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My Lord,

It is with extreme Reluctance that I force my self to give your Lordship this present Trouble. But the Love of Truth, which ought to be above all humane Considerations, will, I hope, plead my Excuse with your Lordship, and with all Persons of impartial and honest Minds, for the great Presumption of this Address. The Cause it self, which determined me to it, is a Cause in which I have for some time
time been engaged, and which I think
my self under some fort of Obligation
still to prosecute; esteeming it of the
utmost Importance, both to the Honour
of Christianity, and the Security of Hu-
mane Society: For the Sake of both
which it deserves seriously, and impar-
tially, and frequently, to be consider'd,
whether the Nature and End of Go-
vernment necessarily take away from
the governed Part of Mankind the Right
of Self-Defense; or whether the Gospel
of Jesus Christ hath utterly deprived
them of any such Right, and left them
naked and defenseless against all possi-
ble Attempts of their Governours. Your
Lordship hath been pleased to express
some Zeal for the affirmative side of these
Questions: And I am sensible, that your
Lordship's Reputation and Authority are so
great, that of themselves they are thought,
by many, sufficient to fix the Stamp of
Truth upon what bears a Name so
much honoured and respected. But your
Lordship knows full well, that where a
Veneration for Persons prevails more
than the Love of Truth, as Truth;
there even Truth it self becomes vile,
and loses its Beauty and Grace before
Men,
Men, as well as forfeits its Title to the Rewards of God. I humbly therefore hope, that your Lordship will not take it amiss, if I freely examine those Thoughts and Observations upon this Subject, which your Lordship hath lately published to the World. If I may be permitted to do this, it cannot possibly do the least Injury either to Truth, or the Gospel we profess, when it is seen that I do it with all the Reverence due to your Lordship's high Station and Character; and with all the Respect due to that Integrity and Goodness, which shine so bright in your Lordship's Example.

My Lord,

The Sermon preached by your Lordship before Her Majesty on the Eighth of March, 1708, is the Occasion of this Trouble: Which, compared with that preached at St. Dunstan's in the West, on March 8, 1704, gives us such an Account of your Lordship's Judgment concerning the Duty of Subjects, and the Original, and Authority of Governors, as seems to me to give just Ground for such
such an Examination of it as I at this Time design.

i. In the Sermon preached 1704. p. 9. Your Lordship acknowledges, that the Scripture leaves every Country to itself to establish that Form of Government, which is most suitable to its own particular Temper and Genius. Again, p. 15. There is no one particular Form of Government that can truly be said to be of divine Institution, and Appointment. Again, p. 18, 19. The Designation and Appointment of particular Persons to the Administration of the Government, this is humane; and the Distribution of the Power of Government into one, or into more Hands, this is likewise humane: This is the Ordinance of Man only. Again, p. 23, 24. it is declared, that No Man hath a natural Right to the Government of a Kingdom: That the only Right thereto must be a Legal Right, such a Right as is given him by the Law and Constitution of the Realm; i.e. by the sovereign Legislative Authority for the Time being. And that the Kingly Power is not lodged in our King or Queen solely, but in King, Lords, and Commons, conjointly, is freely declared by your Lordship.
2. I observe, that in giving an Account of the divine Institution of Government, Sermon 1708. p. 4, 5. Your Lordship declares, that that ought to be taken for the most rightful Government, which is established, and that for the best Title, which hath prevailed by Prescription, or is settled by the Constitution: That you do not affirm, or think it implied in any Expression of St. Paul, or any other Scripture-Writer, that the Form of Government, or Person Governing, are designed, and marked out by God, any otherwise than as all Revolutions are brought about by the Working or Permission of God: And that when you affirm Government to be of divine Institution, you understand by this, that it is the Will of God that some should bear Rule, and that others should be in Subjection; and that they which bear Rule, should enact Laws for the Preservation of Justice and Peace amongst their Subjects, and duly execute the Laws made for that Purpose: In which two things the whole Power and Exercise of Sovereignty do consist. This is all the divine Right your Lordship acknowledges.

3. Your Lordship adds, p. 6. That the Authority by which the Magistrate acts,
acts, in all Forms of Government, is a Ray or Portion of the divine Authority and Power, derived to him from, and communicated to him by God. But then your Lordship contends, p. 16. that this Commission from God to the Civil Magistrate is not absolute, and unlimited; and that he can act with Authority no farther, nor otherwise, than as he is warranted to do by his Commission.

After I have thus presumed to lay before your Lordship your own Words upon these several Heads, in order to make farther Use of them; I beg leave now to mention some Particulars, which seem inconsistent with these Principles, or in which I am forced to differ from your Lordship; tho' Matters of great Importance both to the Religion we profess, and to the Foundation of the present Establishment under which we account ourselves so happy: And I beg leave, with all Submission, to examine them with that Freedom, and Impartiality which becomes a Lover of Truth. And,

I. From the Magistrate's being called the Minister of God by St. Paul, your Lordship argues, that he hath none above
above him upon Earth, to question, cen-
sure, or punish him; and that he is ac-
countable to none but God.

