions. Afterwards they were farther Confirm'd by the miraculous effusions of the Spirit on the Gentiles Converted by St. Paul and St. Barnabas, without any Circumcision that might qualify them for it. But most of all, by those ordinary Manifestations of the Spirit then accompanying their Baptisms, even of Persons uncircumcis'd;
nay, which Circumcis'd Persons could not pretend to, till they were also Baptized. It being the peculiar Prerogative of our blessed Saviour's Baptism, that it was not only of Water but also of the Spirit. Thence St. Paul argues to the Galatians, as a thing very notorious, that they had not receiv'd the Spirit by any ritual Observances of the Law, but by the Obedience of Faith. And very solidly, even according to the Notions of those times. For the Holy Spirit being own'd for the Principle of Consecration of the holy People, I mean of the Mystical, which was also own'd for the only true Consecration; it thence appear'd that Baptism alone, without Circumcision, was sufficient for admitting a Person into the Holy People, which was one of the proper Titles of the peculiar People, which were in immediate Covenant with the Supreme Being.

VI. NOW this Constitution of the new Peculiar was perfectly inconsistent with the Old one. The Old one admitted none to their Sacrifices, by which Gods Covenant with them was transacted, but only Circumcis'd Persons. No Gentiles therefore could be admitted into it till they were first Circumcis'd, that is, In-
torporated into the Jewish Nation, and thereby made liable to all the Impositions on that Nation. And that by the express Command of God, who had excluded all uncircumcis'd Persons from partaking of those Sacrifices of the Jewish Temple, and consequently from the Archetypal Heavenly Sacrifices represented by them, and from all the Mystical Benefits of the Archetypal Sacrifices which were apply'd to the Communicants in the external Sacrifices, as well as represented by them. By the new Covenant grounded on these new Revelations, the Gentiles were admitted into the new Peculium by Baptism immediately, without any Obligation to Circumcision, or to Incorporation into the Jewish Nation. Both of them therefore being confessedly divine establishments, were to be receiv'd as far as they were consistent with each other. The first was to take Place confessedly till the second was introduced, because so long it had no Rival that might pretend equal Authority with its self. Afterwards it was to give way on account of that general Authority every Legislative Power has to repeal its own Sanctions, and on the general account that where the repeal is not express, the latter Sanction is to take Place, in Case of inconsistency, as being
being the Sense of the Legislative Power, at least from that time forwards. This could not have been Disputed, if the Jews had granted, that their own Establishment was design'd only for a time. But observing in the Old Testament, frequent mention of an everlasting Covenant, it was very natural for them to apply it to that of which they were already possess'd, and of which their Education had given them so great an Opinion. And when this Opinion had obtained, it was then very natural for them to gather farther, that God had thereby declared that their present Constitution should last for ever: and that therefore whosoever should pretend to repeal it, either wholly, or in any part, was for that reason to be presum'd not to be from God, because it was in their Opinion so contrary to his former express Declarations against any future Innovation. This Mistake therefore, the Christians of that Apostolical Age Dispute against. They observe in those Writings of the Old Testament, express mention not of one alone, as the Jews conceiv'd, but of two Covenants, an old one which then obtained, and a new one which was to succeed upon the abrogation of the first. Then they prove that it was only the latter of these

Heb. viii. 6,
5. xii. 24.
these that could be intended to be everlasting. That the former could not be so, because if it had been so, there could have been no place for the latter. There could have been no second if the first had lasted for ever. Besides, because the first Covenant is called Old, and that which is Old is ready to vanish away, Heb. viii. 13. And because the Tabernacle of Moses was made in imitation of another Pattern, which had been shew'd him in the Mount. This was observ'd as well by Philo as St. Paul. Understanding therefore by the Tabernacle, the whole Mosaical Dispensation, they thence inferred that all the efficacy of that was derived from this other latter Dispensation, as from that which was Principal in God's Design, tho' latter in Execution, and in order of time. Hence it followed in this Mystical way of Reasoning, (which was indeed the properest way of Reasoning in explaining Prophecies) that the latter Covenant was to take place of the former, and to be taken so far as a Repeal of it, as a practice of both of them were mutually inconsistent. And this way of Reasoning will suffice for abrogating all that part of the Mosaical Establishment, which is supposed to be abrogated in the Reasonings of the N.T. and of the Apostolical Age.
I mean with reference to the Design of those Reasonings, that is, as Impositions on the new Peculium.

VII. Those Particulars, were indeed inconsistent which are supposed unlawful in the N.T.

Those Particulars, were indeed inconsistent which are supposed unlawful in the N.T.

Thence it appear'd that Circumcision as a Condition of being reckon'd of the new Peculium, that is, as impos'd on Gentiles by extraction, must necessarily be taken away before it was possible that Gentiles, not yet Incorporated into the Jewish Nation, could be counted as Federally Holy, according to those new Revelations of the Gospel, of which I have already spoken. So also it was necessary that the Peculium must no longer depend on the Temple Sacrifices. For those were not in the Power of the Apostles, nor could they admit whom they pleas'd to them. They were perfectly at the disposal of the Jewish Sanhedrin, who were profess'd Enemies to our Saviour, and would admit no uncircumcis'd Person to partake in them, nor could do otherwise whilst they disown'd the new Revelations of the Gospel by the Apostle. So also that Ceremonial Holiness of abstaining from certain sorts of Meats, could no longer be required in order to the Holiness of the Peculium. For those had never been required from any Nation besides that of the Jews, and therefore
fore could not be expected from the Gentiles, when they were no longer obliged to an Incorporation into the Jewish Nation, in order to their being entitled to the highest Benefits of the Peculium. Nor could the Jews insist on these things as requisite for their communicating with the uncircumcised Gentiles in Holy Offices, if themselves would partake of the mystical Benefits of the new Peculium, on its own Terms. Their doing so made the Wall of Partition, mention'd by the Apostle; and made it impossible for them to coalesce into one Body with the uncircumcised', as the new Revelation of the Gospel requires. It were easy by this Reasoning to account for all the particulars of the old Mosaical Institution, that are supposed' unlawful in the Gospel.

If this which I have given be the true Original how it came to pass that some Mosaic Rites have been abrogated by the Gospel; there will hence follow no pretence for condemning them as universally unlawful now, for no other reason but because they were Duties then upon positive, as well as upon Moral and universally obliging Reasons. All that will follow from this Topic will be, That only those Particulars of the Mosaic In-

VIII.

This inconsistency cannot be pretended in the Case of Instrumental Mosaic.
stitution will be thus affected, that are inconsistent with the Gentiles free admission to the highest Priviledges of the new Peculium, immediately without Circumcision or Proselytism of Justice; and which being admitted would have made that breach of Communion which was principally disputed against by the Apostles and Writers of the Apostolical Age. Those could not be things wherein the uncircumcis'd Gentiles were already agreed, as they were in the use of Instrumental Musick, in their Sacrificial Hymns, and in their publick Solemnities. How could that have made a breach between them, wherein they did not differ? How could that have excluded Gentiles from the new Peculium, without submitting to the whole Law of Moses, which was already practis'd by the Gentiles, before they concerned themselves to know what had been requir'd by Moses? How could that have been taken for an Imposition which they had freely taken upon themselves, without any regard to the practice of the Jews? Then all that Dispute was concerning what might be lawfully impos'd on the Gentiles, not concerning what may be lawfully practis'd by the Jews by Nation. This is so certain, that even the most indisputably abrogated
instance of Circumcision, and the Temple Sacrifices were used by the Apostles themselves, as being Jews by Extraction; by St. Paul himself, the most zealous Opposer of those very same Rites, as imposed on the Gentiles; and that after he had said and done so many things against their Imposition. If therefore even these Particulars, neither were, nor could be thought unlawful, How can our Adversaries gather it concerning those many other things against which they can pretend no other Exception but their originally Mosaic Institution? The Apostle himself rather implies that some of the Mosaic Institutions did, and ought to, remain according to the design of the Gospel. What else can he mean? when applying that Passage of Haggai, concerning the state of the Gospel, that That God would shake not the Earth only, but also Heaven, he subjoins the event of that shaking, and tells us, that it signified the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. What this shaking means may easily be understood from what I have already Discoursed. That Convulsion depended on the inconsistency of the Doctrine of the Gospel, by which the Gentiles were
were admitted into the new Peculium without any Incorporation into the Jewish Nation, with the Mosaick Establishment, whereby the Peculium was by God himself confin'd to the Jewish Nation, and could not be Communicated to the Gentiles on any other Condition than Proselytism of Justice and Incorporation. This new Establishment must in course remove all these Mosaical Constitutions, which either suppos'd or caus'd this confinement. But all those other Mosaick Constitutions as well Positive as Moral, which were consistent with this enlargement of the Peculium, could not therefore be thought shaken or remov'd by it. If therefore they were not shaken, what can hinder by the Apostles reasoning, why they should not still remain? Possibly not as to the obligation which they had receiv'd from the Mosaick Sanction; yet so, at least, as to continue in their own native indifference, which may qualify them for a new Ecclesiastical Sanction by the Power of the Church. Such an Ecclesiastical Sanction would plainly suppose no antecedent Obligation from the Law of Moses, and therefore could be no Imposition on the liberty of the Gentiles, whilst it pretended to no other right of Obligation than what it receiv'd from their own Act.
Nor is there any thing in this Obligation inconsistent with this true notion of the new Peculium, nor repugnant to the union of Jews and uncircumcis'd Gentiles in one Body, on the terms of the new Peculium. Of this nature is the Subject of our present Dispute, I mean Instrumental Musick, as imposed not by a Mosaical but an Ecclesiastical Authority. I cannot for my part, foresee any solid Consequence from this way of Reasoning of the Apostles, that can possibly affect it.

So far the Apostles were from admitting this way of reasoning us'd by our Adversaries, of even making indifferent things unlawful, upon no other account but that of their former Imposition, in things unconcern'd in the change made by the Gospel; that even where there had been inconsistency, and therefore a change was really made, they yet allow a reasoning from the abolish'd Constitution of the Law, to that which answer'd it under the Gospel, as far as the Case might be prov'd equal. Circumcision had been appropriated to the old Peculium, and had therefore Baptism substituted instead of it, of which the uncircumcis'd Gentiles were as capable as the native Circumcis'd Jews. Yet I have shewn the Apostle argues from the Holiness of the Seed in Circumcis'd, to the
the Holiness of the Seed of Baptized Persons. So the Gospel Priesthood was not confined to the Tribe of Levi, or the Family of Aaron, as that was instead of which it was substituted. Yet in other things I have given instances of Arguments from the Levitical to the Evangelical Priesthood, allow'd by the Apostles and Apostolical Persons. So the Eucharistical Sacrifice, in which Gentiles also might Communicate, succeeded the bloody Sacrifices of the Temple, which had been appropriated to the Jews alone: Yet even here also St. Paul reasons from one to the other, 1 Cor. x. 18, and St. Clemens also in his unquestionable Epistle to the Corinthians. None can doubt but the precept of not muzzling the Mouth of the Ox that trod out the Corn was Levitical and Temporary. Yet the Apostle argues thence also, that the Presbyters also should partake in the Ecclesiastical Alms which they ministered to those who were to be maintain'd by them. If this way of arguing be design'd to prove a Duty in a matter so arbitrary as this is, concerning the Persons who were to partake of the publick Contributions; it will follow that even in these abrogated Particulars, they still judged it to be the Divine Pleasure that the old Sanction should...
should still continue, where the Reason holds the same. Had the Reasons been, without any regard to the Legislator, drawn from the nature of the things themselves; such might have prov’d the things rather Prudent than Obliging, and rather fit to be made Laws than to have had any Sanction from the former Legislation. But the Reasoning here insisted on, why the Ox should not be muzzled when he trod out the Corn, is to shew the Sense of the Legislator. Doth God take care for Oxen? Or saith he it not for our sakes? Why so, if God had not been to have been regarded in the Duty here insist-ed on? If as a Law-maker, then even the Sanction will continue, by which such Laws as these obliged formerly: So they will still oblige as Laws, whilst the same reason continues for which God was at first pleas’d to impose them. If as an infallible Judge of Reason, still it will follow, that whilst the Reason holds, they will be so far from being made unlawful, in such particulars wherein the Reason does indeed hold, that their performance will still be acceptable to God, tho’ not commanded by him. Either way of Explication is sufficient to overthrow this whole way of reasoning, as manag’d by our Adver-saries.

But
But what if we should turn this way of reasoning, us'd by the Apostles, against our Adversaries? What if we should conclude, That because Instrumental Musick was us'd then in their Temple Sacrifices, therefore it should still be at least fit and acceptable in our present Eucharistical Sacrifices? I cannot foresee what they could say, why we should not have reason'd as the Apostles did; or how the Apostles could blame us for doing so; or why our Adversaries should blame us, who profess themselves such Enemies of Impostitions, if they did not impose upon us more than the Apostles, in so easily condemning matters of this nature as unlawful. They can pretend no more condemnation in other places of the Writings of the Apostles in this Case, than in those others wherein the Apostles themselves allow this way of Arguing. And I know no reason from the natures of the things themselves, that even our Adversaries can pretend to be Temporary, or that will not make Instrumental Musick as suitable to our present Worship, as it was to that of the Apostles. No sort of Sacrifices were more proper for Hymns than those that are Eucharistical, and such all ours are now, but were not so
in the Days of the Apostles. And the use of Hymns neither is, nor can be denied by our Adversaries, as well in the private Synaxes of the Apostolical Christians, as in the Worship of the Temple. The Hymn to Christ as a God, in Pliny, appeal'd to in the latter end of the second Century, as a very early evidence of the belief of his Deity, seems to have been joined with the Eucharist. For Pliny tells us, on the same occasion, of the Covenant the Christians entred into against all the liberties us'd by wicked Persons. And the publick Singers are mention'd in the earliest distinct Accounts we have of their Offices, not as newly introduc'd, but as actually obtaining without any memory of a late Original. Had the reasons of the things been all that had been requisite for raising of the Affections, I cannot conceive any need our Adversaries can pretend for Singing: That does no otherwise contribute to the raising of the Affections, than as the assistance and Improvement of the Imagination may be supposed to contribute to it. The Singing does not add a new Reason, nor improve the old ones, why the Affections should be raised. But however they do dispose the Affections to follow Reason, more
more readily and more vigorously than they would if they had not the assistance of a favourable Imagination; and that by the Nature of the things themselves; and in that regard, Musick Instrumental also was acknowledged to have the same influence that Singing had by the Imagination over the Affections; and to add to the advantages of Singing Vocally: So it was that David's playing on the Harp cured Saul of the evil Spirit, by curing that Melancholy which disposed him to receive the Influences of the evil Spirit: So it was that the like use of Instrumental Musick dispos'd Elisha for the Influences of the good Spirit, by composing that Passion which his Zeal against the Idolatry of the King of Israel had put the Prophet into; it made him capable of being acted by the Spirit of Prophecy. For cheerfulness of Temper is one of the Dispositions required by the Rabbinical Jews themselves, for fitting Men for Prophecy. That may possibly be the Reason why the Scriptures mention Instrumental Musick as receiv'd in the Schools of the Prophets, especially when they were actually Prophecying; as it should seem to dispose them for the freer Influences of the Divine Spirit. The Singing Hymns to such Instruments is call'd Prophecying;
in the places now mention'd. So far the nature of the Spiritual Worship of the Gospel is from superseding this assistance of Instrumental Musick, as our Adversaries would have us believe, that on the contrary it contributed to it, if we would rather believe the Scriptures and the actual Opinions of the sacred Writers. So Miriam Prophesied with a Timbrel, the Instrument most us'd by Women: So Samuel's Disciples, the Sons of the Prophets, the Candidate expectants of that sacred Gift: They also Prophesie with a Psalter, a Tabret, and a Harp, and a Pipe. So the ordinary Officers in the Jewish Liturgicks, were to Prophesy with Harps and Psalteries, and Cymbals according to the order of King David, 1 Chr. xxv. 1, 2. And Jeduthun is said to Prophecy with a Harp, to give Thanks, and to Praise the Lord, v. 3. Why should we therefore think it strange, that the Church of Jerusalem in the Revelations, should be represented Harping with the Harps of God? 

We see it was the proper Employment of Prophets, according to the sense of the sacred Writers; that is, of those wherein that Church of Jerusalem did so much abound. How could those Sacred Writers judge Instrumental Musick improper for a Spiritual Dispensation, when they thought it fo
*in* an ordinary way, to dispose Men for the receiving the Spirit of Prophecy.

