



*An Answer to a Letter of
Master Matth. Rutton, Mini-
ster of Baughton (as he so call-
eth himself) sent to a friend of
mine, in order to the Vindicati-
on of a Dispute between him and
myself at Baughton, where wee
accidentally met, to his friend
Master Mat. Rutton, as fol-
loweth.*

S I R :



Hereas you were pleased to
affirm in your *Letter* I was
troubled about a Sermon
you delivered, in the which
you writ, you proved such as I am to
be the *Ministers of Satan*, for the
which cause you say I fell upon you
with abusive words ; Sir, I pray you
do not forget your self, for I began not
with you, neither did I give you any

abusive words, neither did I know that you had delivered such a Sermon as you confess, in which you rendered me, and such as I am, to be so odious; although I had heard before that you did usually rail much, as your *Predecessors* did against *Christ and his Apostles*, saying, they were Deceivers, pestilent Fellows, and turners of the World upside down, though *Michael* the Arch-Angel, when he was Disputing with the Devil about the body of *Moses*, did not bring a rayling accusation, but left it to God, with these words, *The Lord rebuke thee*. But I pray remember, that your Neighbour, of whom you at that instant received *Tithes*, after he had paid it, asked you in much mildness of speech, Why you did rail so much against the *Baptists*; and you presently said, they were Anabaptists, for you said the word in the Greek signified *again*, and you Baptizing Persons again are called Anabaptists; at the which words I could no less than make answer, saying, That for my part I did dis-own Baptizing of any persons again, who were once truly Baptized according to *Christs* appointment;

ment; and more-over I said, That sprinkling a little water in a Childes face in its Infancy, was not Baptism, but a *consenting shift brought in by Pope Innocentius the Third*; and then you replied, and said, That *Baptizo* signified Sprinkling, as well as Dipping, the which I denied, and shewed you, there was no correspondency between the word *Baptizo* and *Rantizo* (in *Baptizo* their significations) to prove one and signifies the same thing, *the one signifying to dip, to plunge, to sink, to over-whelm in water*; the other word to sprinkle, to scatter here or there, or to disperse abroad on divers parts of the body; then all that you had more to say in the behalf of that was, That it was set down so in the Book of Common Prayer, and when you could say no more to that, you cried out against them, (*viz.* the Baptists) for broaching of gross Errors, and instanced that of *Original sin*, to which I said, that for my part I did beleeve, That all the Sons and Daughters of Adam, were not only under the guilt of it, but also groan under the punishment of it, untill this day; although you falsely writ in your

Letter

* Adams sin
brought
not Con-
demnation
to Hell on
his Poste-
rity, but
death of
the Body,
with Sick-
ness, Ser-
row, &c.

Letter that I denyed that there was
such a Sin as Original sin, and yet you
may remember, that you made me this
answer, Though I did beleve that
there was such a sin, yet there were
many of my adherents that did beleve
there was no such sin; and Sir, then I
went on to deal plainly with you, and
shewed you what that first Sin of *Adam*
in *Paradise*, which is usually called
Original Sin, did incur, and made all
his Children liable to, the which * I
affirm to be the first Death, with sick-
ness, weakness, and all such infirmi-
ties, with the loss of all *Paradisical*
injoyments, and not *Damnation in*
Hell; which is only the desert of sins
against God manifested in *Christ*,
which brought a second state of life,
and that you may see clearly in the
pronunciation of the Sentence by God
to *Adam*, in *Gen. 3.* from the four-
teenth to the twentieth, where he tells
him, That in sorrow he should eat
bread, with the sweat of his brows,
until thou return unto the ground, for
out of it wast thou taken. This was the
punishment God laid upon *Adam* and
his Posterity for that Sin; Dust thou
art,

art, and to dust thou shalt return. Hence it cometh to pass, that both righteous and unrighteous suffer alike, whereby wee may see Gods Justice must be satisfied; and so much briefly as to the Sin which you call Original, or more properly to the punishment thereof.