1. In Answer to this, I might here put your Lordship in Mind, that St. Paul hath guarded his own Expression very cautiously and judiciously; that he tells Subjects, not barely that the Magistrate is the Minister of God, but that he is the Minister of God to them for Good; which manifestly shews that he is speaking, in general, with respect to the Nature and Design of the Office; which is the Ordinance of God, as your Lordship before explained it, in this Sense, because it is agreeable to his Will, that so good and useful an Office should be kept up in humane Society. But all this reasoning falls to the Ground, when once it is supposed that the Magistrate is not the Minister of God; as it is impossible he should be, in any thing disagreeable to his Will, I mean in the Sense now contended for. Granting therefore, that in his Office he is the Minister of God; yet in contradicting the only Design of his Office he cannot be so; nor can the Argument hold good. This hath been
argued at large in a late Treatise, concerning the Measures of Submission: Nor
hath the least Reply been given to it, besides general, and positive Affirmations to the contrary.

2. I might likewise put your Lordship in Mind, that every Person in the World, who is the Instrument of Good to us, is the Minister of God to us for Good. And this may be affirmed of them without any such universal and unlimited Inference as this: Which is sufficient to prove, that the Magistrate's being called the Minister of God, or in the Apostle's Words, the Minister of God to us for Good, cannot justify any such Inference.

3. I will beg leave to shew your Lordship, that the Magistrate's receiving a Commission for one particular Work, immediately from God, ought not to be an Argument, in your Lordship's own Judgment, to prove that there is none upon Earth that may question, censure, or punish him. Your Lordship contends, p. 16. That his Commission is not absolute and unlimited, but confined to one Purpose, viz. that of Civil Government. Your Lordship likewise contends, that for another Purpose the
Ecclesiastical Officers have received likewise a Commission from God; and are the Ministers of God as properly, for the Ends of their Office, as the Magistrate is for the Ends of his. Yet, tho' they be the Ministers of God, and his Servants only; it doth not follow, according to your Lordship, that there is none upon Earth to question, censure, or punish them. From whence I argue, That the being the Minister of God, in the most proper Sense, is not, of it self, an Argument to prove such an Exemption as is here mentioned: For if it were, then would the Ecclesiastical Officers be exempt from that Restraint, and Censure of the Civil Magistrate, under which your Lordship hath concluded them in all things, but those which their Commission empowers them to do. I would not willingly be mistaken; and therefore I add, that what I am now saying is this, That the being called the Minister of God, or the being actually commissioned by God for one particular Work, doth not, of it self, prove the Person so commissioned absolutely exempt from all Question and Censure. And this I was led to say by your Lordship's Argument drawn
drawn from hence. The Truth of the Matter seems plainly this; That, as the Commission of the Ministers of the Gospel cannot exempt them, in Cases in which they are void of all Authority, and to which their Commission reacheth not; so cannot it be proved barely from their Commission, that Magistrates are in a more exempt Condition. For a Commission gives an Authority, and consequently a Superiority, only in those Points to which it extends itself; leaving all others as it found them. Your Lordship well observes, that they can act with Authority no farther than their Commission reaches. Consequently therefore, they can have a Superiority no farther than their Commission reacheth. And it follows infallibly from hence, that their Superiority vanisheth in those Instances in which they act without, or against their Commission. One of these two Points must be proved, either that the Commission given by God to Magistrates, gives them a positive Authority to act against the Ends of their Institution, and the Design of their Commission; or that they remain Supreme, even in those Cases in which they have no Authority; and
and in which they cannot be the Ministers of God: tho’ it be their Authority only, and their being the Ministers of God, that gives them this Supremacy. Nor should this, methinks, seem so strange to your Lordship, since the Case of a Mayor in a Corporation, who, after his Election, is not accountable to those that choose him, but to the Queen, by whose Commission he acts, (by which Instance your Lordship very unfortunately endeavours to illustrate your Position) may be found to help us very much in discovering the Truth of this Matter. For the Commission given to this Mayor, makes him not superior to any in the Corporation, unless it be in the due Execution of the Office he is called to. Nor will the supreme Governor censure or punish any Freeman for opposing this Mayor, in any Cases but those to which his Commission reacheth. Nor doth the King or Queen by this Commission exempt him from an Equality in other Instances. And in all Cases where the Danger is imminent, Violence is allowed to be repelled with Violence, and the same Behaviour which is allowed in the Case of Equals. Nor doth his being, in other Cases, the King’s
King's Minister, exempt him. The Application is so plain, I need not make it: and your Lordship affirms that the Cases are parallel. If so, then the being the Minister of God, and commissioned by Him, gives the Supreme Magistrate a Superiority over the Governed Society no farther than is consistent with the Safety and Happiness of the Society, for which alone he was commissioned.

4. Doth your Lordship think that St. Paul could not intend his Exhortations to have respect to Deputed Magistrates, as well as the Supreme; and that he could not possibly understand by the higher Powers, and his general way of Speaking, all in so useful an Office as that of Magistracy? If he could, as he certainly did; then deputed Magistrates, as well as the Supreme, are called by him the Ministers of God; and this alone will destroy your Lordship's Argument drawn from that Title. Nay, Are not deputed Magistrates the Ministers of God, and may they not justly be called so, who help to execute so useful an Office? And yet we see, this cannot prove such an exemption as your Lordship speaks of: therefore, neither will this alone prove it for
for others. And with respect to the case of deputed Magistrates, it is observa-
ble, (what hath been often quoted by the Patrons of Passive Obedience) that our
Lord told Pilate, that his Power was from above. But he being manifestly a
deputed Governor, was undoubtedly ac-
countable to Man: Which shews that a Magistrate's being called the Minister,
or Servant of God, doth not imply in it what is by some deduced from it. But, after all,