If our Adversaries would learn from the Scriptures, they should reason from the Opinions received in the Ages of the Sacred Writers, rather than from prejudices imbib'd from Modern Systems. That would be the way to reason as they did then, and the best expedient for finding the Sense of them who were us'd to that way of Reasoning. They pretend that all the efficacy of Instrumental Musick then, was due to a particular Interposition of God seconding his own Institution. Had the Institution been singular and different from the Customs of other Religions, or the event other than what would have been expected, according to the opinions then receiv'd among those who had no regard to the Mosaical Institution; there had been indeed some pretence for ascribing the Benefit rather to the extraordinary Interposition of God, than to the Natures of the things themselves. The jealous God, who will not give his Glory to another, makes choice of the most unlikely means in the opinions of those with whom he has to deal; when he designs to challenge the Glory of the event
event, entirely to himself. So it was when he was pleas'd to restore the Sight of him that was born Blind, by anointing his Eyes with Clay: So when Naaman was to be Cured of his Leaprod: by Washing in Jordan, rather than in Abana and Pharpar, the Rivers of his own Country: So when he reduc'd the Numbers of Gideon's Army, from many Thousands to 300. Here, on the contrary, those very means are us'd, which even the Heathens themselves had agreed on as most naturally conducive to the same end, and which least needed an extraordinary Interposition of Providence, in the Opinions of those who were to use them. It was easy to foresee that they would ascribe the event to the natural Course, of second Causes themselves, and that, in the way of reasoning suited to their Capacities, they would also think they had reason to do so, and that God intended they should do so, whilst he signified nothing to the contrary: And therefore God must have indeed intended they should think so, if he did at all intend they should understand him rightly. And who can think Saul's Servants particularly inspired when they recommend'd a Musician to their Master, as an expedient against the Ailings caused by the evil
evil Spirit? The reason in all likelihood why they recommended it, was because they knew it a likely Cure of Melancholy, and they believed withal, that when the Melancholy was cured, the evil Spirit who was confin’d to Rules, could not exercise his Malignity on a subject indisposed to receive his Influences. This is a plain Account how the thing might be done, in their Opinions, by Instrumental Musick, as an ordinary means, without any pretence to Revelation, which they neither did, nor had any reason to pretend to. The like Account seems most probable of the Case of Elisha, when he also made use of Instrumental Musick for disposing himself to receive the Spirit of Prophecy. He pretends no Revelation for it; nor indeed could he do so, if he was yet indispos’d for it, till he had us’d the remedy of Musick. For if he had been capable of Inspiration without the use of Musick, he might as easily have answered the principal Question demanded of him, as have used one Revelation for an expedient to qualify him for a second. But it has appeared that the practice was already received in the Schools of the Prophets, which might easily put Elisha in mind of it, when he found his case required it. And for its being receiv’d in hose
those Schools, no divine Revelation is, that I know, so much as pretended. The most likely original therefore, is its natural conduciveness to dispose the Mind for being acted by Prophetick Inspirations. The Heathens used it for that end, purely on account of its natural usefulness for that purpose. The Priests of Cybele, the Galli, advanced their Enthusiasm by the use of Cymbals: So did the Baccha in the Rites of Bacchus, who for the time were transported besides themselves, and knew not what they did; so absolutely they were under the power of that emotion of Mind which they believed Prophetick. They brought themselves to that Condition among other means; by this also of Instrumental Musick. The Passage of Nero, ridicul’d by Persius, is famous to this purpose: Torva Mimałoneis imple
rant cornua bombis. To the same pur-
pose, I conceive, may be referr’d those Passages of the New Testament that require our rejoicing always; that forbid our grieving, as well as quenching, of the Holy Spirit; that require perfect Concord between married Persons, that their Pray-
ers might not be hindred. By all these things it appears, that, in the received Opinions of those Ages, Cheerfulness of Temper was thought to dispose for the
Influences of the good Spirit, and Melancholy for the Influences of the evil one; and that Musick Instrumental, as well as Vocal, contributed to promote that Cheerfulness, and to remove that Melancholy. These Opinions, being supposed and alluded to in the Scriptures, ought therefore to be taken for the measures of Interpreting them. And what is there in this Hypothesis, that can, in Reason, be supposed Temporary? Can we suppose God to have made new Rules, for the Influences of the two Spirits now, that were not in the Age of the Apostles? Or, supposing the Rules the same, Can we suppose any Change in the Nature of Instrumental Musick, that may now make it unuseful, for those very same ends, for which it was then believ’d to very Advantageous?

XII.
The Influences of Good and Evil Spirits upon Man, such as may be promoted or obstructed by Instrumental Musick.

OUR Adversaries, who have been always more intent on the Words, than the Reasonings of the Scriptures, have not, I think, so well consider’d the Rules of Providence, by which both Spirits are constrain’d in Acting upon Mankind. The rather, because they are rather supposed than delivered in express Terms. But God does not deal with Mankind Arbitrarily, nor suffer Spirits to Influence
ence him otherwise, than may be consistent with that Free will that he has given him, in order to the making him capable of Rewards and Punishments, and of Political Government. That the good Spirit suggests good Thoughts, and that the evil Spirit tempts by injecting evil ones, is undoubtedly supposed in the Scriptures. But the manner how this is done, is not so clearly Explain'd. Yet it is certain, that neither of them do it to the uttermost of their Natural Power. The Holy Spirit being Omnipotent, could do more Good; and the Evil-Spirit, tho' Finite, yet being so much Superior to Man, could do more Mischief than we see is done by them. They might assume Bodily Shapes, and propose their Arguments as visibly to us, as we do to one another. But this is not the way of Conversation observ'd. They might impress Ideas immediately upon our Imagination, if God had been pleased it should have been so. But that had been too great an Impostion upon our Humane Liberty. As for that immediate Conversation with them which separated Spirits have with each other, of that we are incapable whilst we our selves are in Bodies. Even our Superior Soul, uses the Imagination, and is incapable
pable of framing any distinct Ideas of things that are not Material. The way therefore remaining, how Spirits may Influence us, without violence to our Liberties, is by their Exciting or Compounding Ideas already in us on fit Occasions, when external Objects are before us, that may Invite us to what is Good, or Insnare us to what is Evil. So the Inspiration of the Good Spirit, is call'd ἐπιθυμία, a putting us in Mind of what we knew before, on the Season wherein we are to Practice. For the adapting Thoughts to the Seasons of Practice, is that upon which the Event does principally depend. This therefore the Good Spirit may do undoubtedly, as well in Ideas of the Understanding, as of the Material Faculties. And there was no sort of Prophecy, wherein both sorts of Faculties were not concern'd. Prophetick Dreams had their principal Scene in the Imagination. Prophetick Visions not only there, but also perhaps in the External Senses. The Bath Col. was to the Sense of Hearing. Even the Mosaic Degree of Prophecy, was a Conversation with the Deity, under a sensible Representation, tho' not of any particular living Creature that might have been Represented by an Image. The Jews
Jews therefore do reasonably require in him who would be dispos’d for the Spirit of Prophecy, a lively Imagination, as well as a good Understanding. So that no good Man who wants either of them, is by his Goodness alone, dispos’d, as is requisite, for receiving the Gift of Prophecy. But the Imagination requisite for the Influences of the Good Spirit, was such as was Calm and Sedate, free from tumultuous Passions, and ungovernable Fancies, and consistent with the most accurate use of Reasoning. This therefore was the Reason, why the first Christians imputed the Heathen Divinations of the Pythia, the Sibyls, the Baccha, &c. rather to Enthusiasm and malignant Spirits, than to a Gift of truly Divine Prophecy, because of the Brutish Transports, and indecent, undisciplin’d, Behaviour, into which those Persons were driven, when they surrendred themselves to the Conduct of those pretended Deities. And what difficulty is there, why grave and grateful Tunes of (Intrumental as well as Vocal) Musick might not contribute to the allaying the Passions, and to invigorate the Imagination to such a degree, as would still be consistent with Decorum, and perfect Subjection to the Nobler Faculties, which this
this Divine Principle kept in possession of their Native Right of Government? On the other side, the Evil Spirits were not believed, in the Apostles Days, so pure from Matter as they have been since the modern Aristotelean Philosophy, received at Second-hand from the Spanish Arabs, has prevail’d. It was rather the Grossness of their Aërial Clothing that was then thought to Confine them to these Aërial Regions, and to make them need the Nidour of Bloody Sacrifices for their Nourishment and Delight, and that inclin’d them to that Malignity of Nature, that made the Devils; that ungovernable Pride, that Envy at the Prosperity of others, that Relish of Cruelty, and doing ill Offices to their fellow Creatures, which are the Characteristicks of those wicked Beings. This being suppos’d, must make them uncapable of Acting the reasonable, but only the inferior materials, Faculties. Their Power therefore was conceiv’d to be only in the Imagination, and the material Faculties depending on it. These being suited to their degenerated Nature, they can therefore Act upon them as far as the Rules of Providence shall give them leave, for the tryal of free Agents, in order to Rewards or Punishments. Their
Their way of Tempting therefore, is to awaken those Ideas which lie Dormant in the Imagination and sensitive Memory, as the effects of vicious Inclinations, confirm'd by frequently repeated vicious Acts. I mean, to awaken them at the Presence of vicious Objects, and suitable Opportunities. This may be allow'd them, if they be permitted to Act upon the Brain, the Seat of the Imagination, and the other material Faculties and Ideas which raise the Passions, and make them Head-strong, and consequently affect the whole Body, in the Disturbances following upon them. Accordingly Madnesses, which arise from Disorders of the Brain, were usually ascrib'd to Devils in those Times. The Excellent Mr. Mead, has long since made this Observation on those Words of the Evangelist: _He hath a Devil, and is Mad; why hear ye him?_ Joh. x. 20. So having a Devil, is the same with being Mad, in the Language of that Age. _Thou hast a Devil: Who goeth about to kill thee?_ Joh. vii. 20. And when the Jews charge our Saviour with Inconsistency in his Discourse, they tell him that he had a Devil, Joh. viii. 48. but more plainly v. 52. _Now we know that thou hast a Devil; Abraham is dead, and_
and the Prophets, and thou sayest, If a Man keep my saying, he shall never taste of Death. So St. John x. 21. These are not the Words of one that hath a Devil. From the Coherence of our Saviour's Discourse, they infer that he had no Devil. The same Opinion is represented by St. Justin Martyr, as the Sense of the Christians of his Age, that Mad Persons were believed to be Daemoniacks. As therefore King Saul was Punished by having an evil Spirit sent him from the Lord; so also, frequently in the Poets, the ancientest Writers of the Greeks, and the Personators of the eldest Antiquities they knew of, it is mentioned as the Punishment of pious Persons; that they were delivered over to Furies, and by them alienated from their Senses, and driven into Madness. So in the Case of Athamas, of Hercules, of Alcmen, of Orestes, &c. And their Cure was usually by Expiations and Offices of Religion, rather than Physick, which proved the Aylings to be caus'd immediately by Spirits. Yet sometimes also by Physick, which proved withal, that the Disposition of the matter was removeable by Natural Expedients, and that when it was so, the Evil Spirits had no longer Power to molest those who
who were so Cur'd, by the Rules prescrib'd to them by Providence. This Hippocrates proves particularly in the Cafe of the Morbus Sacer. Besides these Distractions of Mind, there were also other Aylings and Diseases inflicted by way of Punishment on Criminals by the Sentence of God, and the Intervention of Evil Spirits. Such were the Falling-Sickness, such were Aylings returning with the Changes of the Moon, such were Leprosies, such several sorts of Fivers and Agues, such all those Molestations which were removable by Charms, and the like suspected means of Covenants and Intercourse with Evil Spirits. For it was the receiv'd Opinion, as Tertullian shews, that the Devils could Cure no Maladies but such as had been caus'd by them, by ceasing to use the Means that had caus'd them, when they were address'd to in the ways appoint-ed by themselves, and permitted by Providence for the Punishment of those who rely'd on them, and maintained such unlawful Intercourse with the Spirits that had appointed them. They did not so much as pretend to Cure all sorts of Diseases by Charms and Expiations. I believe all those Diseases which were so Cured, may be reduc'd to the Brain;
Brain; that part which I have shewn was thought liable to the Devils Influ-
ences. I mean, including the Spinal Marrow, which is of the same Nature with the Brain. This also is included in the Part allowed to the Devils to A& by the Romancer, under the Name of St. Clemens, in the third Century; and therefore a good Witness of the Opinions receiv'd among the Christians of that Age. This is express'd less clearly in the Recognitions, whereof we have only the Translation by Rufinus, in these Words. Ante omnia ergo intelligere debetis deceptionem Serpentis antiqui & callidas ejus suggestiones, qui quasi per prudentiam decipit vos, & velut ratione quadam serpit per sensus vestros; atq; ab ipso vertice incipiens, per interiores dilabitar medullas; lucrum magnum computans deceptionem vestram. But more clearly in the Greek, perhaps more Faithfully preserved in the Clementines: περὶ τὰν ἐν έννοιλείαις ὑφείλεται τῷ ὑμῖν ἀπατῶν-Θεός ὑφαίσθησαί ἑπινοεῖ, ὁς ἐγκνώμευς ὑμᾶς ἀπατᾷ, ὑποκείμενος λογίσμῳ, ἔρπων ὑμῖν ὡς τῇ ἐγκαφείᾳ εἰς τῷ ναπαίον μυελὸν, ὅμως παραπέθεθαν ἀπάτως. It is no great matter whether the Tradition be true, that is mentioned by the Ancients, that the Spinal Marrow of a Man, when cor-
rupted
rupted turns into a Serpent. Such as it is, we have it from Authors ancient, and not contemptible, Ovid, Pliny, Plutarch, and Ælian. However, we know, even pretended Physiology is taken, by the Mystical Interpreters of the Old Testament, as a Rule of Mystical Interpretation, and doth really serve the end of God, for recommending Mystical Senses to the observation of the Reader, better than truer Physiology, that had not been so well understood by the Readers of those Times. Besides, we know what a Subject the Fall of Man, and the Devils concern in it, under the Allegory of a Serpent, the Old Serpent, as he is called in the Revelations, afforded of Mystical Interpretations. We know withal, that even among the Heathens, a lower sort of Demons, especially those called Heroes, were usually represented under the Symbols of Serpents, possibly in memory of this Scripture History, as has been observ’d by the late Learned Bishop of Worcester, in his Origin. Sacr. Why might not then this Natural History be adapted to signify the Seat of the Devils Influence? There is a not-unlike Experiment pretended by the Pythagoreans, for explaining their Symbol for Abstaining from
wibus, the rather apposite to this purpose, because they, as well as our Sacred Writers, design'd mystical Senses, especially in their Symbols. But I cannot allow my self at present, to follow this Argument as far as it would lead me. It suffices now, to observe that this Hypothesis seems generally alluded to in the Sacred Writers, especially of the New Testament, and therefore cannot indeed be thought so precarious as our Adversaries might otherwise conceive, if they will suffer themselves to be led away with popular Prejudices, without examining it. The New Testament plainly enough distinguishes the Gift of Healing, which Cured Diseases not caus'd by Devils, directly from the Curing Infirmities caus'd by Devils, which were sufficiently Cured by casting out the Devils that caus'd them. And I think also, that they mention no Aylings of the latter sort, which may not be accounted for by their Power allow'd them by God on the Parts now mention'd. However, this Difference between Divine Prophecy and Diabolical Enthusiasm, seems to have been generally agreed on, that Prophecy requir'd Imagination, but perfected and duly subordinated to the Nobler Faculties; but En-
thufiasm went no farther than the Imagination; and therefore disorder'd and hindered the Understanding, and the immaterial Faculties depending on it. And our Adversaries must be very difficult indeed in their Concessions, if they can doubt whether Instrumental Musick can affect the Imagination, so as to Compose or Disorder it. Yet this alone is sufficient for disabling Devils to Influence it, if their Power be confined by Providence to disposed Matter, and Musick may indispose the Imagination for their Influences, and it be not withal, in their Power to make or hinder Dispositions.