And now in order I shall come to the one and fiftieth Psalm, vers. 5. these words, *Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.* In which words there appeareth no such thing as you say, that David there confessed any sin, or guilt of any sin, as he stood in the loyns of his Parents, unless that first sinne, which, as I have shewed you, brought but the first Death; neither have they any less perfection in quality of nature, by the which they are put into a worse capacity, to stand, or fall, as to the losse of the injoyment of that eternal inheritance, although I grant the first thing they do when they are capable of a Law (and temptations do approach) they like their first Father *Adam*, break the Law of God, as he did; and these words have I spoken as in order to the making

making way for the opening of the words before mentioned ; for in the first verse *David* is a Petitioning to God for Mercy and Pardon for that sin ^{wh} he had committed in killing *Uriah*, and taking *Bathsheba* his Wife unto himself, in the which Petition he uses three Arguments, as we may so say.

The First is from the multitude of Gods Mercies, in these words, *According to thy loving kindness, according to the multitude of thy mercies*, verse the first.

The Second is from his acknowledging of his Sin, saying, *My sins are ever before me*, vers. 3. as if he should say, They are the greatest trouble that I have in the World, they are always in my way ; so that we see the second Motive that he uses to attain Mercy, is by confession of his sin, with great zeal and ardency of spirit, he well knowing that God had promised, That he that confesseth and forsaketh his sin, should finde mercy.

And the Third and last Argument which he used (in this Psalm) to move God to have mercy upon him, in blotting out his transgressions, was
from

from
the w
made
said,
the Ea
much
fore he
last rea
he shou
tice, as
the Mo
med (
Mother
with, an
made a
Mother
thou con
blot ou
pression
hath the
13, 14, n
as the F
hath he
from us,
he giveth
to graciou
knoweth
died, so th
of the o

from the brittleness of his Nature, and the weakness of that Lump that he was made out of; As if hee should have said, Father, thou knowest I am of the Earth earthly, which is subject to much weakness, and frailty, and therefore he beyond all other reasons, in this last reason, vers. 5, saith, Behold ! as if he should have said, Lord, take notice, as well consider how defective the Mould was in the which I was formed (which to me appears to be his Mother *Eva*, in whose loyns was *David*, and all other shapen, for God made all Mankind at once, and not his Mother that bare him) that thereby thou considering my frame, maist in pity blot out my transgressions. This expression of *David* is not used alone, but hath the like import, *Psal.* 103. v. 12, 13, 14, in these words, ver. 12. *As far as the East is from the West, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us*, And in the fourteenth verse, he giveth the reason why the Lord is so gracious, in these words, *For hee knoweth our frame, that we are but dust*; so that I conceive in this fifth vers. of the one and fiftieth Psalm, which
you

you cited to me in these words, *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me*, is no more but the proneness of *Dauids* Nature, by reason of the weakness of the matter that he was made of; and that is the same that he desires God to take notice of, or behold, whereby hee might graciously remit that sinful Act that he had committed, unless you meant that Sin which beleeving men and women suffer for, which is the sin against the first Covenant, which did consist of an *earthly Paradisical glory*, which I did to you, and do still affirm, That both *Adam*, and all his Posterity consideredly as they were in his loyns, did not only commit it, but also suffer for it, which I did then (and do still) affirm to bee the first Death, by which Pollution and Corruption run thorow all

Adams Sin the parts of the outward man.

brought
no pollution
or disability
on the Spiritu-
al part
of Man-
kinde.

But as I have said, no pollution or disability in the least hath it brought to the Spiritual part of man, whereby the Conscience or spirit of man should be defiled, neither actively, nor imputatively; not actively for this reason, because the Spiritual part of man is not

in-

involved
by he d
man by
ding to
he speak
of that M
faith, th
and the
that as n
rat part o
and there
in form a
dam, the
not be po
ing in m
Adam, w
formed;
the corrup
ness, De
all such
remain
shall pur
clear, th
Sons of
by action
being
The se
of Adam
Spiritual

involved in the loyns of *Adam*, whereby he doth beget it, but it is formed in man by God, *Zach. 12. 1.* so according to the Word of the Lord, when he speaketh concerning the dissolution of that Mortal lump that man begetteth, *Man is not made un-* faith, then *Dust shall return to dust,* *capable to* *and the Spirit to him that gave it;* *act good* *by Adams* *fin.* so that as man begetteth only the Natural part of man, and not the Spiritual, and thereby the Spiritual part being not in form and matter in the loyns of *Adam*, therefore the Spiritual part could not be polluted, but the Natural part being in matter involved in the loyns of *Adam*, was polluted, corrupted, and deformed; from whence ariseth all the corruption of Nature, as Blindness, Deafness, and Lameness, and all such like Corruptions, which shall remain, until this corruptible body shall put on incorruption; so it is clear, that the Spiritual part of the Sons of *Adam* did not sin in *Adam* by action, because it was not in theirs in-being.