5. I must intreat your Lordship not to think that I am contending for the Words Accountable, or Censure, or Punishment. I know none who are solic-
citous about them. All that is contend-
ed for with any Zeal, is this, that there should be a Right left in the governed So-
ciety to preserve it self from Ruine and Destruction: Which is a Point that your Lordship hath not touched upon. The Commission of Fathers is from God; and their very Persons are pointed out by Him: Yet was it never doubted, as I know of, that should a Father be so outra-
gious, or mad, as to attempt the Lives of his Children, his Hands may be tied, and Self-Defence be justly practised by
by them. Nor do I know that ever an-
ny one, merely for saying this, was re-
viled, or thought to dissolve all Filial
Obedience. His being the Minister of
God therefore, let it make him never so
unaccountable to his Children, yet doth it
not, in the Case of Habitual or Actual
Madness, take from them the Right of
Self-defense. So likewise, let the Magis-
trate be, in never so proper a Sense,
the Minister of God; and never so unac-
countable, never so much superior to his
Subjects; yet doth not this in the least
deveft the Governed from the Right of
Self-defense, and Self-preservation: as we
see in all other parallel Instances what-
soever, that Superiority in one doth not
rob others of the Right of Self-defense.
And with submission, my Lord, if the
Case had been put after this manner, e-
very one at first view must have seen
the little force of the Argument now
before us. And what I have been say-
ing holds true, whatever the Original
of Government were, and whencesoever
Governours have their Authority. But
because your Lordship hath thought fit
to enter into that, I beg leave to fol-
low,
II. In giving an Account of the Authority by which Magistrates act, your Lordship is not content that an humane Institution should have an humane Authority, but contends that the Power of the Magistrate must be immediately from God.

1. Your Lordship's first Reason is, because he can have this Power no other way, p. 9. for no Man hath it originally and essentially in himself, (which some Men will think a very great, and too large a Concession; ) and that he can't have it from the People, is evident; because it is such a Power as the People never had, nor could have; and what they have not themselves, they can't give to another. The Power which your Lordship instanceth in, is, the Power to cut off evil Doers, i.e. Enemies to the Society: And this your Lordship affirms that the People never could have. No Man hath power either over his own Life, or over his Brother's.

On the contrary, I do affirm, and hope to prove, 1. That for the sake of public Good, a Man is allowed to have such Power over his own Life, as to contract that, when that requireth it, it shall be given up; which is all that is pretended in
in the Case of Civil Government. This is plain from hence, that when a Soldier voluntarily Lifts himself into the Service of his Country, he contracts in effect to this purpose, that when his General commands him for the Publick Service, and it becomes necessary for his Countries good, he must and will venture where he is sure to lose his Life. So likewise in Civil Government, a Man may have the same Power over his own Life, voluntarily to contract, that when the public Good requires it, and the Magistrate ordains it, he will submit. But your Lordship's Argument, drawn from a Man's not having Power or Authority to lay violent hands upon himself, gives the Question a wrong turn, and is apparently of no weight; since it will as well prove that a Man may not voluntarily enter into the Military Service. There is, I hope, a great difference between a Man's violently sending himself out of the World, at the time, and after the manner, which the public Good doth not require; and his contracting to give up his Life to the consideration of public Safety: and a Man may have Power to do the one, tho' not
not to do the other. And because this may be thought not fully to touch the Point, I add, what will come nearer to the Case in hand, that supposing no fixed Magistrate, or General, a Neigh-
bourhood of Persons, in danger from Robbers and Murtherers, attempting their ruine, may jointly consent to go out a-
gainst these Enemies: and any parti-
cular Man hath such a Power over his own Life, that He may with Honour, voluntarily run upon inevitable Death, knowing that He doth so, in order to sustaine the first onset of these Enemies, and for the Safety and Security of his Neighbours. And as He hath this Power in himself; so, suppo-
ing a General chosen by him and others, he doth by this choice transfer this Right to the General, and oblige him-
sfelf to do the same at his Command, which he might himself voluntarily do before. But,

2. It is of small Importance to this Question, whether a Man have any such Power over his own Life, or no; if so be that he appears to have it, in some particular Cases, over the Life of others. Now, 1. The Question being here, what
what Power Men have, before there is supposed a fixt Governor of a Society, your Lordship manifestly puts the Case wrong, when you say that a private Man would be a Murderer should he, of his own Head, kill even a Malefactor. For tho' this may possibly be true, in some cases, supposing a Government fixed; yet supposing no fixed civil Government, this is so far from being true, that he would be a Public Benefactor, who should kill a Public Enemy. As Cain thought it but just to fear, that all would be armed against a Murderer, as an Enemy to the whole Race of Mankind; and had a Right to defend themselves from such an one. So likewise supposing a Band of Destroyers coming down upon a Place not yet settled under civil Government; have not the Inhabitants such a Power over the Lives of these Robbers, as to enter into a voluntary Association, and take Arms to defend themselves by destroying them? And may not they transfer this Right of Self-preservation, by empowering one, or more Persons, to ordain, and do, what should be necessary on all such Occasions: and so give to them a Power over the Lives of others,
thers, as truly as any civil Magistrate upon Earth hath it? And if in a State, in which no established civil Government is supposed to be settled, (and some such there actually yet are in the Wildnesses of the Earth; ) Private Men have certainly this Right, which is no more than that of Self-defense and Self-preservation; then they may certainly transfer and convey the Exercise of this Right, in all ordinary Cases, to one or more Persons, for the greater Security of public Happiness. And that they have not this Right, upon supposition of no civil Government settled, your Lordship hath not attempted to prove. But this is not all, for, 2. When a civil Government is actually settled, yet there are extraordinary Cases in which Private Men may justly kill Malefactors, of their own head, as your Lordship expresseth it; and consequently, have such a Power over their Brother's Life, as your Lordship is pleased to deny them. As in Case of a sudden and violent Attaque upon their Lives, and the Lives of their Family, in which an Appeal cannot soon enough be made to the Magistrate, they have a natural Right to kill
kill the Attempters, resulting from that Right to Self-preservation given them by God. And these things are so plain, that I cannot help expressing some Astonishment to find a Person of your Lordship's Judgment, and great Abilities, overlooking all this, and urging only a few affirmations to the contrary. All this shews that Men have such a Right to Self-defense, (which implies in it often, by necessary consequence, a Power over the Lives of others;) as is sufficient to convey to civil Magistrates, agreeably to the Will of God, all that Power over the Lives of others which they can justly claim, or lawfully put in Execution. Nor can I help observing that our Parliament hath openly asserted the original Contract between King and People, as the Foundation of civil Authority; the same Parliament, my Lord, which laid the Foundation of that alteration in the Succession to the Crown, which your Lordship defends in the former of the Sermons just now mentioned; and that Parliament to which we owe all the Happinesse we enjoy or hope for.