BUT our Adversaries have a strange Notion of the Spiritualness of our Christian Religion, as if all Bodily and External Assistanctees were now perfectly useless and inconsistent with the Nature of our present Dispensation. On this account, they are averse to all Assistanctees of our Senses, as well as this of Instrumental Musick. But why should God have Instituted Sacraments for Assisting our Senses, if the whole kind of such Assistanctees had been so derogatory to the Nature of his new Establishment? Why should he have allow'd even Vocal
cal Musick; if even our Senses could contribute nothing to the raising of the Devotion of our Spirits? I know our Adversaries are more willing to impute this Usefulness of Instrumental Musick, rather to the extraordinary Interposition of God, seconding his own Institution. But why should they think it derogatory to the Providence of God, that he should make use of the Power, himself has given to the Natures of Things? Or why should they deny the Experience of so many Heathens, who, tho' they regarded not the Institutions of the God of the Jews, yet receiv'd the same Practice of Instrumental Musick, on account of the Devotion they pretend-ed to feel rais'd in themselves by it, in their several false Religions. This could be imputable to nothing but the Natures of the things themselves. But where have they learned such a Noti-
on of the Spiritualness of the Christian Religion, that should exclude the Use; or even the Necessity, of Corporeal Affi-
iances. The Scripture is not more express in requiring a Spiritual Worship, than it is in requiring that also of the Body. Our Bodies are Temples of the Ho-
ly Ghost, and we are accordingly requir'd to Glorifie God in our Bodies, as
well as our Spirits which are his, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. The unmarried Woman, is so to care for the things of the Lord, that she may be Holy both in Body and in Spirit, vii. 34. We are to present our Bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable Service, Rom. xii. 1. And our whole Spirit, and Soul, and Body, are to be preserved Blameless unto the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Thes. v. 23. If Service be expected from the Body as well as the Spirit, How can it be disagreeable to the Nature of our Spiritual Religion, that such Parts of Bodily Worship may be retain'd or introduc'd as may in their own Nature contribute to the Worship of the Spirit? There was indeed near the Apostles times, an Opinion introduc'd among the Philosophers, Numenius perhaps may be the first that brought it in, from whom Porphyry owns Plotinus to have borrowed what he has to this purpose, That the Soul alone was the Man, and that the Body was no part of the Man, but a Prison to the Soul; and therefore preternatural to it; and to be avoided by it, that it might be qualified for a perfect State. And these did indeed so insist on the Spiritual Nature of Religion, as to dis-
charge the Body from any share in it. The Good Man with them was the only Priest, the Soul it self the only acceptable Temple, the Devotion of the Mind the pleasing Sacrifice. And the way to union with God, was to alienate themselves as much as was possible from the Body, and from the external Societies of Men, and to ensue themselves to abstracted Operations of the Mind, in order to the Cultivating of the Spirit, which was the only Power that they thought capable of an Union with the Supreme Being. This is that Philosophical Religion so much Celebrated by Plotinus, Porphyry himself, and Hierocles, and several other of the later Philosophers. Porphyry particularly was very much pleas'd with it, as appears from his Sentences, and his Books de Abstinentia, but especially from his Epistle to Anebo, where he does by these Principles undermine all Obligation to the Externals of the Heathen, as well as the Christian Religion. This put him on Starving himself in his Lilybaean Retirement, if his MasterPlotinus (whom he follow'd in these Opinions) had not reclaim'd him. This seems to be the Original of all that Enthusiasm that has decry'd the external Ordinances and Sacraments
cramenents even of Christ himself, upon Pretences to greater Perfection, and several Fancies of the old Monks relating this way in Anastasius Sinaita; of the Popish Mystical Divinity and Quietism, of the Familists and Quakers, of the Bourignonists and Philadelphians, &c. It is strange, our Presbyterian Adversaries who dislike these Consequences in others, so destructive of their own Discipline, are notwithstanding insensible of the advantage they have given to others, of justifying Separation from themselves, by these Pretences of the Spiritual Nature of the Evangelical Worship, by which themselves defended their own Separation from their own Superiours. This might at least have warned them to a more accurate Examination of the Principle, when they found they could not justify the Consequences which followed from it. For us it is abundantly sufficient that this Doctrine, tho' taught by the Adversaries of the Apostles Age, was notwithstanding perfectly different from the Sense of the Apostolical Church it itself. The Hereticks by this means evaded the Resurrection of the Body, pretending the Resurrection promis'd was already past; in their mystical Resurrection from Sin. For the rising of the Body could not be thought
thought a Reward, if the being in the
Body was preternatural, and a State of
Punishment. Thence also it proceeded,
that so many of those first Hereticks de-
filed the Flesh, as not belonging to
them, and condemn'd Marriage, as con-
tributing to confine Souls to Bodies, up-
on this very Pretence of being them-
selves Spiritual, and being therefore for
a more Spiritual way of Worship. But
it is as certain, that this Doctrine was
different from the Doctrine of the Apo-
stles, as it is certain the Apostles were
for the Holy Treatment and Resur-
rection of the Body, and that they Con-
demn'd those for Hereticks, who Rea-
sion'd from this Principle insisted on by
our Adversaries, of which they had o-
therwise no better means of Informati-
on. How therefore can our Adver-
aries Reason loofly for the Reformation
of Christianity from that same Principle
which we see was contrary to the very
Foundations of truly Primitive Aposto-
logical Christianity? Which was the Fou-

dation of most of those Heresies which
were then Condemn'd by that Unque-

XIV.

The same Reason that
provdBodi-

FOR my part, I can see no Difference,
in this particular, between the Old and
the
the New Peculium. We have Bodies as well as they, and of the same frail Make and Constitution as theirs were. Our Souls are also of the same Kind, as dependent on our Bodies as theirs, and as apt to be Influenc'd by them. Providence has impos'd no new Rules, that we know of, for the Influences of Good and Evil Spirits, from what were impos'd then. What then should hinder, but that still our Minds should be Influenc'd by the Good and Evil Dispositions of our Bodies as much as formerly? And that in order to the receiving the Influences of both sorts of Spirits. And certainly they cannot think that Musick has lost any of that Influence on our Bodies that it had formerly. How can they therefore doubt, but that it might still have the same effect on the like Bodies, alike Influencing the same kind of Souls? The Church is still as much a Body as it was then, and as much oblig'd to Worship God in Assemblies, tho' not confin'd to one particular Nation, as it was then. And the Apostle requires that all Acts of the Worship in Assemblies, were to be perform'd with a design of Edifying the whole Assemblies. He permits no Exercice of Gifts, even of the Divine Spi-

rit there, but such as were for common Edification. But the Edification of Assemblies is not otherwise performable than by Sensible and Corporeal Significations. These are the only means by which the whole Body can Communicate in the Devotion of every particular, by which they can mutually give and receive Edification. It is therefore still as impossible to signify a great Honour for the Deity Ador'd in such Assemblies but by Signs greatly affecting the very Senses. And what is done in the Name of the whole Body, ought to be suited to the Dignity of the Body represented. That must be by Signs by which Bodies usually signify their great Respect by the Customs of such Bodies. But Bodies do not usually signify their great Respect in their Worldly intercourse otherwise than by Pomp and Magnificence. They cannot therefore signify it in Affairs of Religion by Signs, mean and ordinary. Especially if their Design be to signify it to the Senses, and for the Edification of others. For certainly Signs which signify a mean or no Respect on other occasions, cannot be thought to signify a great one in the Affairs of Religion. It is on the contrary taken as an Affront to Hon-
our excellent Persons in a way unsuitable to their Character, tho' the same Significations might justly be reputed Honourable, if perform'd to an inferior Person to whom they had been proportionable. This Consideration must make all Significations short of the utmost that can be done dishonourable when paid to an Infinitely Perfect Being. The Magnificence therefore of the Worship of God, ought to be such as it us'd to signify the greatest Respect to the Senses of the Spectators, if the Respect be to be signified Sensibly. I know not how our Adversaries can deny any part of this Reasoning on the Principles now mentioned.

BUT I know they do pretend Authority for this way of Arguing, God is a Spirit, says our Saviour, and they that Worship him, must Worship him in Spirit and in Truth, St. Joh. iv. 24. This is spoken with relation to the Worship of the Jews at Jerusalem, and the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim; and therefore must signify something Spiritual in the Christian Religion, which was not so in the Worship of the Jews and the Samaritans. But this might very well be true without making external Worship

The VVorship of God in Spirit, not oppos'd to that which is Sensible & Corporeal, but to the Literal Sense of the Law of Mo-
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ship inconsistent with the \textbf{Spiritual} Nature of the\textit{Christian} Religion. The true Account of this Matter; I take to be this: That in what was common to the \textit{Jews} and the \textit{Samaritans}, there were two Parts, the \textit{Sensible} and the \textit{External} Part, which was proper to themselves, and which the \textit{Christians} were not concern'd in; and the \textit{Mystical} and \textit{Spiritual}, which was principally design'd by God, which was thenceforward to obtain as the peculiar Glory of the \textit{Christian} Religion. So the \textit{New Testament} is oppos'd to the \textit{Old}, that it is not of the \textit{Letter} as the \textit{Old} was, but of the \textit{Spirit}, \textit{2 Cor. iii. 6.} that is, that the \textit{New Testament} is really the same with the \textit{Old}, the same thing in the \textit{Spiritual Sense}, which was prefigur'd by the \textit{Literal Sense}, of what was enjoin'd on the \textit{Jews} then. Thus the \textit{Letter} and \textit{Circumcision} are taken for \textit{Circumcision in the Literal Sense}, \textit{Rom. ii. 27.} by a known \textit{Hendiadis}, and \textit{Circumcision of the Heart}, is said to be in the \textit{Spirit}, \textit{not in the Letter}, \textit{v. 29.} So the Service in newness of the \textit{Spirit}, is oppos'd to that which had been in the oldness of the \textit{Letter}, \textit{Rom. vii. 6.} And when the \textit{Jews} understand'd our Saviour's Discourse concerning \textit{Eating his Flesh}, and
and Drinking his Blood in a Carnal Sense, he Corrects their Mistake, by telling them, That the Words he had spoken to them were Spirit and Life, St. Joh. vi. 63. that is, by warning them, that his Words were to be understood not Literally but Mystically. Life is join'd with Spirit in our Saviour's Words, exactly as it is by the Apostle, when he also tells us, that the Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life, 2 Cor. iii. 6, intimating, that the Life promis'd by Moses, when he set Life and Death before the Israelites, was not to be expected from the Observation of the Literal Sense of the Mosaical Law, but the Mystical, which was a strong Obligation to the New Peculium. Because the Mystical Sense even of the old Law, which was the principal Sense design'd by God, was suppos'd to be the same with the Gospel. So Spirit and Truth are also fitly join'd together in the Discourse of our Saviour with the Woman of Samaria. For the Mystical Sense, was the Sense truly intended by God, and the Literal no otherwise then as conveying the Mystical. The Truth here is also opposed to the Shadow. So the Apostle tells us, that the Law was a Shadow of things to come, that is, of those
those which were to be fulfilled under the Gospel. The Shadow is oppos’d to the Body that causes it, therefore the Word Body as signifying Truth in opposition to the Shadow of the Body, is apply’d to the Realities of the Gospel, even in things not properly Corporeal. So the fullness of the Godhead was said to dwell in our blessed Saviour Bodily. Not like that which was in the Tabernacle of Moses, which was but a Shadow of the true Tabernacle. That the Mosaic Tabernacle was but a Shadow, was granted by the Mystical Interpreters of the Law, as appears from Philo. They gather’d it from the Name of Bezaleel who made the Tabernacle, which signifies so, and from its being made in Imitation of the Pattern in the Mount, which Pattern the New Testament Reasonings suppose to be meant of the Gospel. This way of Reasoning, tho’ it would be precarious in other things, yet is the properest for understanding Prophecies, which were usually understood by the God that gave them in that Sense which seem’d otherwise most remote from their Literal Signification. This is so notorious, that not having leisure for it, I cannot think it necessary to heap Examples. Our Saviour’s Design there-
therefore in this Discourse with the Woman of Samaria, is to shew that the confinement of the solemn Worship of God to one Place, either Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim, was disagreeable to the Nature of the Worship of the Gospel, and therefore to be Abrogated by it. And as to that particular Design, I take our blessed Lord's Reasoning to be this. The original Consecration both of the Tabernacle and the Temple, was by the Descent of a Luminous Body on them, as a Symbol of the Majestick Presence of God, which the Rabbins call a Schechinah. This visible Appearance at first, was suppos'd to be the cause of the Consecration, which lasted afterwards, long after the visible Appearance itself had disappeared, as the Jews say it did under the second Temple. This way of Consecration, confin'd Consecration to Places. The Schechinah itself, as a Body, could not be otherwise than confin'd. And whilst God was pleas'd to reserve this Power to himself, that besides the Consecration of Men, which was requisite to separate the Place Consecrated from common uses, no Place however should be counted Holy, till God himself had signified his own Acceptance of it, by such
such a visible *symbol* of his own Presence; it followed necessarily, that if God shewed this *symbol* only in one Place, no other Place besides that one could be counted Holy as accepted by him. But the true Presence of God signified by that *symbol*, our Saviour observes, and that by the *mystical* way of *Reasoning* then receiv'd, to have been suitable to the Nature of God himself, who was a Spirit, and therefore Spiritual, and might as well be (if God pleas'd) in Places where no such Appearance was to the Senses, as where it was. Withal, that these invisible *Archetypes* were the Eternal things that were to hold when the visible *Eclipses* were abolished; this was also granted him in the *Platonick Reasonings* of that Age. When therefore the Gospel was to take place, which was a State of those very *Archetypes* which were Prefigur'd in the Law, from that time forward God was not to insist on that way of Consecration, by visible *Schechinahs* which had been required before. But as the separation of a Place from common use, was sufficient on Man's part to Consecrate it, if God should be pleas'd to accept it; so when this way of signifying the Divine acceptance immediately by a *Schechinah* was laid aside, the Divine acceptance would
would be sufficiently signified by the acceptance of the Priest whom God had Invested with an indefinite Authority, of not only representing, but obliging, him to ratifie what he was to do in his Name, in things wherein God had not particularly oblig’d him to expect a more particular Signification of his Pleasure. When therefore this mystical Dispensation was to take place, then as every City was to be equal with Mount Gerizim, or even Jerusalem it self, then the Bishops of particular Cities, were to be equal with the High-Priest of Jerusalem, and might as freely Consecrate as he, and exercise the supreme Power of the Evangelical Mystical Sacrifice within his own Jurisdiction. This I take to be the true Design of our Saviours Discourse in that Place, to prepare both Jews and Samaritans, not to be surpriz’d at this Change, which was punctually fulfill’d in the Event, how contrary foever it seem’d to their present receiv’d Opinions and Expectations.

AND what is there in all this Reasoning, wherein our Adversaries can think our present Cause concern’d ? Spiritual we see here, is not oppos’d to Bodily, but Literal, that is Literal of the
the Law of Moses, where it was to interfere with the Mystical Sense, which was principally intended by the Legislator. Do we revive the Literal Sense as it concern'd the particular Nation of the Jews? Or do we extend the Obligation of it farther so as to oblige other Nations, on whom it was not impos'd then, and for whom it was never intended, under the Spiritual Dispensation of the Gospel? Do we so urge the Literal Sense as to exclude the Mystical, so as to exclude Gentiles from the Benefits of the Law, whilst they do indeed more comply with the true Design of the Legislator, than if they had observed the Literal Sense? Do we exclude any from the new Peculium, who have the Circumcision of the Spirit, for no other Reason, but because they want the Circumcision of the Letter? This had indeed been repugnant to the Design of the Gospel, which was to convince us, that, in all things inconsistent, the Observation of the Mystical Sense was to take place of the Literal, and thenceforward to take away its Obligation. And do we say otherwise? Or do we say, that Schechinahs are to be expected for Consecrations now, or any other Significations of the Divine Acceptance of what is separated for his use
use by Men, besides the acceptance of them, who are Authoriz’d in general to represent and oblige him in things whereof he has made no particular exception? Can they pretend, that our present Dispute has any Relation to those which devided the Jews and Christians in the Apostolical Age? They very well know, that our present Dispute is wholly between Christians, and has no relation to the Obligation of the Mosaic Law in any Sense. It is very true, that the Literal Sense of the Mosaic Law usually related to External Sensible Things, and the Mystical to Things Insensible and Spiritual. And the Mystical Sense being the Spiritual, may give the occasion why our Adversaries fancy that the Mystical Sense should always relate to Spiritual Things. But it is not being oppos’d to Sensible or Bodily, but Literal, shews plainly that the things concern’d in the Literal Sense, are not consider’d in this Reasoning, as Sensible and Corporeal, And on the other side, in the Reasonings of the New Testament, the Evangelical Institutions even in this World, are all suppos’d to belong to the Spiritual Sense of the old Law. And for that very Reason it is infer’d, that they were princi-
principally regarded by God, because the mystical Sense of the Law was more principally intended by him than the Literal. The whole Evangelical Institution, is, in the same Reasoning, suppos'd to be the Pattern shewed to Moses in the Mount, in Imitation of which, the Tabernacle was to be made. And this in order to the proving, that the Evangelical Institutions were to be Eternal, because the Ideal Patterns of things were in the Platonick way of Reasoning suppos'd to be so. This Eternity concern'd in this Dispute, can only be meant of that which was to last as long as this World; so the everlasting Hills, Gen. xlix. 26. And the everlasting Mountains, Hab. iii. 6. And the Land of Canaan, is said to be given for an everlasting Possession, Gen. xvii. 8. xlviii. 4. For in this Sense, the Everlastingness of the Gospel, is oppos'd to the Duration of the Law, which was; even in this Life, to give way to a more lasting Establishment. But it is certain, that those very Institutions of the Gospel, which have succeeded the abrogated Institutions of the Law, and which are therefore suppos'd to be Spiritual in this Sense, as Spiritual is oppos'd to the Literal Sense of the Law, are not-
withstanding themselves Sensible and Corporeal. So is Baptism, which has succeeded in the Place of the abrogated Circumcision of the Letter. So also is our Eucharistical Sacrifice, which now answers the abrogated Bloody Sacrifices. These therefore must be supposed to be Spiritual in this Sense of the Word, notwithstanding their being Sensible and Corporeal. Our Adversaries therefore do certainly mistake the meaning of this Reasoning, when they hence gather that any Observations are contrary to the Spiritual Nature of the Gospel, on that account alone, because they are Sensible and Corporeal.