The second Reason why the guilt of *Adams* sin cannot lye upon the Spiritual part of any, so as to make death.

The Fa-
thers in-
quity
makes not
the Child
liable to
the second
make death.

make them stand guilty before God of a second Death, is from the reproof the Lord gave to a Generation of men of your judgement, that thought the Childe must dye for the Fathers sins, that when the Lord did threaten the punishment of the sins of the Fathers upon the Children, that you blindly, (with those whom the Lord reproveth Ezek. 18. 2, 3.) do conclude, that it must needs be the punishment of the second Death, therefore the Lord saith, he would have that Proverb used no more, *The fathers have eaten soure Grapes, and the Childrens teeth are set on edge, but the soul that sinneth shall dye.* So much briefly as for the second reason.

But whereas you said, that there was no thought of time betwixt the Natural being of *David*, and the sinful being; if you mean his sinful being, by that matter that he received from *Adam*, it is granted, but if it be of the Soul, or inward part, which had its being from God, it is denied from the two Reasons already rendred.

Further, one Reason more; *Any Creature that is defiled in the inward*
man,

man, is
God;
Kingdo
them
defiled
man.
Further
things, that
read in Sc
damned,
ginal to L
instanced
probated
which I a
said to, b
say so is n
of the Rom
thirteenth
prove the
for let any
place, and
that God
was born,
We may ta
place make
Scripture,
the next is
But first
of Esau b

man, is not fit for the Kingdom of God; but Children are fit for the Kingdom of God at the very birth of them; therefore Children are not defiled or corrupted in the inward man.

Further, You affirmed in your writing, that I said that you could never read in Scripture that any Children were damned, and therefore no such Sin Original to Damn; to which say you, you instanced that of *Eſau*, who was reprobated from all Eternity; to the which I answer, I do indeed confess you ſaid ſo, but I have learned, that your ſay ſo is no ſufficient proof; for the ninth of the *Romans*, the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth verſes, which you cited to prove the matter, prove no ſuch thing; for let any Soul ſeriously read that place, and ſee whether that place ſay, that God reprobated *Eſau* before hee was born, or had done good or evil; We may take notice that *Paul* in that place makes uſe of two portions of Scripture, the firſt is *Gen. 25. 23.* and the next is *Mal. I. 2, 3.*

But firſt to the firſt place, that ſpeaks of *Eſau* before he was born; now in
 C this

this place we may take notice that *Rebecca* had been barren, and Child-bearing was somewhat strange to her being barren, so that in verse twenty two it is said, *the Children struggled within her* (which was a Type of that variance and difference that was to be in time betwixt *Jacob* and *Esau*) and she said, *If it be so, why am I thus?* as if she should have said, What is the cause of this struggling, since it is so that I have been barren, and the text said, *Shee inquired of the Lord*; now followeth the matter that was spoken of *Esau* before he was born, *vers. 23.* And the Lord said unto her, *two Nations are in thy wombe, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels, and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger.* Now I pray consider, *Doth this say that God hath reprobated Esau before hee was born?* and this was all that I finde was said of him before hee was born. Pray may not a younger brother farre surmount in external injoyments, insomuch that thereby the elder may come to serve the younger, and yet both

both
mild
Jac
Land
inferio
not Es
his tale
And
seth is
as it is
and Esa
Now w
written
have I h
Jacob a
Paul ma
Gene
stant of
Malachy
years since
cerning Es
had done
diah the re
Thus yo
the Scripu
or less exe
dings in the
died Jerem
Amos; I

both of them saved, if the elder do not
misdemean himself to God? so, though
Jacob have that great possession of the
Land of *Canaan*, and *Esau* have the
inferiour possession of *Edom*, yet, may
not *Esau* be saved if he do not abate
his talent?