2. Your
2. Your Lordship is not content with this Argument only, to devest the People of all pretension of being the Original of civil Authority: but is pleased to add, that the Position is directly contrary to what the Apostle affirms, That there is no Power but of God. A way of Interpretation which will as well prove all Usurpers, all Robbers in Power, to have a Commission immediately from God! whereas your Lordship knows (and hath observed it in this very Sermon in the Case of Nebuchadnezzar) that the Scripture useth this expression in many Cases where the Providence, the permissive Providence of God only is concerned; and where there can be no Commission from Him possibly supposed. And here St. Paul speaking of Magistrates, it is most reasonable to interpret these Words, that there are none posses’d of Authority for the good of Humane Society; (which is the Magistrate’s Authority;) but that this Authority is of God, agreeable to, and founded upon, his Will. And all that your Lordship thinks fit to make of this, and the like Expressions, in the former part of your Sermon is, that it is agreeable to the Will of God,
that some should bear Rule, and some should Obey, in humane Society. But who can believe that St. Paul intended by such an Expression at once to condemn that Doctrine, that the Power of the Magistrate is originally derived to Him from the Contract or Concession of the People? I am sure when your Lordship can prove that the Apostle designed in these Words to contradict and condemn this Notion rightly understood; I may undertake to demonstrate, that by those other Words, The Powers that be, are ordained of God, the Apostle meant to assure us that the very Forms of Government, and the Persons governing, were then, and are always, pointed out by the immediate Voice of God. And indeed, I shall not doubt, by the very same Arguments by which your Lordship will prove that St. Paul condemned the one, which you are pleased to condemn, to prove that St. Paul did likewise as positively condemn the other, which you are pleased to maintain. And if your Lordship think it absurd to hold that the very Persons governing, are ordained by God immediately, notwithstanding the high Ex-
Expression of the Apostle, I hope others may the more easily be forgiven, who use not greater latitude in interpreting the one form of Expression, than your Lordship doth in the interpretation of the other. And why your Lordship allows not the same latitude in both, I cannot well imagine.

3. Another Argument I find added, viz. that the Notion, now condemned by your Lordship, is plainly grounded upon a Supposition false in Fact, viz. that there was a great Number of Men living before the Institution of Civil Government; which whole multitude of Men had then, by natural Right, the same Power over single Men, which is now exercised by the Magistrate: Which your Lordship denies to be true, because every Man descending from Adam and Eve, in his natural Capacity, is born a Subject to his own Parents, and, in his political Capacity, to the Chief Governor of that State, of which, at his Birth, he becomes a Member; p. 11. But,

1. Your Lordship in the same Place grants that this indeed might possibly have been true in Case this Multitude had been all created at one and the same time: Not
remembering that you had before maintained, that the Power of the Magistrate could not originally be in the People, for Reasons inconsistent with this way of Arguing. For what signifieth it in this Case, whether they came into Being all at once, or no; if the Power of Life and Death, which is in the Magistrate, be, as your Lordship hath before declared it, of that nature, that no private Man, or company of Men, can have any thing of it in themselves to communicate to any other? For if Men had all sprung up together, they could have had no more Power over their own, or their Neighbour's Lives, than they have now they are born one of another. Or, if your Lordship will give me leave to make use of this concession, that the Power of the Magistrate might have been derived from the People, had Mankind been created all at once; then I must argue, that all that your Lordship hath said before, concerning the Power of Life and Death, is of no importance to the Cause.

2. Your Lordship is pleased to distinguish between the Natural and Political Capacity of a Man born into the World;
World: From whence I argue, that a Man may possibly be born free in his Political Capacity, tho' not free from all the Subjection due to a Father and Mother, in his natural Capacity; and consequently, if Civil and Paternal Government differ, as your Lordship seems to think, it will not prove, that there was not a Number of Men in the World before the Institution of Civil Government, to allege that Men are born one of another: It will not prove that there always was a Civil Government, to allege, that there was always Paternal Government. The Right to Paternal Authority is a Natural Right: But your Lordship assures us often, that no one hath a Natural Right to Civil Government, and consequently, say I, Paternal and Civil Authority are two so distinct Things, that tho' Man be not born free with respect to the one, yet he may, with respect to the other; and his being born, and consequently born under Subjection to Paternal Authority, which is a natural Right, signifieth nothing to prove that there might not be a great Number born, before the Institution of civil Government, to which there is no natural Right.