BUT; tho' Sensible Assurances should not be inconsistent with the Nature of Evangelical Worship, yet our Adversaries think, at least, that Pomp and Magnificence must needs be so. One would think, by the gradation, that their Arguments on this Head were more cogent and convincing, but it proves quite the contrary. Not one Text can they pretend against the Pomp and Magnificence of the publick Worship of God. rather all the appearance of Scripture Reasonings is against them. The Worship of the Old Testament was manifestly
ly very Magnificent; nor can our Ad-
versaries deny that it was so; what have
they therefore to say, why it ought not
to be so still? Can they shew any Text
of the New Testament against it as a thing
that was to cease and to be no more practis'd?
I know of none they do pretend either in
the same, or in equivalent Terms. Can
they then pretend any thing inconsistent
with it in the constitution of the Gospel,
or of the new Peculium? These things I
have shewn to be the true Originals of
the abrogation of what was indeed abro-
gated in the old Mosaic Law. The rea-
soning of the Old Test; as well as the po-
sitive Precepts of it, rather favour, than
contradict, the Magnificence and Sumptuous-
ness of the publick Solemnities of the di-
vine Worship. David would not offer
Burnt Offerings unto the Lord his God, of
that which cost him nothing. 2 Sam.
xxiv. 24. and Malachy makes me. Sacrifices
to redound to the contempt of the Religion wherein they were used.
He makes them to be a polluting God's
Altar, and interprets the offering them
as if the Offerers of them had said, The
Table of the Lord is contemptible, Mal. i.
7. He Expostulates concerning them far-
ther, v. 8. Offer it now to thy Governour;
will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy
Per-
Person faith the Lord of Hosts? Plainly intimating, that God did as much expect expensive Sacrifices from those who were able to Offer them, and had reason to do so, as any of their Governours; and would as much resent the contrary as an affront, as Governours would mean Presents from such as were able to offer great ones. The Reasoning is the very same in Is. xl. 16. Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the Beasts thereof for a Burnt Offering. Arguing for the Magnificence of the Offering from the greatness of the Person to whom it is made. And I have already shewn how in the N. T. the Reason even of abrogated Precepts is owned as still obliging, as a reason approv'd by God. Much more in cases wherein our Adversaries can prove no abrogation, such as is this of Instrumental Musick. But the divine Authority of the N. T. does also plainly approve the same Reasoning. It is a clear instance of it, when our Saviour values the poor Widow's Mites as more than the Offerings of the Rich, who had cast in greater Sums out of their greater abundance, St Mar. xii. 43. St. Luke xxii. 3. This plainly shews, That as God does graciously accept of mean things from those who are able to give no more, so he does not excuse them from Magni-
ence whose Abilities may afford it. Our Saviour reasons the same way in the case of the Woman who anointed his Feet with the Alabaster Box of very precious Ointment. The same Objection was made then which is made by our Adversaries now, that it might have been sold for much and given to the Poor. Yet our Saviour commends the seasonableness of the Gift, as well as the Gift itself, and returns the Woman an honourable Memorial for it, wherever his Gospel should be preach'd. The Objection would indeed be greater then, when the numbers of the Poor were greater, and the Abilities of the Christians for Contribution were less than they are now. Yet even so our Saviour did not approve of our Adversaries Reason. He allow'd a liberality in shewing their respect to the Temple of his Body, as a token of what he would also judge commendable if us'd to the material Temples that should afterwards be Consecrated to his Worship. And in giving a precedent for teaching his Disciples what he would have them do afterwards, and introducing it, he did not allow even the present Necessities of his Disciples to overrule him. Thus, I am very apt to think, the generality of his Disciples were then inclinable to understand him. And there-

S. Mat. xxvi. 7, &c.
S. Markxiv. 3.
S. Luke. vii. 36.
fores in all likelihood, he design'd they
should understand him, when he gave
them no warning of misunderstanding him
in such a way of interpreting his mind as
he foresaw them inclinable to follow by the
way of reasoning of that age. It was a
received principle, that our Saviours Ac-
tions, as well as his discourses, were Pro-
phetical and Instructive. And that they
signified many things which were not to
be understood at present, but afterwards
when they were fulfilled, and when Prov-
dence had fitted circumstances for practi-
sing them. Especially in things which
were not practicable at present, as not fitted
to their present circumstances. This was
plainly the case then in relation to the
Subject of our present discourse. The
poverty of the apostolical christians,
disabled them for all things sumptuous
and magnificent. Nor was there then
any prospect of a change for the better
which might make it prudent to provide
expressly for the case. Withal our bles-
sed Saviour knew that his sense would be
gathered from his actions. Himself had
train'd up his disciples to do so. And the
Jews in their mystical interpretations of
the history of the old testament had,
even in his time, taken up the custom of
gathering the sense of God from the Pro-
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phetick Instincts and Actions of their own Patriarchs. The leaving them therefore to those Inferences, which he fore-saw them inclinable to make from his Actions and Intimations was a very prudent, a very sufficient Provision for a Case which was to fall out at such a distance afterwards.

The only Reason this present Adversary insists on for proving the Inconsistence of Magnificence with the Nature of the Worship of the Gospel, is that the Romanists are usually cenfur'd for their excess in this kind. This he only takes for granted, and draws Inferences from it; but never offers any Proof that it is indeed blameable. The same way he takes in his use of the other popular Prejudices now disprov'd but, methinks, it would have better become them who so usually appeal from humane Authorities to the Scriptures, (if they could find any) that even themselves could judge favourable to their Design, before they had ventured on drawing Inferences. That would have made their Dissent look more like a reverence to greater Authority, than Re-sentment and an Aversion to their Adversaries against whom they are concern'd in this whole Dispute. But I cannot, indeed, imagine what they can pretend from
from the Scriptures against the Magnificence of Gods Worship in those who are able to bear the Burthen of it. They may fancy, perhaps, that the Simplicity of the Gospel may be inconsistent with this Magnificence. But the Simplicity of the Gospel is never (that I know of) us'd concerning the Worship of the Gospel itself, but concerning the good meaning of the Persons who Preached the Gospel. It is plainly oppos'd to \( \text{παναγία} \) 2 Cor. xi. 3. It is us'd as fynonymous with \( \text{πλασύνεία} \) 2 Cor. i. 12. which plainly shew that it signifies Sincerity and Heartiness, only in opposition to double Dealing. But so far it is from implying Inexpensiveness, that on the contrary, it rather sometimes denotes Liberality, when it is used concerning a subject that is capable of it. So, \( \text{δυστασθένε} \) \( \text{εν ανάλογής} \) Rom. xii. 8. As the \( \text{επιστεφνε} \) \( \text{οφθαλμός} \) is oppos'd to that which is called \( \text{πονηρός} \) S. Mat. vi. 22. 23. And as the \( \text{πονηρός} \) \( \text{οφθαλμός} \) is oppos'd to \( \text{ἀληθής} \) S. Mat. xx. 15. as that signifies Bounteouesness and Liberality. In this way of Interpretation the Simplicity of the Gospel signifies the Generosity of the Gospel, and will rather countenance Magnificence than discourage it.

BUT our present Adversary is solicitous for the Consequences that may follow from
from the restitution of Instrumental Musick. He conceives that by the like Interferences we may restore Circumcision and bloody Sacrifices, and the old Custom of Dancing to the Instrumental Musick. And what if we should grant him his last Consequence concerning Dancing, so far at least, as to acknowledge that the Church might lawfully reduce it? I doubt he would be hard put to it to prove it unlawful. It must be so, at least, if he would confine himself, as they pretend to do, to the Scriptures. He cannot sure think there is any Argument in the irreverent Expression he Uses concerning it. It is no other than what Michol would, probably, have used if he had spoken English. But David was contented to bear the Reproach of it, and to justify it against her. And I believe our Adversaries will not easily question but that we are safer in following the Sense of David than they are in following that of Michol. The Design of the Objection in both Cases, both of our Adversaries and of Michol, is to Charge the Posture of Dancing with the Imputation of Levity. As if there could not be Grave and Decorous Dances as well as Grave and Decorous Tunes; and as if there could not be Grave and Decorous tunes on Instrumental, as well as on Vocal, Musick.
At present, it is sufficient for us now, that if their Objection had been true in general, God would neither have allowed sacred. Dancing then, nor would David have avowedly defended it, nor would God have seconded him in doing so by inflicting a Punishment on Michol for her Prophane upbraiding her Prince and Husband with it, as if in Practising it he had done any thing beneath the Dignity of his Station. If they will defend David in it, they are as much oblig'd, as we are, to own the weakness of this general Charge. I think therefore the Practice, if it had been again receiv'd, secure enough if they will be pleas'd to admit no Objections against it now that would have prov'd it unlawful then. For we have a greater Evidence, than any their Reasons can pretend to that it was not unlawful then. But supposing it lawful, yet the Apostle himself will assure them that all things indeed lawful are not on that account alone to be therefore own'd as expedient. 1 Cor. vi. 12. x. 23. And therefore fit to receive a new Sanction. There will be no more Obligation to revive that ancient Custom now, than many others which were undoubtedly allowable and prudent in those times wherein they were universally receiv'd; but have
have now lost the reason that made them useful then, by their being since as universally diffus'd. Singularity alone is an inconvenience in a thing indifferent in its own Nature, where there are not more momentous Considerations to make amends for it, and to recommend it. However the genuine Ignatius in his uninterpolated Epistles reasons from allusions to holy Dances and Instrumental Musick. This shews that, whether they practic'd them or not, yet the Christians, of that Age at least, did not Condemn them. And there is reason to believe they did not. The Pythagoreans greatly approv'd them, as we know the Jewish Essenes were great admirers of the Pythagoreans, who derived many of their own Customs to the whole Body of the Christians. Such were their Praying to the East, their great aversness even to lawful Oaths, their Reconciliations before Sunset, their use of Milk and Honey as a Symbol of the new Birth. These things we find the Church posses'd of in very antient Monuments, without any Account of their first Original. And the first and last are not so accountable from any other Original as this of their being brought among the Christians by the universal Conversion of the Essenes. So the Author of the Book
Book of Judith makes the Jews express their joy for the defeat of Holofernes's Army by Dances with Musick also Instrumental. This appears partly from the Greek, partly from the Latin, which in those Apocryhal Books are strangely different. This shews, at least, the Sense of the Jews in that Age wherein that Book first appeared. That could not be later than the Apostles time because Clements mention Judith in his Epistle to the Corinthians. And indeed, within fresh Memory of Ignatius, the Apostolical Church, which was the Head of all other Churches, had notoriously approved and communicated with Instrumental Musick, at least in the Worship of the Temple. It is not also improbable but that the Apostles continued it in the Head Church, whether in Pella, or in the Ruins of Jerusalem, after the Dissolution of the Worship of the Temple. That mention of Harpers with it in the Vision of the Revelations has nothing joyn'd with it Characteristic of the Jewish Worship before the Dissolution. And therefore may represent the Fact truly as it was in this Interval between the Destruction of the Temple and the new troubles which befell the Christians in the latter end of Domitian, but especially under Trajan. This is a time,
time wherein we have no Monuments that can inform us any thing to the contrary. And within this time it must have been that St. John saw that Vision in his Exile at Patmos. The eldest Testimony produc'd by our Adversary from Clemens Alexandrinus is considerably later than Ignatius, when the memory of the Traditions of the Apostolical Church of Jerusalem was now much forgotten by the many Disturbances which followed on the Ruin of the Temple. It is not improbable that the Instrumental Musick was the Prerogative of that Supreme Church, as it seems also to have been of the Temple Worship of the Jews in Jerusalem. The Musick usually accompanied the Sacrifices, which by the Jewish Law were to be Offer'd only at Jerusalem, we never find it mention'd in the Synagogue-Worship. And this may give a probable Account, why it was not receiv'd in other Christian Churches besides that of Jerusalem. They were form'd in imitation of the Jewish-Synagogues at first, with the same dependance (in many regards) on the Church of Jerusalem that the Synagogues had on the Temple. And when after the Decease of all the Apostles, the other Churches succeeded into the full Rights of the Head Church of Jerusalem; the disorders of
of the times had so long discontinu'd that Custom even in the Head Church, that tho' Ignatius might, yet it might be very possible that Clemens Alexandrinus might not remember it. No, not even with the Assistance of those old Witnesses of Apostolical Tradition from whom Clemens receiv'd his Informations of the Apostolical Affairs, as he himself tells us. But 'tis not likely that any of those Witnesses could be near so old as Ignatius. But the Musick describ'd in the Revelations is such as might likely be practis'd by the Apostles in the Ruins of Jerusalem after the Dispersion of the Jews, and the Abolition of the Temple-Sacrifices.

HOWEVER our Adversary conceives that Circumcision and the old bloody Sacrifices might be restor'd by the same Consequence that Instrumental Musick were, if any Church should think fit to do so. He might well think so, whilst he believ'd that the only Reason which made Circumcision and those Sacrifices unlawful now, was their having been observ'd formerly. But I have shewn how contrary that way of Reasoning is, to the way of Reasoning us'd by the Writers of the N. T. and have thereby prov'd a necessity of sett'ling an Hypothesis, by which we may be able to distinguish what is Abolished from what is not so. And the Hypothesis now given
given, affords a Rule sufficient, to shew why Instrumental Music may still be Lawful, tho' neither Circumcision nor bloody Sacrifices were so. That is because Instrumental Music is no way repugnant to the Constitution of the new Peculium, which is not true of the Jewish Circumcision, nor the Jewish Sacrifices. For no uncircumcis’d Person could partake of the Jewish Sacrifices, and he that was Circumcised, was thereby Incorporated into the Jewish Nation. Whilst these two things were insisted on it was impossible for a Gentile not Incorporated into the Jewish Nation to be admitted to the Benefits of the new Peculium, which was directly contrary to the new Revelations of the Gospel. But our Author urges the Circumcision of other Nations as if their Agreement in it would have gone as far to have recommended it for a Law of Nations as their Consent in Instrumental Music. But he did not remember that no other Nation that used Circumcision did pretend to use it as the Jews, as a Ceremony of Admission into the peculiar People of God, which is the only Consideration, that made it inconsistent with the Constitution of the Gospel. Several of them seem’d to have us’d it, not as an Initiation to their Nation, but to their Sacerdotal Dignity, to quali-
the Men for being admitted to the Secrets of their Religion. So it seems to have been in the Cases of Pythagoras and Apion, who were Circumcised among the Egyptians. And therefore also among other Nations who deriv’d their Circumcision from the Egyptians, as particularly the Colchians are said to have done by Sosoniris. And perhaps this may be the Reason why the old Peculium is call’d a Royal Priesthood, as well as a Holy Nation, because the right of Admitting into that Nation was equal to that which among other Nations was thought sufficient to confer that higher Degree of Sanctity which all Nations ascrib’d to their Priests above the ordinary Holiness, thought requisite to partake of the National Sacrifices which were common to the whole Nation. But no Nation however beside the Jews pretended to be the peculiar People, who were favour’d with the immediate Patronage of the supreme Being. They could not therefore impose Incorporation into themselves as a Condition of Admission into the new Peculium on other Nations besides themselves, tho’ their Circumcision had been design’d as a Right of Incorporation. Their Circumcision therefore not having impos’d as a Condition of the Peculium,
had been as Innocent as that of the Jews was, when observ'd only by their own Nation, and not impos'd on others, as a Condition requisite to qualify them for the Spiritual Favours of the Peculium. Upon those terms the Jews themselves, were permitted the use of it whilst they Communicated with the Uncircumcis'd Gentiles, in the Offices of the Christian Religion. Much less could it be Condemned in other Nations, who never impos'd it farther than their own Nation. There was therefore neither parity of Reason, nor sufficient Consent of Nations to prove the Jewish Circumcision lawful now, tho' we should on, those Accounts, grant that Instrumental Musick were so.

BUT Bloody Sacrifices, our Adversary conceives might at least pretend to them. Not certainly so as to unite all Nations into one Body, which was the true Design of our Evangelical Eucharistical Sacrifices. The Jewish Sacrifices none were capable of, but one only Nation, that of the Jews. The same was the Case of many others of the publick National Sacrifices. None were indeed suppos'd to have a Right in them, but the Nation for whole use they were originally Instituted. Some were as severe as the Jews themselves, to make it Piacular and
Capital, if one of another Nation did but come into that part of their Temples, where the publick Sacrifices were Offered. So it appears that it was only the remissness of their Discipline above that of the Jews, that made them allow others that were not of their Nation, to partake of their publick Sacrifices. Augustus when he was in Egypt, would take no notice of Apis, and commended his Grandson Caius, because he would not Pray at Jerusalem. The like was the Practice of Hadrian, who pretended to an Inquisitiveness into all things, and to be a severe Observer of Discipline. And it was a Favour usually desir'd from the Senate, that other Nations might have leave to Offer their Donaries at the Roman-Altars, These are sufficient Evidences of what was generally taken for the Rule, which is the only thing to be regarded in this Reasoning. It is true the Jews allow'd publick Sacrifices for the Persian Kings and the Roman Emperours. But not so, as to suffer any Heathens to partake in them. Yet even this was blamed by the strictest Pretenders to the Observation of the Law among them, the Galileans and the Zealots. Tho' otherwise if any other Nation could admit others to their National
of national Sacrifices, the Jews had more reason to do so. They by their own Confession Worshipped a God, to whom all other Nations ought Duty as well as themselves, which other Nations did not pretend concerning their own Deities. There was therefore no Sacrifice of this kind, that all Nations with their national distinctions could pretend an equal Right to. How could they therefore unite all Nations into one Body, as it was the Design of our Christian Religion to unite them? None of them pretended to a Right to be confirmed in Heaven, besides that of the Jews, which yet could not unite all Nations, whilst it was believed to be the Right of one only Nation. There were no Bloody Sacrifices in the World, which being received into one Place, gave a Right to all other Sacrifices in the World. I do not now insist on what Porphyry has endeavour'd to prove at large, that the first Sacrifices received among the Nations, were not Bloody, but Innocent, and such as were perfectly agreeable with his Pythagorean Notions, which were for the 'ουδένα καθαράνα. They did not either know or regard the most ancient Example of Abel to the contrary. However he has said very consid-
rable things for it, from the Histories of the Heathens. That is enough to dis-
prove that fort, at least of Sacrifices, from being a Tradition of the Law of
Nations. And the Reputation of being ἄνθρωποι, had then prevail’d not only in
those Cities which had submitted to Py-
thagorean Legislators, but also among the
Romans themselves. I am apt to think
this was the Reason, why so many of
the good Emperours who affected Felici-
tia Tempora, affected also that their
Reigns might be ἄνθρωποι, free from
the Piaculum of shedding Civil Blood,
at least of the better Quality. But
the Pythagorean Doctrines were parti-
cularly grateful to the Jewish Essenes;
who were as I said, the best disposed
to the Christian Religion, and who
seem therefore to have been extirpated
by an universal Conversion, upon the
appearance of it. They were most ad-
dicted to the Mystical sense of the Law,
which is the Foundation of most of the
Numenius the Heathen, who first joyn-
ed the Mystical Interpretation of the
Law of Moses with the Heathen Philo-
fophy, was a Pythagorean, and so was
Philo the Jew, and the Essenes, as the
same Philo teaches. This alone was
suffici
sufficient to dispose the *Essenes* to an aversion to Bloody Sacrifices, and to have the better Opinion of the Christian Religion, when they understood, that by it they could satisfy the Design of the *Legislator* without them. If they could once free themselves thereby, from the Obligation of the Bloody Sacrifices, required by the Law of Moses, there were no other in view, that were likely to be substituted instead of them, at least by them. But the Mystical Interpretations of the Old Testament, afforded an easier account of the Change which was to be made by the Gospel, and more grateful to the Relish of the Pythagorean *Essenes*, and the *Philosophical Asceticks*. The everlasting Priesthood which was to answer'd by that of the Gospel, was suppose'd to be that of Melchizedek. So 'tis expressly called by the *Psalist*, as the Apostle has observed: No doubt as granted him by the Mystical Reasonings of those Times. His Sacrifice, (ὡς*φρονος*) is the Word u'd by Philo, concerning him, as well as by St. Paul, concerning our Saviour) was Bread and Wine, exactly the same with that of the Gospel. The Notion of a Priest implies an Offering, by the Reasoning in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*.

*Heb.*
Heb. viii. 3. And no other thing but Bread and Wine is mentioned in the Story of Melchizedeck, that can be called an Offering. Our Eucharist therefore, must, by this Reasoning, be the everlast- ing Offering or Sacrifice, relating to his everlast- ing Priest-hood. The rather because there is a Bread from Heaven, mentioned also in the Old Testament, a very fit original Archetype to answer our Evangelical Terrestrial Sacrifice. That was the Manna which was called Bread by Moses, and was indeed Rained from Heaven, and is called the Food of Angels by the Psalmist. No doubt to shew its Heavenly Mystical Nature, far exceeding the Nature of our common Bread. It is called also a Body prepared, as the same Apostle Quotes the Words of the Old Testament. These are the very Expres- sions us'd by our blessed Saviour, concerning his own Sacrament in St. Joh. vi. He also calls it Manna, Bread from Heaven, and his own Body, exactly ac- cording to these Mystical Reasonings from the Old Testament. We never find any mention of an Archetypal Heavenly Beast, answering those Bloody Sacrifices. Yet the whole Benefit of these Sacrifices de- pended on these Archetypal Patterns an- swering them in Heaven. Thence fol- low'd
Iow’d the Obligation of God, to ratify in Heaven what was performed by the Priest on Earth, in giving or denying the Mystical Benefits of the Sacraments, as the Priest shall think fit to give or deny the Sacramental Elements. Thence the Union between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant, on account of the Union between the Celestial Archetype, and the Terrestrial Eucharistical Sacrifice. Thence the Union between the Patriarchal Church of the Old Testament, and the Apostolical of the New, because the whole efficacy of those old Sacrifices of Beasts, was derived from their representing and applying the Death of our blessed Saviour, as commemorated and apply’d in our Christian Eucharistical Sacrifice. Thence the Union of all the visible Churches in the World with the Celestial Church, and among themselves, and the Reason obliging all particular Churches in Earth, to ratify each others Censures, which was that which made their Admissions into Communion, and their Excommunications Catholick, tho’ the Acts themselves, were only the Acts of single Churches. The Reason was, because every particular in admitting a Member, intitled the Member so admitted to the Heavenly Church, with
with which all the particularly Churches in the World were one, and therefore were obliged to own such a Member, for a Member of themselves. And every particular Church in Excommunicating a Member, deprived the Excommunicated of his Right to the Heavenly Church; which whosoever wanted, could not be owned by any particular Church, which pretended to be one with that which was Heavenly; of so much consequence was this whole Mystical Reasoning, greater perhaps than our Adversary was aware of. However, this Reasoning gives a clear Account, that tho’ Instrumental Musick were as indifferent as we conceive it to be, it would not therefore follow, that it would be Indifferent, or in the Power of any Church, to restore the Custom of Bloody Sacrifices.

I know not whether it be worth the while, to take notice of another Consequence, much insisted on by the Party; that is, the Danger of exceeding in Impositions, if the first Impositions be submitted to. But truly conscientious Reasoners, would first have prov’d the Hurtfulness of many lawful Impositions, if submitted to by the Ecclesiastical
cal subject. The Government might indeed be blamed for it; but in the subject, (for whom they are concern'd) tho' the Imposition were indeed hard, yet submission to it for Peace sake, would for that Reason be highly commendable, as an Act of the greater self-denial and the greater Zeal for Pecae and Discipline, and the greater Abhorrence of needless Division, whilst nothing Sinful were impos'd. Then they would have given some account concerning the due Number that might be impos'd, that might neither be too small nor too numerous. This they would have done, if they had desir'd to have purged themselves to God, and their own Consciences, that they had not oppos'd subjection to those who were over them in the Lord, but Rigours of those who had abus'd the just Authority committed to them. But to stop at the first Impositions, before they can pretend them Rigorous, looks as if Flesh and Blood, as if Stomach and Resentment, as if an aversion to subjection it self, had been the original of their Quarrel. It runs into the opposite extreme, as indeed their Defences of their Schism generally do, as if the Authority it self, not any Tyrannical use of it, were the thing regretted by them.
The Topick itself they cannot defend, nor justify the Consequences of it, who are notwithstanding so forward to warn others of Consequences. There is hardly any thing necessary in Humane Life, but what excess may make pernicious. Eating is so. Yet how great a part do Surfeits make in our Bills of Mortality? Will they therefore think it reasonable for avoiding Surfeits, to dissuade from Eating? If they had no design of running into an extreme of opposing all Impositions in things indifferent; our Churches Impostions, (whatever the Out-cry has been against them) have been so few, that I cannot tell how, even our Adversaries themselves, could charge our Churches Impostions with being excessive, if they had allowed of any Impostions at all: If they allow of none, they would do well to own that their Disputes are not against Abuses only of Authority, but against Authority itself. Their doing so, would let the Favourers of Comprehension see, that our Disputes are not indeed of so trivial an Importance, as they are commonly conceived to be. That they are indeed, whether we shall have any Authority which our Adversaries shall think themselves oblig'd in Conscience to own, and
and to be concluded by, when nothing but Conscience can oblige them to it, in a State of Persecution. That is indeed whether we our selves shall have any Body Politick, when they are once receiv’d into it. For we cannot any longer have such a Body than we have the Authority essential to the Constitution of such a Body. Then it would become the Favourers of Comprehension to consider whether any Grants of our Adversaries can make amends for so great a Concession on our Parts, as the Dissolusion of our selves? Or whether any other independent Body in the World, would think fit to admit Enemies to their Constitution, into their Body together with their hostile Opinions; or whether they could think any Pretences, how fair soever they might seem otherwise, to be sufficient to compensate a Reconciliation of so fatal Consequence. The rather so, because it perfectly discharges Persons reconcil’d on such Terms! from all Obligations to perform, what should afterwards be perform’d as a Condition of the Reconciliation on their Parts. For it is only their Difference to our common Authority, that can make them really one with us, when they are admitted into our Assemblies:
femblies. The giving this up to them as a Condition of their coming in to us, is like opening a Gap which may seem to let them in whilst themselves please, but lets them out again as soon as their old Animosities shall put them on laying hold of new Pretences, or retrieving the old ones. But a regular Admission of them, should be by the Gate. And the same Power of the Keys, which opens the Gate to them at their Admission, should lock them in after they are once admitted. I know no possibility they have of avoiding these Consequences, unless they can shew, either that a Body Politick can subsist without Government, or, that Government can subsist without a right of imposing in things indifferent, either of which indeed would be a great Performance. If therefore (to avoid the odium of so hard Terms imposed on us, of an Admission which when it is made, shall give us no longer security of their Union with us, than themselves please) they will pretend a Deference to our Common Ecclesiastical Authority that may keep them ours by Principles afterwards. I could then wish, that they would be pleas'd to consider farther, that when a true Authority is once admitted, That must
must be allowed to judge concerning the Exigences of the Society to which it is related, and therefore to judge concerning the true mean between both extremes, of what is deficient and what is superfluous. I mean so as to conclude the Subject in Affairs of that Nature. This Consideration will shew, that were there indeed any excess, yet the Authority would be responsible for it, but not to the Subject to whom it owes no account, but to God, from whom the Authority is indeed received. This will shew that the Subject cannot be responsible for the Sin of the Imposition, so long as there can be prov'd no Sin in submitting to the Imposition, because the Imposition is a right to which the Subject cannot pretend. Where therefore the Sin of Imposition is separable from the Sin of Submission, there certainly the Duty of Submission still holds. The Reason is manifest, because the Subject cannot deny its Duty for a Cause that does not concern it to enquire into, and for which it is not responsible unto God, whatever may be amiss in it. And this will always be the Case, whilst the Impositions are only in matters of their own Nature indifferent. 

BUT
BUT our Author pleases himself particularly with a Passage in the Revelation, where it is foretold concerning Babylon; That the Voice of Harpers and Musicians, and of Pipers and Trumpeters should be heard no more in her, Rev. xviii. 22. He urges it modestly, and it became him to do so, having before decried all Arguing from that same Book, because of its Obscurity. The Reason holds in reference to Facts to come. These are the things wherein the Prophetical Style is professedly obscure, even to those who were then living; not so in Facts, then being or past. These, there is no Reason to believe that God intended to conceal from the meanest Capacities, because they were not likely to hinder the Free-wills which were to contribute their Parts in fulfilling the Prophecies here delivered. And of this kind are the Allusions, for which we are at present concern'd, to the then present Customs of the Church of Jerusalem. But to urge the Authority of this Book, as our Adversary does, with relation to the State of Antichrist, is to urge it in a Sense wherein God usually design'd that his Prophecies should not be understood till they were fulfilled, that they might not give warning to those who were to fulfill them,
them, as they must certainly do, if they could certainly be understood before. Till therefore this Prophecy (if it relate to Antichrist) be fulfilled, it is not to be expected that it should be understood so certainly as to be Argumentative. But, to give him the utmost that he can, with any Reason desire, all that he can make of it, is only to have it understood as a Prophecy, not as a Law; as a Prediction of the event, not as a Determination of what was lawful or unlawful. It is very common in the Prophetick Scriptures, to foretel Judgments by the deprivation of what was delightful on any account, Good or Evil, even on account of Religion as well as Luxury. So Hosea Prophecies that the Children of Israel should abide many Days without a King, and without a Prince, and without a Sacrifice, and without an Ephod. Hos. iii. 4. Can our Adversary therefore gather, that Kings, and Sacrifices, and Ephods, were Sins then? No, but it is denounced as the most afflicive thing to them, who in the midst of their Impieties, were full of their Pretensions of Zeal for God and for his Temple, Jer. vii. 4. The like Predictions against the Temple, as a Punishment of the unworthy Worshipers in it, are fre-
frequently mention'd on other occasions also, which can by no means be interpreted as a Condemnation of the Temple then, but rather of the People, as unworthy of so great a Favour. So, in the Babylonish Captivity, they are represented as hanging their Harps on the Willows, when their Adversaries insolently demanded of them one of the Songs of Sion, Psal. cxxxvii. 2, 3, 4. We cannot therefore conclude, that the Temple-Songs play'd on their Harps, were sinful then, but unseasonable, not suitable to the Condition they were then in, and the Behaviour that became them in the desolation of the Temple. So God threatens to turn their Feasts into Mourning, and their Songs into Lamentation, Am. viii. 10. Hos. ii. 11. We must not therefore say, that their holy Feasts or Songs were sinful. All that is imply'd thereby, is only this, that they should be so estranged from Joy, that it should find no place in their holiest Offices, even of Religion. So Job expresses the sadness of his Condition: My Harp also is turned into mourning, and my Organ into the Voice of them that Weep, Job. xxx. 31. So in Isa. xxiv. 8. The mirth of Tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice ceaseth, the Joy of the Harp ceaseth. And
And in Ezek. xxvi. I will cause the noise of thy Songs to cease, and the sound of thy Harps shall be no more heard. Who sees not, from these and the like Places, that these Expressions are used to describe a State not Sinful but Penal rather and Calamitous? The same appears from the other things following in this very Text, concerning which we are disputing, of the Revelations. It follows, And no Crafts-man of whatsoever Craft he be, shall be found any more in thee. Will our Adversary therefore say, that all sorts of Crafts are here condemn’d as unlawful? It is easie to observe, that there is nothing more foretold in these Words, but the failing of the Trade of Babylon, for which she had been so very famous. It follows farther, And the sound of a Millstone shall be heard no more in thee; and the light of a Candle shall shine no more at all in thee. Must Millstones therefore and Candles be unlawful also? This only shews a Famine that should befall them, and a want of Corn to employ the Millstone, as cleanliness of Teeth for want of Bread to foul them is likewise threatned, Am. iv. 6. Teeth as well as Mills are called the Grinders, Eccle. xii. 3, 4. It also describes the Disconsolatencss of their Condition,
dition, when they should want the common comfort of Light. Exactly parallel to the Passage in Jer. xxv. 10. where it is threatened that the sound of the Millstone, and the light of the Candle should be taken away. Next it is added, And the Voice of the Bridegroom, and of the Bride, shall be heard no more at all in thee. The Adversary himself will not, I believe, conclude that the rejoicings in Marriage are therefore unlawful. This is also another way of signifying a very dejected State in the Prophetical Poetick Stile. So Jer. vii. 34. xvi. 9. xxv. 10. Thus it was counted to have no share in those few Solemnities of Joy, which were allowed in States not utterly ruin'd, at least at Nuptial Festivities. So clear it is, that tho' we should grant that these things were to be understood of Antichrift, yet they would not prove the Sinfulness of the things of which he was to be deprived, but the Calamity of the Deprivation.