D 2 3. Your
3. Your Lordship's Argument against this Freedom is this, Every Man, since the Fall, is born a Subject to his own Parents, in his natural Capacity; and, in his political Capacity, a Subject to the civil Government under which he is born. Now the thing to be proved was, That there never was a Time without civil Government. The Subjection to Parents, I have shewn, in your Lordship's own Judgment, to have nothing to do with the Freedom we are now speaking of. And for what your Lordship adds, that every Man since the first is born, in his political Capacity, a Subject to the chief Governor of the State, of which he is born a Member; this is taking the thing for granted which is the Question in Dispute. For the Point in Debate is, in effect, this very thing, whether every Man, since the first, was born a Subject, in a Political Capacity, to a civil Governor: And your Lordship here proves it, barely by affirming it; which will not effectually convince those who seek for Reasons for what is affirmed.

4. If there be no such thing as a Natural Right to civil Government, as your Lordship faith, then there must be
a State of Equality preceding the Institution of it; and it must inevitably be founded upon voluntary Compact and Agreement, without which no one Person could have any more real, authentic Right to it than another. For if there were not an original State of natural Equality with respect to civil Government; then certainly there must be, in some particular Person or Persons, a natural Right to civil Government. But your Lordship assures us there is no such thing; therefore it follows, with a Mathematical Evidence, that the State of Nature, with respect to civil Government, is a State of Equality. And I cannot but wonder to find that your Lordship can urge such fort of Arguments as seem inconsistent with your own Concessions: Especially considering that your Lordship hath not thought fit in the least to consider what hath been largely said by several Writers in Answer to this Argument, or to hint the least Consideration which might furnish a Reply to them. Nor can I wonder less, to find your Lordship declaring, p. 4. that the Title of the first Kings that ever were in the World was most probably only their Pa-
Paternal Right to rule and govern their own Children and Descendants. For this Paternal Right is a Natural Right, and therefore cannot be thought by your Lordship to be a Right to Civil Government over their Descendants; because you say, there is no such thing as a Natural Right to that. That the Fathers of Families might be at first pitch'd upon by many Clans and Societies of Men, to be Civil Governours likewise, hath been thought probable by many wise Writers; or that their Civil Government might have been submitted to, tho' taken up by themselves without any formal Choice: But then their Right to this could not be the Paternal Right; but was founded upon that voluntary Choice, or Submission. Your Lordship therefore hath de vested the first Kings, (who probably had the best Titles in the World) of all Title to their Civil Power, by fixing it upon a Paternal, which is a natural Right; and at the same time declaring, that there is no such thing as a natural Right to Civil Power, and making a Distinction (as there is indeed a most manifest one) between Mankind in a natural Capacity, and Mankind in a political Capacity,
5. There are at this Day, and have been in every Age, Instances of People in the unciviliz'd Parts of the World, without any established civil Government: And if ever Government comes to be rightfully settled amongst them, it must be by voluntary Compact and Agreement; and, we see, hath been preceded by a State of as great an Equality, with respect to civil Government, as is contended for by any Writer that I know of.

6. But I cannot see what mighty Advantage your Lordship would procure to the Cause you defend, could you demonstrate that the Authority of Governors comes from God, in the Sense inconsistent with the Supposition of a Contract founded upon a State of Equality. For since (as your Lordship allows) the Forms of Government, and the Persons of Governors, were always, ordinarily speaking, of humane Determination; and these were certainly determined by Societies of Men merely in order for the greater Happiness of Society, and for the good Execution of a particular Office: Since this is so, I say; supposing their Authority (upon such humane Appointment)
pointment) to be conveyed to them immediately from God himself; yet methinks, this Authority can be only such as the Nature of their Office, and the Reason and Ground of the Contract supposed to be made with them, necessarily require. It will be very difficult, I believe, for your Lordship to prove, that God doth give any other Authority to the Persons of Governours, but what is founded upon the End proposed in their Election; or that they can be superior to the whole electing Society, by his Will, in any Instances to which their Commission doth not reach, and in which they destroy the very End of their Commission given them by God, as well as of the Charge of good Government reposed in them by this Society. Nay, your Lordship declares, that their Commission from God is limited; and for one Purpose only: From whence it follows, that their Superiority is limited; and (to come to a plain Instance) that in the Case of Governours attempting the Ruine of a Nation, they are without Commission, and so without Superiority; the Consequence of which is, that, in this Case, Self-Defense is a most necessary and lawful Practice. There are King-
doms which are Elective: as part of our own Legislative Constitution is. Now when the Electors of such a Kingdom choose a King, expressly to rule them according to their Established Laws; and he knows, and solemnly agrees to it; how can his Commission from God be any other than to do so? And how can he pretend to any Superiority in doing the contrary? And how is it possible to suppose, that he hath immediately Authority from God to change this into an Hereditary Kingdom, by his own Act, and the People all obliged to submit to such a Change? How is it possible that he can have Authority to do this, unless it be in his Commission? and which way it can be in his Commission, it is past the Skill of the ablest Head to determine, unless God can give a Man a Commission to destroy those very Ends for which he was elected; and which he voluntarily hath sworn to answer. Again, who can imagine that our Parliament, chosen by the People to maintain our Constitution, and enact wholesome Laws, can receive immediately Authority from God to ruine it, if they think fit; and to consent to the turning it into an
Absolute Monarchy; nay, to the subjecting it to the King of France, or of any other Country; and the People, in a State of Damnation, unless they meekly submit to all this, which neither Elected nor Electors ever dream't to be in their Commission? Yet all this, and much more, if possible, doth your Lordship effectually affirm, whilst you maintain the Authority of Governours to be such, as that they can alter, annul, destroy Constitutions by divine Right; and the Slavery of People to be such, as that all must be patiently submitted to. These, my Lord, are astonishing Positions; such as are void of all Proof, and indeed only affirmed by your Lordship, Sermon 1704. p. 17, 18, 19. For my own Part, I must be so plain as to declare again, that I think it toucheth the Honour of Almighty God nearly, as well as the Happiness of humane Society, to introduce Him as granting such Commissions to Governours; and affixing his Seal to what is contrary to his Will; as well as carries great Absurdity along with it, to give them a Superiority in those Points which absolutely contradict their Commission; and by this to take away from Inferiors all Right
Right to Self-Defense in all possible Cases. This is what is not done, I think, in any Case but this, in which the doing it is of the most dangerous Consequence.