BUT our Author has an Observation XXIV. from the very learned Dr. Lightfoot, which if it had been true, would, I confess, weaken what I have said for Instrumental Musick; Christ, says that excellent Person, abolish'd the Worship of the Temple as purely Ceremonious; but he perpetuated the Worship of the Synagogue, read...
true,

ing the Scriptures, Praying, Preaching and Singing of Psalms, and Transplanted it into the Christian Church as purely Moral. For I have already granted that Instrumental Musick was used not in the Worship of the Synagogues, but of the Temple. But there are no Words of Christ, that I know of, that could be so much as pretended for shewing what he designed concerning these two Worships in General, and much less to shew that this was Christ's design concerning them. We have seen withal, that the Apostles did separate from the Synagogue worship, tho' they never did so from that of the Temple. This would rather imply the contrary to what that great Man has advance'd, if Arguments were allow'd to proceed universally on either side. But as there is no Text, so neither is there any Reason, to pass this Judgment concerning both these kinds universally. I know not why singing of Psalms should be counted Moral. Especially according to our Adversaries Opinion, which ascribes its efficacy for promoting Devotion, not to its own Nature, but to its divine Institution. This must needs take away the antecedent Reason of its Institution. So far it is from allowing it an Antecedent Reason, that it must necessarily and universally oblige without any positive Sanction.
Sanction. This is usually thought necessary according to the commonly received notion of a Law of Nature. And on the contrary the use of Lots were taken by the Apostles from the use of the Temple Worship, where it was usually made use of, for determining which particular Priests of the whole congregation were to perform the duty of the Week. This could be used by the Jews nowhere but at Jerusalem, because there was no other place where Priests could lawfully Officiate. But by the Apostles it was made use of not only for choosing a new Apostle of their own order, as in the Case of St. Mathias, but also for determining the Persons that were to be invested with Ecclesiastical Sacerdotal Power. And that very consequent-ly, because the exercise of the Evangelical Priesthood was not confin'd to one place as that of the Jewish Priesthood was, to Jerusalem. This was used so generally, that from thence the name of Clerics came to be appropriated to the sacred Order in opposition to the Laity, as I have often shewn elsewhere. It is therefore a plain instance that the general way of Reasoning will not hold that any thing must be unlawful now, on that alone account, that it had been used in the Worship of the Temple. I know no ground the Doctor could have

Diff. Cypr. 1.
for this distinction, but that he seems to have believed, that the Temple worship was universally settled by a positive Law of God, as having no antecedent reason why it should have obliged without such a positive Sanction; and that the Synagogue worship having no positive Sanction in the Scriptures (without which our Adversaries allow no proof of a positive Divine Sanction) must therefore have received the Sanction it pretended to from the nature of the things themselves, and therefore as immutable as those natures of things from which they thought it was deriv'd. This is indeed so far suitable to our Adversaries Principles, granted on popular receiv'd Prejudices, that in things of this nature they allowed no humane Sanction to be of any force. This precautious Supposition did naturally put them upon finding a Divine original for all the old Establishment of the Worship of the Synagogue, which because they could not pretend to find in the Scriptures, they were oblig'd to derive from the Moral Law, which was indeed suppos'd to derive its Authority from a divine Legislation. But the Moral Law, being founded, as they thought, on the Nature of the things, they must therefore believe its Obligation as Eternal and Immutable, as
those Natures were supos'd to be. So on the contrary, because the written Law was written with a prospect on one fixed Place for their solemn Assemblies, which fixation was made by a positive divine Sanction, which was designedly to cease upon the Destruction of the Jewish Temple, and the Dispersion of the Jewish Nation; therefore they think the whole written Law relating to the Temple, was to have an end with the Temple, for the use of which it was contrived. But neither way does the Argument proceed as our Adversaries are concerned for it. The Synagogue Worship not being a thing expressly provided for in the old Testament) where there is no mention of Synagogues in the latter Sense of the Word) I should rather have taken for an Argument against the Reasonings of the Nonconformists, from the Testimonies of the old Testament, for the necessity of an express divine Command for every indifferent Circumstance of Divine-Worship when the whole kind of Synagogue-Worship cannot pretend to a divine Command in the Scriptures. And without the Scriptures, there can be no divine Command pretended, by their Principles, but what is Moral, which must therefore be grounded on Eternal and Immutable Reasons, which will not be
be so easily found for every particular of the Worship of the Synagogue, as our Adversaries may fancy before they consider it. Every antecedent Reason will not do. For indeed no Law, however positive can be thought prudent, that has not an antecedent Reason, that might move the Legislator to add his Sanction to it. But if that had been alone sufficient to oblige the Subject, there could have been no necessity of the subsequent Law. The reason therefore requisite for a moral Law, must be such as must hold necessarily and universally, and so as to expose the Person who is not ruled by it, not only to inconvenient Consequences, and prejudicial to his Temporal concerns, but so as to involve him in the guilt of sin, with relation to God, and the consequent indefinite Effects of the divine Displeasures, besides the natural Consequences of the Actions it self. Such Reasons as these, our Adversaries will not be so easily able to find for all the particulars of the Synagogue-Worship, when they shall be pleased to consider it sedately. I am sure the Worship of the Body, and of the Mouth too may be without singing, if they will allow no more natural conduciveness to Vocal Musick for raising the Imagination and the Affections, than they do to that which
which is Instrumental. The Reasons mentioned in the things Sung, receive no more accession of strength by their being Sung Vocally, than they would by being Sung Instrumentally. I am apt to think the whole Synagogue-Worship was introduce'd after the Captivity perhaps instead of the Schools of the Prophets, that is, after that ordinary way of Educating Prophets in Schools had fail'd of which we find no more mention after the Captivity. From that time forwards the failing of the ordinary use of Prophets is owned in the Scriptures. Pf. lxxiv. 9. Nehem. vii. 65. and Josephus, as well as in the less certain Testimonies of the Rabbins. At least as to Colleges and Schools. Whilst, those ordinary Bodies of the Prophets were still in being, the People seem to have made the same use of them, as was afterwards made of the Synagogues, for performing those parts of the Offices of their Religion with them, which by the Law, were allowed to be performed elsewhere than at Jerusalem, 2. Kings iv. 23. The new Moons and the Sabbaths, are mentioned as ordinary occasions of having recourse to them. If so, the whole Synagogue way of Worship must have been settled by prudential Provisions, which could alone take place upon the failing of the Spirit of Prophecy.

Especially
Especially if we will not allow any proof of Prophetick discoveries, by those few Prophets which even then remain'd after the Prophetick Colleges were generally dissolved. This our Adversaries are averse to on other occasions. If they be true to themselves on this occasion also, I do not foresee how it is possible for them to pretend any Divine Revelation for this way of Worship in the Synagogues, from those few Prophets yet remaining, whose Writing we have extant. And how can they possibly prove a Revelation that is nowhere Written? What then will become of their Negative Arguments from our present Scriptures? Nor does their Argument hold on the other side, that every particular of the Temple Worship, must for that only Reason, because it was so, be unlawful now. They might indeed infer that its confined use in the Temple must cease, when the confinement of all sacerdotal Offices to that Temple, was its self abrogated and repealed. But they very well know our present Dispute, is not whether Instrumental-Musick be to be confined now, as it was formerly, to that particular Temple. They might say, farther, that the Obligation it then had from that Mosaical Sanction, is expired when the Mosaical Sanction is it self repeal'd from
from whence that Obligation was deriv'd. But neither is that our present Question, whether the same Instrumental-Musick shall oblige us now, on account of that Mosaic Imposition, which even then was never intended for uncircumcis'd Gentiles, such as we are now. All that can be thence inferred by any regular Reasoning, is, that, upon the Revocation of the Confinement of sacerdotal Worship to the Temple, Instrumental-Musick returned to its own Nature as it was before, either to remain as it was at first, Indifferent, or to receive, or retain, some other Sanction distinct from that. But that it must be thenceforward unlawful, is more than I think our Adversaries will ever be able to prove from this concession alone, that it was formerly a part of the Worship of the Temple.

ANOTHER pretence the Adversary has for proving Instrumental Musick abolish'd, is, because it was a Shadow of something then to come, of our Praising God with the Organs of our Bodies under the Gospel. This would indeed hold if it signified somewhat to come, as to be guilty of false Signification, when the thing signified was actually come to pass. If this had been the Case, that, while Instrumental Musick was used, it signified Bodily Worship, ed.
Worship only to come, our Adversaries would do well to consider how it could have been used by the Jews, even in the time of the Mosaick Law. For it is certain that the Jews used the Worship of the Organs of their Bodies together with their Instrumental Musick, not only of their Mouths as we do, but also of their Feet, in their Religious Dances. If bodily Worship being used at the same time with it made a false signification inconsistent with the futurity which it is pretended to signify now, Why should it not do so then also? If even then when it was designed as a Prophetick Symbol of the Organical Worship of the Body, that same Organical Worship of the Body might notwithstanding be used at the same time with it, Why not now? This was, one would think, sufficient to shew that it's signification of bodily Organical Worship, was not so essential to it but that, when that particular Reason should fail, it might notwithstanding be continued on other Considerations which might give no pretence of false signification, and inconsistency with the present Innovations of the Revelations peculiar to the Gospel. This I have shewn to be the only true Reason of the abrogation of all the particulars of the old Mosaick Law, as abrogation is understood
derstood by our Adversaries, not only to make things unobliging but unlawful also. But how does our Adversary know that Instrumental Musick was a Type of our bodily organical Worship under the Gospel, or of any other particular Practice now in use? No other Reason is pretended, but the general precarious presumption that all usages then practis’d, that were not Moral, must needs be so. The Apostle does indeed acknowledge, that of events, they were νπαθικα of what we might expect in the like Cases, 1 Cor, x. i. He also owns that the Law in general had a shadow of good things to come. Heb. x. 1. But that every particular Imposition of the Law was a shadow of some particular Imposition that was to answer it under the Gospel, I know no Text our Adversaries can pretend to that could inform them. Many of the positive, as well as the Moral, Precepts of the Jewish Law, were adapted to the particular Exigencies of that Nation. Many were fitted to the Vices that Nation was generally more inclined to than other Nations, as Idolatry, Covetousness, &c. Many to those they were more in danger of, on account of their particular Situation, the Vices of their Neighbour Nations. Many to other Reasons and customs long since antiquated, as Maimonides has
has judiciously observ'd from the Caldean Writings by him ascribed to the Zabij. Many to particular Favors of Conversation, which God was in those Ages pleased to grant to other Nations, as well as his Peculium. Such were those of the Waters of Jealousy, of the ways of atoning unknown and involuntary Murthers, and the Oracles of Lots, and Prophets and Urim. Why should we think that such Laws as these should have any prospect farther than those Ages, and that Nation for which they were design'd? Especially since the reasons of many of them failed long before the Publication of the Gospel; and when they obtain'd, concern'd no other Nation whatsoever besides that of the Jews.

OUR Adversaries might have been pleased to consider that the way of delivering even known Moral Duties under Mystical Symbols, was the usual Custom of those of those earliest Ages, even where no farther future Innovations were ever thought of. Such were the ancient Oracles, the Fables and Parables and dark Sayings and Riddles of the Wise. Such the Pythagorean Symbols, taken up from the Observations of the Customs of those Oriental Nations thro' which Pythagoras had travell'd for Cultivating his Knowledge,
by the Inventions of those Nations that were then famous for Inventions. And so the Jews of the Apostles Age understood that by prohibiting the eating of Animals, God's true design was to forbid the Vices, of which those Animals were counted Symbols by the received Traditions of the Physiologers. So Philo and St. Barnabas, that I may confine myself to the Age that I am speaking of. These had no more relation to the times of the Gospel than of the Law, nor could be thought to be more obligatory then, than now. The Vices design'd by those Animals the Jews were oblig'd to avoid as much as we are, and in order thereunto, were obliged to understand the Mystical Senses intended by those Symbols. Nor are we more excused from the Mystical Sense than they, tho' we be not obliged by the letter of the Prohibitions of those Animals. The reason why such things were delivered by Mystical Symbols was not to conceal them from the Persons to whom they were delivered for any time, much less till distant events might come to pass; but only to dispose the Hearers to receive them with the greater Reverence, according to the Customs of those times, wherein all wise and sacred Documents were so recommended, that too much familiarity
familiarity might not expose them to contempt. Clemens Alexandrinus has at large shewn that to have been the Fashion of those Ages. But the Symbols we are concern'd for in judging what particulars of the Jewish Ceremonial law were to be abrogated in our Adversaries Sense, so as that from the time of the Publication of the Gospel, they were to become unlawful, and incapable even of any new humane Sanction, were quite of another kind. These were purposely contrived to be Symbolical, that they might not be understood till the Gospel was clearly publish'd; and that, when it was sufficiently published, it might then be understood that all the changes that followed upon the new Revelations of the Gospel, were Originally designed by God. By their not being understood before they found themselves oblig'd; not to admit Gentiles to the Privileges of the new Peculium, without Proselytism of Justice and Incorporation into that particular Nation of the Jews. Perfectly agreeable to what God himself design'd till then. But from that time forward God intended his new Establishments of the Gospel should take Place, whereby Gentiles were to be admitted to these same Privileges, without the Condition of Incorporation. Thence forwards there-
fore it was necessary that there should be that evidence concerning what was to be abolished, that might satisfy, even the Jews by Nation, of their Duty of admitting Gentile Proselytes into the Peculiarum, without exacting from them, those particulars of the Mosaic Law, which were abrogated by the new Revelations of the Gospel. For they were Jews by Nation, who had then the Power of admitting into both Peculiums. The Old was in the Power of the Sanhedrin; the New was in the Power of the Apostles, who were themselves also Jews by Nation, and under the same prejudices of Education with other Jews, from which they were to be reclaim'd by the Evidence of these new Revelations of the Gospel. This being so, it plainly appears, that it is not every shadow that is sufficient for our Adversaries purpose of proving a thing unlawful. A shadow consistent would only return to its own nature of Original indifferency, and would still be as capable as formerly of receiving a new Obligation from a new lawful Sanction. But the Symbolical shadowing, we are here concerned for, was to perfigure and predict a new and ungrateful Innovation of the Gospel, which should in course repeal some Custom, they
they were then in possession of as inconsistent with it, such could not be the Singing with the Organs of our Body, as shadowed by the old inanimate Organs. For vocal Musick was even then also in present use, not only future. It was not ungrateful to the Jews themselves, and therefore had no need of being conceal'd from them, till the times of the Gospel. It was not inconsistent with any other received Custom of theirs, which might have been abrogated by that inconsistency, not with that very Practice of Instrumental Musick which is pretended to have shadowed it. So far from that, that even then the Jews had been used to Practice them together. There can therefore be no pretence here for shadowing a thing to come, when that same thing was in present use among the Jews themselves, and which could not therefore seem strange to them, and against which they could not therefore be possesse'd with any prejudice.