7. This seems to me the Truth of the Matter. A Community, or Neighbourhood of People living together, have a Right to defend themselves against Robbers, and Murthers, and Enemies; which includes such Power over the Lives of them, as that they may destroy them whenever they, or any of them, meet with them. But finding this a State of no regular and established Security, they resolve to transfer this Right of Self-Defense, or Power over the Lives of their Enemies, to some particular Persons; reserving only to themselves the Exercise of Self-Defense, in those Cases in which the Magistrate cannot act for their safety. This is allowed to particular Persons in all Civil Governments that are settled, in Case of sudden Attakues: And for the same Reason must be allowed to the Community, when the Magistrate refuses to guard against these Enemies; and much more when he joins with them to bring on Ruine, and Destruction. This Right to Self-defense, in Cases
in which the Magistrate cannot defend the particular Members of it, was never given up to him by the Members of the Community: Nor was it ever supposed by any to be taken from them by God. And consequently the Case of Public Impending Ruine from the Magistrate himself being of the Number of these, this Right of Defending the Community in this case was never given away by it, or taken from it by God. From the whole I think it evident, that the Magistrate hath no Authority, properly speaking, but what the whole Community, or Governed Society, have in themselves, supposing no Magistrate: and consequently none but what may be transferred to Him by the Governed Society. But if your Lordship still be resolved to date their Commissions from Heaven, and to affirm that they are immediately from God, accurately and properly speaking, I must beg leave to reply, that this Commission being, according to your Lordship, for the Civil Government of the Society only, and limited to this Purpose; God Almighty may grant a Commission to others for other Purposes, as your Lordship well argues: and consequently, say
I, He may, notwithstanding this Commission to the Magistrate, give a Commission, for self-defence and self-preservation, to the Society it self. And I will humbly presume, that it hath pleased his Goodness actually to give this Commission to the Community, till your Lordship is pleased to perform a Task so useful to humane Society, as to prove the contrary.

III. That your Lordship should so positively confine St. Paul, to have in his Eye the Person of the Roman Emperor, and him considered not only as a vicious Man, but a very bad Governour, is very strange and unaccountable: When his Words are all manifestly applicable to the Office in general; when he declares, that there is no Power, no true Magistratical Authority, but of God, in which the Senate, how much soever their Power was impaired, and overawed, must share; and in which deputed Governours may justly claim a Part, agreeably to what our Lord told Pilate, one of them, that his Power was from above; and agreeably to those other Texts which shew it to be the Concern of Christianity, to press Subjection to Magistrates of all Ranks, and which do com-
command it in the same Words to the supreme, and the deputed Magistrates. Nay, that St. Polycarp thus understood St. Paul, is plain from his applying the Expression of the Powers ordained of God to the Proconsul, a deputed Officer. And that St. Paul designed what he said, even to hold true of Nero, in his worst Character, is what I hardly care to repeat. I rather choose to believe St. Paul himself, who assures me, and all who can read him, that he is speaking of Magistrates, as a Terror to evil Works and a Praise to them that do well, and endeavouring to reconcile some foolish Men to the Offices as it is useful to Humane Society, and not to the Power employed in destroying all the Ends that it is designed to answer. And if all the Wit of Man, or Art of Logic, can make St. Paul's reasoning consistent, or tolerable, supposing him to speak of Nero only, when he was, even in his own Conscience, the Burthen of the Earth, and the Plague of Society, I will then believe anything that can be affirmed of this Apostle. But otherwise, your Lordship will say, (as I see upon a like Occasion) he could mean no Magistrates then living. What?
What? were there no good Orders then kept at all? No deputed Magistrates who did their Duty tolerably? No Acts of the Senate to which your Lordship will allow any Validity? No Power which they claimed that was to be obeyed, because in other things it was over-powered by Force and Bribery? None to be spoken of to a few private Christians, but the supreme Head, the great Emperour, of whom they knew little, and saw less? But supposing He was all that St. Paul had in View, might not this be written by him at the Beginning of his Reign, as hath been thought by good Judges, when he might be said to answer St. Paul's Character as well as most Princes? Can your Lordship demonstrate that this was not the time of his Writing? And if it were, can your Lordship possibly think, that St. Paul would have said the same of him, when the remains of Power in the Senate awoke, and fought after him for publick Punishment, which he said when he was truly the Officer that he describes a Magistrate to be? Let any one read the whole Passage in St. Paul, and
and try the Truth of what I have here alleged.