SO little our Adversary would gain by it for his purpose, tho' his Observation had been true, that Instrumental Musick had been one of the shadows of the Mosaic Law. But the contrary will appear more likely, if he will be pleas'd to remember, that it is mentioned in Heaven, in the Revelations. Which by the way will make

XXXVII

The Harping in Heaven could not by the Reasoning of that Age, be taken for a Shadow.
make the way of Arguing from those Passages in the *Revelations* which mention Harping in the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, stronger than perhaps our Adversary was averse of. For in the *Reasonings* of the *Apostolical Age*, the *shadows* of the *Law* which were made, as I have shewn, by Bezaleel, are directly oppos'd to the *Heavenly things themselves*, which are suppos'd to be the *Pattern* shewn by God to Moses in the *Mount* that was to be copied by Bezaleel. The shadow is said to be ὁ ἑαυτὸς, Heb. viii. 5. as an imitation of them. The shadows therefore are call'd ὁ ἑαυτὸς, to which the αὐτὸ τὰ ἑαυτὰ are professedly oppos'd by the same Apostle, Heb. ix. 23. If therefore Harping have any place in Heaven, it cannot, by this way of Reasoning, be reckon'd among the *shadows* of the *Mosaic Law*, which were to be abolished. These *Archetypes* are the *ὑποτύπωσις* hidden in the κόσμος according to St. Paul, Col. ii. 3. exactly answering the *Hellenistical Platonical Language* of that Age from which the Apostle Reasons.

The *Platonists* plac'd their ἐνίσχυμα in the Contemplation of those *Idea* in the κόσμος. The *Pythagoreans* from whom *Plato* borrowed his *Timæus*, and who were more closely follow'd by *Philo* and the *Hellenists*,
nists, call the same thing ἡμῶν, which the Platonists call ἐμπληκτής, as appears in their golden Verses. And the same Word is used by the LXXII, who are followed by Philo, who represent the Request of Moses thus, ινα ἡμῶν ἰδον σ. And θνεύεις and ἡμῶν are Terms used in this same matter, by the same Philo. It is further observable, in the same Reasoning, that the Heavenly things are suppos'd to be Eternal. So the Platonists of their Idea. Their αὐτάνθρωπος (so they called their Archetypal Man) was thought free from that Generation and Corruption to which Individuals were believed obnoxious. So St. Paul, The things which are not seen are eternal, 2 Cor. iv. 8. And eternal in the Heavens, v. 1. and where he speaks of the shaking of the Heaven and Earth, he mentions this event of that shaking, that it should be, that the things which cannot be shaken should remain, Heb. xii. 27. Who sees not that those Words of the Apostle, are designedly us'd concerning these very Changes which were to be made by the Gospel? And that the Heavenly things, are those which are suppos'd uncapable of that shaking, and therefore to remain? μέτοχέν is the Word us'd by St. Paul, and plainly signifies the same thing with
And we see how he opposes it to the

By this Reasoning therefore, Harping cannot be reckon'd among the shadows, nor can it be supposed abolished by the Innovations of the Gospel, if it be reckon'd among the Celestial, which are not capable of being affected by the great shaking of the Gospel; and which must therefore remain unmoved under the Gospel Dispensation. This Argument will receive a farther Confirmation, if he will be pleased to remember farther, that the Gospel State supposed in the Reasonings of the N. T. is really supposed to be the same with that of the Celestial Patterns shewed to Moses in the Mount, in imitation of which the Mosaic Dispensation was formed. And that even in this World, before its compleat Perfection, which it is to receive in the future State. Hence it is, that it is said, that the Jerusalem above, is even now, the Mother of us all; That even now, we are Fellow-Citizens with the Saints in Heaven; That our πολιτεία is there; That here we are πασηνός and πασεπίσκοποι, as having here
no abiding City; that we are said to have actually 
sate down in Heavenly places. Who can therefore wonder, that con-
siders this, if the Heavenly Jerusalem described in the Revelations, represent
the present State of the Church of Jerusalem then on Earth? Our Circumcision
is the Circumcision made without Hands,
Col. ii. ii. oppos'd to the Jewish Cir-
cumcision, made by Hands, Eph. ii. ii. 
Exactly as our Saviour is said to be a
High Priest of good things to come, by a
greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not
made with Hands, that is to say, not of
this Building, Heb. ix. ii. And as he is
said, not to have entred into the holy places
made with Hands, which are the figures of
the true; but into Heaven itself, v. 24.
If the Tabernacle, and the Holy Places
made without Hands, be Heaven itself;
why should we doubt, but that the Cir-
cumcision made without Hands, should have
been then thought Mystical and Heavenly?
The same Apostle gives it else-were,
as a Character of the things that were
to be abrogated by the Gospel; that the
Reason of their abrogation, was their
being made. So he tells us, yet once
more signifieth the removing of those things
that are shaken, as of things that are made,
Heb. xii. 27. It seems plainly to allude
to the Ectypes of the Tabernacle which were made by Bezaleel, in opposition to those Patterns of which there is no mention of their being made, but only shewn by God to Moses in the Mount. For their not being mentioned as made, is the same Reason for reckoning on them as not made in this mystical way of Reasoning, as it was to reckon on Melchizededek's having no Father, no Mother, no Genealogy, no beginning of Days, nor end of Life; because none of these particulars are mentioned concerning him in the Scripture. Nor must this be call'd precarious Reasoning, in Interpreting Prophecies, being the usual way taken, ever since there were Prophecies in the Prediction of distant future Events. The same thing is suppos'd in all those Places, where the things of the Gospel are called Eternal, in opposition to the things answering them under the Mosaic Law. So the Life promised in the Gospel, is call'd Eternal, in opposition to the Life promised by Moses, in Deuteronomy. So the Salvation of our Lord Jesus, is call'd Eternal, Heb. v. 9. in opposition to that of the Jewish Jesus, the Son of Nun. So his Redemption also is call'd Eternal, in opposition to the many Redeemers mentioned in many places of the old Testament, where the
the same Word is used in the LXXII. So the Inheritance of the Gospel is likewise call'd Eternal, in opposition to the Inheritance of Canaan. So the everlasting Destruction, the everlasting Consolation, 2 Thes. ii. 16. The everlasting Covenant, Heb. xiii. 20. The everlasting Kingdom. 2 Pet. i. 11. The everlasting Gospel. Rev. xvi. 6. By the same Allusion it is, that the things of the Gospel are said to be things themselves, and the true things. So the Gospel Worshippers, are the true Worshippers, St. Joh. iv. 23. The Eucharistical Bread, the true Bread, in opposition to the Manna of the Israelites, St. Joh. vi. 32. The Holiness of the Gospel, the true Holiness, Eph. iv. 24. The Tabernacle of the Gospel, (which none can doubt to be Heaven itself) the true Tabernacle, Heb. viii. 2. For the Archetypal Idea, were supposed only to have Truth in them, according to the Platonists. So Grace and Truth which came by Christ, is opposed to the Law given by Moses, St. John i. 17. And being stedfast to the Gospel Communion, in opposition to the Communion of the Hereticks, is said to be the abiding in the Truth. All these Forms of Speech understood according to the Custom of that Age, do plainly suppose, that all the Heavenly Archetypes of the Law were Evangelical,
gelical, and uncapable of any revocation that should make them unlawful under the Gospel; and that all the positive Institutions of the Gospel, were reckon'd on as Heavenly, and therefore Harpers, being mentioned in the Heavenly Jerusalem, must needs be supposed to have place among those antient Customs that were not to be abrogated. It is certain that Instrumental Musick could be itself no Shadow, according to the Doctrine of the Gospel, seeing the Evangelical Writers reckon it among the Heavenly Archetypes, which were the Truth and the Body that answered those Shadows. Nor is it any more difficult to prove Harps in Heaven, which the Adversary insultingly requires, than to prove a Circumcision there not made with Hands; than it is to prove a Manna and a Bread there, that is the Food of Angels. This sure, is an easier Account of that Idiome in the Style of the new Testament, which my late excellent Friend Dr. More, called Israelitismus, than that insisted on by our Adversary. He might have been pleased to remember, two Israelitisms there mentioned, the Mystical, which by the Christians of that Age, was believed to be perfectly the same with their own Constitution, as consisting of a Body of Gentiles ingrafted upon
upon the Apostles, who were themselves Jews by Extraction; and the Literal, which was in some things contrary to the new Revelations of the Gospel, and so far, as it was so, abrogated by them. And it is certainly much more rational to Interpret them by the Israelitism they professed rather, than by that which they opposed. This was no other than the Native Language that was, in course, to be expected in their Circumstances. But the Event of this way of Interpretation will be quite contrary to what the interest of our Adversaries Cause will require. It will argue that the Israelitish Customs so alluded to, were still receiv'd by the converted Christians, and that they could be no part of those old Israelitish Customs which were antiquated on account of their inconsistency with the Gospel. This therefore will confirm what I laid before, that the Apostles still continued this Instrumental Musick in their capital residence, at least, whilst the quietness of their Circumstances in those troublesome times would allow them to do so.

XXVIII. BUT there are Odours also, θυμίαμα, joined with the Harpers, Rev. v. 8. and the viii. 3. 4. joined with the publick Prayers; exactly as among the Jews. This the Adversary makes an argument of, that
that it must have been the old antiquated Judaism that was here alluded to, not that which was approv'd by the Christians. I suppose he may think himself the more secure here, because even our Churches do not practice what here seems to have been practis'd by the Apostles. But he might have remembered that there were also several other undoubted Apostolical Practices which have been since discontinued generally, at least in the Reformation. Such were those of the Ecclesiastical Deaconesses, the Kifs of Charity, and the Feasts of Love. He, I confess, cannot account for this, who makes all things either Sins or Duties, that are taken from Precedents of that Age, and allows no mean between those two Extremes. We can easily do so who believe that the Apostles themselves, as well as other Ecclesiastical Governours, took some things into the use of the Church from the civil Usages of their Age, which as they were prudent then, when they were in Civil use, so they may as prudently be disused now, when they have been so long antiquated as to their Civil use, and the particular Exigencies of those times are now ceased, which were the principal Considerations that then recommended them: But I see no reason why our Adversaries should believe
lieve that the use of *Incense* was not continued, even after the Destruction of the *Temple*, in the principal residence of the *Apostles*. It is to this Day practised by a far greater consent of the *ancientest Churches*, *Greek* as well as *Latin*; nor can we find any *Original* of it, that can prove it *later* than the *times* of the *Apostles* themselves. It appears in the *first* and *ancientest Liturgies* of both Tongues. It is mention'd in those *Canons* which are therefore called *Apostolical*, because they who first gathered them into a Body, knew no *Original* of their *Practice* short of the *Apostolical* times. It is St. Jerome's rule, that the *Immemorial Customs* of each Church should be presum'd to have been *Apostolical*. This Rule was probably followed by this Author. Thus therefore there is reason to presume that this Custom might have descended from the *Apostles* themselves. We have indeed an express mention of it in an Author considerably *antienter* than the *Collect* of these *Canons*, that is, of the *ancient Hippolytus*, the Disciple of St. *Irenæus*, and a *witness* of *Apostolical Traditions*:

So he περὶ τῶν τοῦ θυμίαμα ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. *Tertullian* is the eldest *Latin Christian* Writer extant, and he also mentions the cost the *Christians* were
were at in buying Frankincense, Tert. Apol. c. 42. Thuraphane non emimus. Those are the Words of the Objectors, not of Tertullian. His own Answer follows, Si Arabia queruntur, Scient Sabai pluris & carioris suas Merces Christianis Sepeliendis profligari quam Dijs fumigandis. He mentions indeed no other use of it but in Burials. He elsewhere excludes it from Sacrifices, where he tells us, That the Oblation offered by the Christians was not Grana Thuris unius aphis, non Arabita arbortis Lachrymæ, &c. c. 30. unless possibly he might intend some Emphasis in the Words unius aphis, as a reproof of their Niggardliness in it, as Alexander the great is said to have reproved his Tutor Aristotle, for his having obstructed his native Magnificence, after his Conquering Arabia. This might have been opposed to the greater Expensiveness of the Christians on Frankincense mentioned in the former Place. But I am rather apt to think, that the Case of the African Churches might be somewhat singular. Tertullian mentions their being at first Converted by the Church of Rome, Præsc. c. 36. And as it should seem, at a distance from the Apostles, ib. c. 32. After the Church of Rome had taken a liberty of Innovating from the Practice
Practice of the Ephesian College of Apostles, in the keeping of Easter, under Xystus. It might do so in this Café as well as the other. But Hippolytus was originally of the East. It is certain the first Jewish Christians, the Apostles themselves, found it actually practis’d. It is withal certain that they as Jews were prejudic’d in favour of received Customs, so as not to disuse them, but upon some great evidence of Divine Revelation to the contrary. And where can our Adversaries find any express Revelation of the N. T. against this Custom? Where can they find any new Establishment of the new Peculium inconsistent with it? On the contrary the Apostle alludes to it in those Words of his, concerning the Alms of the Philippians, when he calls them an

\[ \text{Phil. iv. 18.} \]

Odour of a sweet smell, a Sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God. These Words exactly answer the Custom of joyning Incense with their Oblations then practis’d in the Temple Worship, as it was also afterwards among the Christians. I see no reason why the Practice should be discontinued by the Christians. For these were Sacrifices allowed by the Pythagoreans themselves, who were against the bloody Sacrifices then generally received. This is plain from Porphyry. There is therefore
no reason why they should be ungrateful to the Essenes themselves, who were of all the Jews best dispos'd to the Christian Religion. Withal they were common to the Jews with the Heathens, and therefore fittest for the old and new Peculium to unite in. So far from any repugnancy to that Union which I have shewn to have been the true reason of the abrogation of those old Jewish usages, which were indeed abrogated by the Christian Religion. If our Adversaries ask how we can discharge our selves from the obligation of these things if we believe them lawful, the answer will be very easy on the Principles now proposed. By being excused from Circumcision, we Gentiles, are discharged from all the Impositions God was pleased to lay on the Jewish Nation, since we are not now any longer oblig'd to any Incorporation with them. And this is sufficient to leave things of this nature in their original indifferency as to Us, as if they never had been impos'd.

HOWEVER our Adversary pretends, That the Fathers reason as he does; that they also own Instrumental Musick peculiarly fitted to that State of Nonage, in which the Apostle supposes the Jews under the old Law. St. Chrysostome makes such Musical Instruments rather permitted than imposed.
imposed. Διδ πως ανετουρ εσ. Isidore Pelusio says, they were born with διδ πως ἀνετουρ εσ. And the Author of the Quest. ad Orthodox. very probably Justinus Siculus, who lived in the time of Pope Felix II, tells us, that it is not so proper for a State of Infancy, ὅτι κατὰ τῷ ἱθημένῳ, to sing Simply, but to sing with inanimate Instruments, &c. If these things had been true, it would have been an Indignity below the honourable State of the Gospel to have used these things now, and a false signifying that we were not yet past that State of Childhood, from which it was the design of the Gospel to free us. But we must always distinguish between the Reasonings and the Testimonies of those original Conveyors of our Christian Religion to us. In their Reasonings they had no more advantage than other Men: Especially where they lived at any distance, and were therefore any way suspicious of not keeping close to the Reasonings of that Age whole Traditions they pretend to gather by their Reasonings. For of these Reasonings we can also judge as well as they, whether they were agreeable to the Reasonings to which the H. G. accommodated his Revelations, that they might be rightly understood in the sense in which he intended them. For the
the Reasonings of their own Age could no farther contribute thereto, than as they still continued the same with those of their Age, wherein the Holy Ghost was pleased to discover and publish his new Revelations relating to the peculiar constitution of the Gospel. But the reasonings of the Age of Clemens Alexandrinus, who is the first of those produced by our Author, were by no means fit to inform him in this matter; much less of those later Fathers, who lived at so much a greater distance from the Age of the Apostles. They cannot, they do not, pretend any one Author of the Apostolical Age who showed them a Precedent of this way of reasoning. They had none of that Age that ever reckoned Instrumental Musick among the Rudiments and Elements of the Childish State, which were in course to be antiquated as soon as the Peculium should attain to their perfect and adult Age. On the contrary its being mentioned by the Apostle in Heaven, shews that it was impossible by the reasonings of that Age, that it could have been reckoned among the Rudiments and Elements of Children. For there all are supposed to have arrived to the fulness of the measure of the Stature of Christ: Which Words do plainly describe the Age of Adults
Adults, in opposition to that of Children. And indeed ἵλικα in that place would be better Translated Age than Stature; being opposed rather to the Age than the Stature of Children. So the Saints in Heaven are said to be perfect, as the πάντα ἵλικα is opposed to ἄνθρωπος, not only in the Scripture, but also in ordinary Classick Authors. Nor can I understand how our Adversaries could possibly excuse the Apostles themselves from this Notion of Childishness, whilst even they Communicated with this Instrumental Musick of the Temple, if the bare Observance of, that Musick had been taken for an Element and Rudiment of Children. These Reasonings from the Sense and Practice of the Apostolical Age and Writers, are far more certain for proving the Sense of that Age, than the reasonings instilled on by our Adversary from the Sense of those Fathers, who however superior to us, were yet confessedly later than the Age of greatest Authority, that of the Apostles.