IV. In the Third Inference drawn by your Lordship from your Interpretation of the Magistrate's being the Minister of God, p. 16. You lay the Duty of Absolute Non-resistance upon the governed Society. For your Lordship argues, that tho' the Laws of earthly Governors be contrary to the divine Laws (in which case the Magistrate doth certainly exceed the Bounds of his Commission) yet this doth not void their Authority. They are the Ministers of God for all this. In what? I beseech your Lordship. Not in this, I hope, in which they are without his Commission; and in which they contradict his Commission; in which they are without all Authority, either in making the Law, or in annexing the penalty to it. They therefore who refuse to submit both to the Law and to the Penalty, do not resist the Authority of God in this Case, because in this Case there is none. But if your Lordship means, that they resist a Person who is the Minister of God in other Cases, it is manifest this is allowed in the Case of Resistance to Foreign Invaders; and to a Parent who should
who should in a Fit of Madness command his Child to cut his Brother's Throat, under Pain of having his own Throat cut if he did not. Here, my Lord, is an Instance sufficient to prove that Absolute passive Obedience in some particular Cases, is not due to a Person, who is the Minister of God, and acts by his Commission, not in these, but in others. The same may be proved from hence, that an Ecclesiastical Minister's being the Minister of God for one Purpose, doth not make it a Duty to submit to him in what he is not the Minister of God. All Arguments for Submission in private Men to Punishments laid upon them without and against, the Commission given to Governors by God, must be taken from public Good, and not from their having that Authority in other things, which they are allowed not to have in these. But here is the Case. Suppose the Matter toucheth the whole Community; and the Happiness of that be invaded by a Governor, turned a public Enemy to it in the main part of his Conduct: Doth his having a Commission from God for the contrary, make him not to be resisted in this?
His Authority to rule well, which is all the Authority he ever had, is not indeed so made void, but that he hath that Authority as long as he hath Power. But if he cannot rule, without ruling to the Destruction of the Public, and to the universal Ruine of the Community, can it possibly be supposed, that it should be God's Will he should still bear rule, when he gave him a Commission entirely for the Good of the Community, and for nothing else? Can it possibly be supposed that all Right to Self-preservation and Self-defense is taken from this whole Community, at a Time when they are, in effect, without any established Governor to defend and protect them? No more than it can be supposed that a Father, because he hath a Divine Commission to rule his Family, is not to be guarded against, should he be so distracted as to seek the Lives of his Dependents; or may not lawfully be put out of Rule, and Government, because as long as he hath Power, his Authority in those Cases, in which he hath Authority, is valid.

But if your Lordship recur, as I see you do, to the general Declaration of
St. Paul against Resistance, I beg of your Lordship to give a fair Account of this way of Proceeding, and to prove plainly, why it is, that this general prohibition of St. Paul's must be interpreted absolutely, and declared to be without any limitation, when in our Lord's own most express prohibition of Resistance in Case of private Injuries, Limitations and Exceptions are not only allowed but contended for? Nay, when there are such a Number of general Precepts and Prohibitions in which all admit, and plead for them. If your Lordship say that public Good requires it, as you seem to say, when you tell us, p. 29. That it is much for the People's good to be thus put in subjection to Magistrates, you must give others leave to wonder how it can possibly be for the Good of the People, [i.e. every individual Person, of what Rank and Quality soever, besides the supreme Governor] to suffer themselves and their Posterity to be made miserable at the Will of the supreme Governor, when they see they can save themselves if they will, and establish a better State of Things. It is just as if a Quaker should argue that it is for the good
good of all private Men that they are forbid absolutely to resist Robbers and Cut-throats; it is for their temporal Security and Prosperity, to let them come into their Houses, and cut the Throats of themselves, their Wives, and their Children, when they might prevent this if they would. It is for their good to be thus put in Subjection to their Enemies. But this I believe, with some sort of satisfaction, that as Nature it self will not suffer the Quaker to practice according to this Doctrine; so neither will the powerful Law of Self-preservation ever suffer a Nation of Men of the most passive Principles to sit down contented with their Ruine, when they have it in their Power to keep it off.

My Lord,
I will not trouble your Lordship much longer: but permit me to speak a little freely, with all the deference due to your Station, and all that respect which I have for your Character. There was a Time, which must be still fresh in your Lordship's Memory, when Universal Ruine was thought to hang over the
the whole Community. At this time the People, (which is not a contemptible Word, signifying only Coblers and Tinkers, as some make it,) the Lords, the Bishops, the Gentry, the Commonalty, were all under one common Sense of Danger. Those of the Higheft as well as Holieft Rank, and of the best Quality, invited over a Prince with armed Men, to awe their Legal King, and force him into a Compliance: and this they did in their private Capacity. Numbers joined themselves to Him when He came. Nor do we account any part of our Excellent Queen's Behaviour more truly great; more lovely, or more beneficial, than the Part she bore in this Transaction; when she prefer'd the Safety of a Nation before all other Temporal Considerations; and encouraged by her Example this glorious Design. The same was done by some of my Lords the Bishops, to their immortal Honour, with a Zeal beyond what is common. A Revolution succeeded, which your Lordship acknowledgeth to have wonderfully faved both Church and State from Ruine. Upon this Foun-
otation is built all our Happiness. To this we owe the present Felicity of a Glorious and Beneficent Reign. To this we owe that Settlement in the Protestant Line, for which your Lordship is an Advocate, even so far, as to wish it had been fixed many Years ago. And now, my Lord, how must it surprize all who can think, to hear it affirmed that it would have been good for the People to have acted as if they had been put under such Subjection as your Lordship pleads for? That it would have been good for the Nation not to have invited over Arms, and to have join’d themselves to them? And for their Temporal Advantage to have mis-fled that opportunity, and to have fit down contented with their Ruine, unless Regular Forms prevented it? And how must it concern all good Subjects, to hear a Man of your Lordship’s Character, and Authority, assuring the World that her Majesty’s Title is only that of a successful Usurpation; that Submission to Her Government is indeed lawful, now it is settled; but that the Foundation of that Settlement was laid in a damnable Sin; to find that on a Day,
set apart to celebrate the Nation's happiness in Her Majesty's Accession to the Throne, a Sentence of Condemnation must be read against that Resistance, without which She had never enjoyed either the Crown, or perhaps Her Life; and all the Nobility and Bishops, and others who so bravely interposed, to secure the Throne for Her Majesty, and Her Majesty for the Throne; called, in effect, to Humiliation and Repentance? According to what your Lordship hath delivered, we ought all unanimously to move, that the Fifth of November may be changed into a Day of solemn Humiliation and Fasting, a Day of Reproach to the Nation, when the Arms of Resistance landed, upon the Invitation, and to the Satisfaction, of the whole People? For, upon your Lordship's Principles, it was a Guilt, not to be washed out in many Years, till grievously repented of: and to be visited in some terrible manner upon late Posterity; as some think it hath been upon our Selves by a long and expensive War. And I must observe, that if it were a Guilt, it was much more a National Guilt, than the Murder of K. Ch. I. For this we are
are assured by Authority was the Contrivance and Work of a few Miscreants against the general bent of the Nation: Whereas the Resistance practised against K. James II. was the Contrivance and Work of all Ranks and Orders of Men, against the bent but of a very few.

But I know your Lordship is too well pleased with the National and Beneficial Consequences of this Rebellion, to proceed so far. Without it we had never had a Queen, so great an Ornament to the Throne; nor Bishops so great Ornaments to the Mitre; nor any thing of Property and Protestantism by this time left. And since this is so, my Lord; since these are the Benefits which the Nation hath reaped by Resistance; since to Resistance we owe that Establishment in the Protestant Line which your Lordship wisheth had been many Years ago made; since without it we had had an Establishment in the Popish Line so much dreaded, I dare say, by your Lordship; I may ask, what harm hath Resistance lately done either to the Queen, the Church, or the Nation, that it must be thus run against with so unlimited a Zeal?
Zeal? And why should that be absolutely and entirely condemned as a damnable Sin, any more than Church-Separation, by which we got rid of the Tyranny of Rome. This is allowed to be lawful in some Cases; tho' the Allowance may be as much abused, and tho' Schism be as damnable a Sin: and can your Lordship tell why the same way of proceeding may not be allowed in the Case of Resistance? All Separation is not Schism; All Church-Reformation is not Church-Destruction; All Killing is not Murther; All speaking Evil of a Man is not Slander; All Swearing is not a Violation of the general Law against Swearing; All Resistance to private Injuries, is not a Transgression of the general Gospel-prohibition: And can your Lordship tell why all Resistance in a whole Nation should be called Rebellion, and the Practisers and Defenders of it, in any Case whatsoever, be so often doomed to eternal Damnation? It is wholly unaccountable by all Rules of Interpreting the Scripture, and moral Prohibitions. But not more unaccountable than to establish a Government by
by destroying the Foundation of it; to reconcile Men to an Establishment, by condemning the Proceedings without which the Establishment could not have been made; to be preaching up the most absolute Passive Obedience under an Administration which needs not such a Support, and which deserves not so bad a Complement. But however; if your Lordship think it fit to endeavour to reconcile Men to the present Constitution, as far as your Lordship judgeth it proper, I hope you will pardon others, if they endeavour, by fair and calm Reasoning, to make them love and approve the very Ground upon which it stands: and whilst the former of these Methods can be applauded, it is to be hoped that, by all candid Judges, the latter will not be thought against the Interest of the Nation, or the Government. And as long as your Lordship, and those of the same Mind, go on to defend and secure the Establishment, by bringing an Odium, at the same time, upon the Foundation on which it is built; and making the Gospel to patronize the most abject, and most universal Slavery; to the great Satisfaction and Mirth of the Common
Enemies both of Church and State amongst us: So long, I believe, I may assure your Lordship, there will be a Spirit in some others to take what care they can that the Foundation shall not be undermined, to the manifest Prejudice of that Establishment; nor the Doctrine of Servitude imposed upon whole Nations, to the Scandal of the Church, and the Disgrace of Christianity. And as particular Notice hath been taken, and distinct Replies given long ago to every Position of your Lordship's, in favour of Absolute Non-resistance, as well as to every Argument that hath been urged by others; which will be esteemed, by all good Judges, a great Advantage to the contrary Cause: So, I hope, the same Method will be taken for the future with all plainness, and all Christian Temper. But I must observe, that neither your Lordship, nor any other Writer, hath ever attempted to disprove those Replies that have been given; or to advance any thing but positive and general Affirmations against them: which will be always a wonder to those, who know that Truth fears not the Light; or rather, that the Darkness of every Falsb-
Falshood will presently vanish, when the Light of Truth is brought near it.

I beseech your Lordship to pardon the trouble and boldness of this Address from One whom a profound Veneration for your Lordship induced seriously to consider what proceeded from so excellent and judicious a Person; and who assures your Lordship, with the utmost Sincerity, that He is, with a very high degree of Respect and Esteem,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most Obedient

Humble Servant,

Benjamin Hoadly.

FINIS.