Those very excellent Persons did not sufficiently consider how very easy it was, for matters of this Nature to be discontinu-ed, without the least dislike of those immediately succeeding Ages, that discontinued them. Supposing this Musick proper for the Jerusalem Sacrifices, as they were
were plainly in the Temple of Jerusalem, there could be no pretences to them in any other Church in the World, besides the Head Church of Jerusalem, where the first Apostle had the same right over all the Churches in the World, as the High Priest of the Jewish Sanhedrin had over all the Jewish Synagogues, in all their Dispersions. This was an easy Account why this Practice of Instrumental Musick might have been reserved to the Apostolical Church, till that Church was utterly extinguished by the Death of the last Apostles. After the last residence of the Apostolical Body at Ephesus, in Trajan's time, all the Churches in the World, were equal to that Church where the Apostles had made their last residence, and equal among themselves. Then they might, if they pleased, have taken up that same Custom universally. But were very unlikely to do so, having never till that time used it. And for any one single Church to have done so, when the rest did not so, would have been thought invidious and assuming. It might have been Interpreted as a Challenge of the Catholick Jurisdiction, to have alone exercis'd the Prerogative of that Church, which before had a Right to a Catholick Jurisdiction. So Solomon Interpreted it in his Brother A-
donijah, that de desired one of the Royal Concubines. For they also followed the right of the Crown, as appears from the 2 Sam. xii. 8. This was far from the Humility of those Times, and gives a clear Account, why it might have been universally disus’d, how lawful soever it might have been thought otherwise. But this could be no hindrance why it might not have been resumed afterwards, by any particular Church that pleased, when there was no danger of that Consequence. When the memory of the Apostolical prerogative was lost, and when no Title could be pretended for any particular Church in the World, why it should succeed to the Apostolical prerogative. The pretence of the Church of Rome far later than these earliest times of Christianity, of which I am now speaking. However it was very natural for their earliest Successors, when they found this Practice discontinued in Fact, to impute the discontinuance of it, to some disapprobation it had receiv’d from the Christian Religion; and to bethink themselves of some such Reasons as these produc’d by them why it might have been disliked by them who discontinued it, as unsuitable to the Dignity of the new Peculium. But I have shewn, that this Reasoning of theirs in
this particular, could not possibly be the Reasoning of the Apostolical Age, who both actually Communicated with Instrumental Musick, and who allowed it a place in Heaven, which was not accounted the Place of Rudiments and Children, according to the Hypothesis of mystical Reasoning. This is abundantly sufficient to discharge us from any Obligation to be concluded by the Reasonings of these Fathers in this particular, how great a Veneration for ever we may profess for their Authority in attesting Traditions, either of their own Age, or the Apostles. Indeed the whole design of this Topick of Reasoning from the State of Nonage and Rudiments was, not to prove the observation, even of the externals of the Mosaic Law unlawful, but the stopping at them, so as not to admit the farther Discoveries of the Gospel. The ῥυριστις is opposed to the ἀνὴρ τέλειος, the μετέχει ἐν τῇ ἑγων πηγῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Eph. iv. 13. And to the πρωτεύω, which was when God sent his Son made of a woman made under the Law, Gal. iv. 4. This was to stop at the μαθαυτῶν (so the Law is called, Gal. iii. 24.) whose Office was to bring us to Christ, if then they refused to be taught by Christ, but chose rather still to continue under the Discipline of the Pedagogue.

P 2 That
That was indeed a keeping themselves back from enjoying the Benefit of that fullness of Age, which, as we have seen, commenced with our Saviour's Dispensation. And it was a lifting themselves with Children, to keep still to the Pedagogue, who by the Discipline of that Age, was a perpetual Companion and Guardian of the Morals of unadult Persons, till they reached those Years of Discretion that might make it safe to trust them to themselves. This did not therefore in the least make the practice of the Law Childish, whilst they used it as the Apostles themselves did, in subordination to the new Discoveries of the Gospel, that is, whilst they observed only those particulars of the Law, which were consistent with the Gospel. Which will neither save the ends of those Fathers, nor our Adversaries. The ποιεῖν plainly allude to the things wherein those Youths which were under the Discipline of Pedagogues, were usually Instructed. Especially during the former part of that Discipline. That was Grammatical Learning, wherein they were Instructed by their Grammarians and Literators, the Letters themselves being properly call'd ποιεῖν. But as this Word is used here, it plainly denotes the ἑτυπαλ resemblances of the Law, in opposition to the Evangelical Heavenly.
venly Archetypes, which were supposed to
answer them under the Gospel. So Mount
Sinai is said, συνάξεόν τῇ νῦν ἑρωθυλήμ, Gal. iv.
25. Here we have the true Notion of
συνάξεόν, as it is used by St. Paul. Mount
Sinai in Arabia, the portion of Hagar the
Handmaid, is supposed to be a συνάξεόν.
That is in opposition to Mount Sion, the
Mountain of the true Peculium, which
answered is as the portion of Sarah the
Free-woman, the Mother of the true Pecu-
lium. So the very antient Author teach-
es, de Montibus Sinai & Sion, by some
scribed to St. Cyprian. Agreeably enough
to the Notions of the new Testament,
where we frequently find Mount Sion
mentioned, as that wherein the Archety-
pal Mystical Peculium was alone concern-
ii. 6. Rev. xiv. 1. This being indeed the
Title by which the Peculium is designed
in the old Testament, wherein it is so fre-
quently called the Daughter, and the Vir-
gin Daughter of Sion, never of Sinai, tho'
thence it was, that Moses received his
Law. Accordingly the Jerusalem that is
now, is said also to be a συνάξεόν, that is
another Fellow συνάξεόν, in the same Sense,
wherein the Word had been used of
Mount Sinai in opposition to the ἑρωθ-
υλήμ, which is the Mother of us all. Gal.
P 3
iv.
iv. 26. In both Cases the Worldly Figures are so called in opposition to the Heavenly Archetypes of the Gospel. They are therefore called the σωκεία τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3. Col. ii. 8, 20. As κόσμος is opposed to ἐγώνς. It is the κόσμος τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ, Eph. vi. 12, in opposition to the μικρὸν αἰῶν, which is always ascribed to the Messias. So the ἰδίων κοσμικόν, Heb. ix. 1, is opposed to the αὐτὸς ἐγώνς, v. 24. And as I have shewn, that the Church here on Earth is called Heaven, so the deserting the Church is called, the loving this present World τῶν μικρῶν αἰώνων, of the Messias. These σωκεία are called ἰδενί ἐν παρα, Gal. iv. 9. They are first called ἰδενί, as ἰδενίματα καὶ άρχών are joined together. Rom. xv. 1. So the άρχών ἐν νόμον ἐν ἰδένες ἔκαστος. Rom. viii. 3. The plain Importance of these Expressions seem to have been this, That in the Reasonings of the New Testament, in matters of this Nature, the mystical Benefits represented and covenanted for, by these Symbols of the Law, were never supposed to be performed by the Symbols themselves, otherwise than as they represented and applied the Archetypes, answering them under the Gospel. Thence it followed that in separation from those Evangelical Archetypes, the Legal Symbols must have been perfectly
perfectly useless and insignificant, in relation to those greater Benefits expected by them which of themselves they were no way able to perform. So the Apostle to the Hebrews tells us, that it was not possible that the blood of Bulls and Goats should take away sins, Heb. x. 4. Why so, but to let his Nation see the necessary Obligation that lay upon them to qualify themselves for being received to the Christian Eucharistical Sacrifices, which answered those bloody Sacrifices under the Gospel, if they desired the mystical Benefit of a true Expiation: So he again Warns the Galatians, That in Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision availeth nor Uncircumcision, anything, but the new Creature in Baptism, Gal. vi. 15. Here we see the ἡλίας in opposition to the ἁπευρία and ἁμαρτία is ascrib'd to the καυρίας in Baptism, which was Instituted instead of Circumcision under the Gospel. For the καυρίας was alone to be expected by the Spirit, which was the Prerogative of our Christian Baptism. This was the ἀπελλατίστος τοῦ θυσίας. Rom. xii. 2. and the ἀπελλατίστος πνεύματος, which is joined with the λατενισμένες. Tit. iii. 5. which could be no other than that of our Christian Baptism, as it is also described St. Joh. iii. 5. This, by the way gives a clear account why the Law is said ἁπαντεύων ἃς ᾧρκας. Rom. viii. 3. For
For Flesh is ordinarily used in the old Testament also as a Symbol of Weakness, as the Spirit is of Strength. And the Apostle plainly warns that the Spirit was not received by the works of the Law, but by the hearing of Faith. Gal. iii. 2. So the Apostle shews that the literal Jerusalem, to which the separating Jews pretended, could give no Title to that Liberty which both Parts agreed to be a privilege of the true Peculium, as the Offspring of Sarah the Free Woman. So far from that, that he observes that that Jerusalem was even then in Bondage with her Children. But the Jerusalem, continues he, which is above, is Free, which is the Mother of us all. Gal. iv. 25. 26. So he also elsewhere observes, that it was the Seed of Abraham’s Faith, not of his Flesh that had a just Right to Inherit the Promises made to his Seed. Rom. iv. 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18. ix. 7, 8. This therefore seems to be the true account why the legal Symblos are called ἃς when compared with the Originals which were to succeed them under the Gospel. The same τις are also said to be πώς, Gal. iv. 9. Plainly in opposition to the ταῖς which is frequently ascribed to the Mystical Spiritual Benefits expected by them, but in vain. For the Reasoning of the Apostles supposed, that
that they are really to be expected only from the Rites which were to succeed those legal Symbols under the Gospel. So we read the πληθυσμός αγίων Rom. ii. 4. the ἁπλοὶ ἐνδείξεως, Rom. ix. 23. Eph. iii. 16. Col. i. 7. the εὐθύς πληθὺς, ὑποδείγματα, ἐνδείξεως τῷ Ἐρμόν Rom. xi. 33. Alluding all to the Mystical Senses of the Law, and the Benefits signified and conveyed by them. So again the πληθυσμός Χρίστου. Eph. i. 7. with relation to the Spiritual Ξεισπραξία literally poured out then upon the Christians, but not on the dividing Jews, who kept to the literal Institutions of the Law, which afforded them no Riches of this kind, whilst they obstinately persisted in their Separation. Justly therefore they might be stiled in this Sense Poor, when compared with the richer Institutions of the Gospel, which in that Age, yielded these invaluable Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge in so very great abundance. The same Expression of πληθυσμός with relation to the mystical Benefits of these external σωτηρία thus explained, is used also in Philo before St. Paul, as well as Ignatius after him. This is abundantly sufficient to shew, that these are the true Interpretations of the Expressions objected by our Adversaries, according to the Notions and Language of that Age.

THESE
THESE things thus explained, will make it appear how very different the Reasonings of these Fathers and our Adversaries are in these Matters, from those of the Apostolical Writers from whom they borrow them. The whole design of them as used by the Apostolical Writers, is against Jews, who either would not come over to the Christian Communion on the terms prescribed by the Gospel of Communicating with the Uncircumcised Gentiles in the Holy Offices of the Christian Religion, or who were inclined to a defection from it, as soon as they understood that these terms were expected from them, out of zeal for their former Notions, which were contradicted, and at length abrogated, by these new Revelations of the Gospel; and out of zeal for their whole Law, which was imposed on them as a particular Nation, and on the Gentiles, whilst their Incorporation into that particular Nation was required by God as a Condition of their Admission into the true Peculium, which now they found repealed by these new Revelations of the Gospel. The using these Rudiments without a design of defection was so far from being blamed by the Arguments now mentioned, that it was practised by the Apostles themselves, as Jews, till the dissolution
It was urged and insisted on by those many Myriads of believing Jews, who were zealous for the Law, with a perfect good understanding with the Apostles; that St. Paul himself, who had said most of any against the Obligation of the Law, comply'd with it. And was urged to do so by the chief Apostle St. James. But a breach is plainly supposed in the Arguments insisted on by our Adversaries. A not coming over to Christ, or relapsing from him, and stopping with the Pedagogue who was to, bring them to Christ, was that which was to continue them in, or reduce them to the State of Childhood. This made them Rudiments and Elements, when they went no further than the Mosaic Institutions. This made them weak and beggary when separated from the Gospel Institutions, which were alone supposed able to confer the mystical Benefits Convenanted for, as well as represented by those legal Symbols. This made them beggerly when they kept them off from the Evangelical Archetypal Symbols, which were thence forwards appointed by God, as the only ordinary conveyancers of that riches of Grace which the separating Jews in vain expected from their own Symbols. This was the true dispute of great Importance in that Age,
Age, in which the Arguments now mentioned, were insitit on with great Prudence and Strength. The Error confuted was the depending on Circumcision for the Incorporation into the true Peculium, which could no longer be expected without our Christian Baptism. And the depending on the Temple Sacrifices for all the Benefits of the Heavenly mystical Sacrifice, which were thenceforward to be expected from our Christian Eucharist. The contenting themselves with the literal Circumcision in the Flesh for their intitling themselves to the name of the Seed of Abraham, and the Promises made to them that were so, without the Faith of Abraham in the Messiah, which he had when those Promises were made to him before his carnal Circumcision, as the Apostle observes. Rom. iv. 9, 10, 11, 12. These and the like were the Weak and beggarly Elements spoken of by St. Paul, when depended on for the Benefits which they were not able to perform; and that in separation from those means by which alone they could be performed by the new Revelations of the Gospel. And this Reasoning was very proper to oblige all Jews to come into the Christian Communion, and to continue in it, if they desired the mystical Benefits conferred formerly in the Jewish Communion.
nion alone, before the Gospel Revelations had altered the Cafe, but not afterwards. But then these Reasonings conclude nothing against the very same abrogated Symbols, if practiced in unity with the uncircumcis'd Believers much less if the same things had been observ'd by the Ecclesiastical Power of the Church, without regard to the old Imposition of Moses. For the latter could oblige all its own Subjects, which the former could not do, being only obligatory to the Jewish Nation. Here therefore there was no Enmity, no Wall of Partition, which might any way tend to the dissolution of their common Body and Communion. Withal it is plain that this Reasoning extends to no other Jewish Customs but those only who were thought to entitle to some mystical Benefits represented and conveyed by them, till God had declared it otherwise by his new Revelations. And therefore it is to no purpose, in reference to this design, to find a thing represented by the Jewish Symbol, unless it be a mystical Benefit, to which it was to entitle from God as a Covenanting Symbol Instituted by him. In vain therefore does our Adversary pretend that Instrumental Musick shadowed our Worship with the Organs of our Bodies. Had that been true, yet it had been nothing to
to the purpose in relation to the design of these reasonings. That had been a Duty, not a Benefit, which is plainly supposed as pretended to in all the Instances of these Reasonings. It was their losing the Substance conveyed by the Shadow, on which all the force of the Argument depends, that is drawn from the Appellation of Shadows. The Weakness of the Elements or Rudiments of the Mosaic Law, as argumentative in this Case, implies their insufficiency to convey the Benefits, as their Beggarliness implies their Inability to confer the Mystical Riches that were expected from them. If therefore our Adversary will make Instrumental Musick a Shadow or a Rudiment, he should bethink himself of some Mystical Benefit represented and conveyed by it under the Law, but now conveyed by some other Institution succeeding it under the Gospel. For this is absolutely requisite to make it now an empty Shadow, and a weak and beggarly Element. And what may that be? Is it the admitting us to the Joys of the Heavenly Society, represented by Instrumental Musick? And why may not the like use of Instrumental Musick entitle us to that now as well as represent it? I have shewn that the Gospel Symbols are supposed as best qualified to give us a title to any thing
thing Heavenly, by the Reasonings of the New Testament. I have shewn, that by the same Reasonings the same Title is denied to the legal Symbols in a State of Separation from the Communion of the Church. I have shewn that the contrary is supposed, by the same Reasonings, concerning the Symbols of the Church, that they, and they alone, are supposed sufficient to perform what is represented, and Symbolically Covenanted for by them. The weakness and beggarliness of what would otherwise have been useful, do more concern our Adversaries than Us, who practice even their Vocal Musick, as the Jews did, in a Separation from the truly Original Apostolical Communion. The good God open their Eyes, and make them truly sensible of it. Thus I think I have obviated all that has been said or can be said, from our Adversaries Principles, with relation to my own principal Argument? And I have not leisure to follow him in things less necessary to my own design.
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