And the second place that *Paul* u-
seth is, *Mal.* 2. 3, in these words,
as it is written, *Jacob have I loved,*
and *Esau have I hated*, *Rom.* 9. 13.
Now we know, that it is no where else
written, *Jacob have I loved*, and *Esau* *Esau not*
have I hated; and this was long after *hated be-*
Jacob and *Esau* were dead; though *fore hee*
Paul make use of these two places, as *was born.*
Genesis and *Malachy*, both at one in-
stant of time, yet the sentence in
Malachy was written hundreds of
years since that of *Genesis* and con-
cerning *Esau* after he was dead, and
had done many evil works, as *Oba-*
diah the tenth.

Thus you may see your mistakes in
the Scriptures by your little readings
or less exercising of your understand-
ings in them; and as you say, I falsly
cited *Jeremy*, when the place was in
Amos; I say you falsly accuse me, for
both

Of Original Sin

I cited *Malachy*, *Obadiah*, and *Amos*, and the place cited in *Jeremy* was about the Potter and the Clay.

Sir, one absurdity take notice of, in the which you may see you make God a Lyar, when as God sweareth, (*Ezek. 33. 11.*) that he desires not the death of the wicked, but rather that they would return and live; you say hee is so farre from meaning what he saith, that he hath appointed from eternity the greatest part of men to be Damned. Contrary to that, *1 Tim. 2. 1, 2, 3, 4.* verses, *2 Pet. 3. 9.* with a multitude more of Scriptures that might be added. You say that the *Anabaptists*, as you call them, will say that it is unjust for God to condemn those that have not committed actual Sin; to which I answer.

The Apostle would stop their blasphemous mouthes with *Rom. 9. 14.* in these words, *What, is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid.* Moreover you adde, vers. 21. in these words, *Hath not the Potter power over the Clay, to make one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour;* and in these words you think you have met with us

to the purpose, and therefore are bold to call us blasphemous; but Sir, give me leave to tell you without offence, *That if you know as well how to feed the Flock, as you do to take off the fleece, you would have seen that the Apostle had not brought this place to have proved that God might have been righteous, and yet for all that damn where there is no actual sin; for Sir, take notice, that in this place he speaks not to Children, or such as had not committed actual sin, but to the rebellious house of Israel, whom he compares to Clay marred in the Potters hands; so they were in the Lords hands, and he did intend to make them honourable Vessels, he did (as we may say in reference to his Majesty) do all what hee could to them, use all the means that he had to bestow upon a people to make them Honourable, yet still they were marred in his hand, that is to say, rebellious and refractory. You may see this proved fully in these two portions of Scripture, in the room of many more that might be given, Isa. 5. from the first Verse to the eighth, Ezekiel 16, from the fifth to the four-*

teenth. Now to come to the eighteenth of *Jeremiah*, from the first verse and so onwards, you may see they are the very words that the Apostle *Paul* maketh use of to answer that Objection, *Rom. 9. 19.* which saith, *Thou then wilt say unto me, why doth hee yet finde fault, for who hath resisted his will? Answer, Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the Potter power over the Clay, to make one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour?*

Disobedi-
ence the
cause that
men be-
come
Vessels of
dishonour.

Now this take notice of well, that the Apostle goeth now to answer that Objection, *vers. 19.* in these words, *Who hath resisted his will*; and sheweth them plainly, that they were the people that had resisted his will; if he had not shewed by infallible proof, that they were the people that had resisted Gods will, then the Objection had lain still unanswered, but now he answereth it, as if he should have said, O yee murmuring stiffe-necked house of *Israel*, have you a word to speak against God for his Justice in cutting you off, and making

making
did not
by his
vers. 1
you to
Porter,
story in
would he
when he
old way,
would not
did not
you another
which in a
fel of dish
to the Lor
allured by
Axe of his
15. 1, 2, 3
thou, or
laying, Wh
it is eviden
will, being
hands. Bu
That he h
House of
Vessels of
made Vesse
anyway. It

making you a dishonourable people? did not the Lord say unto you long ago by his Prophet *Jeremiah*, Chap. 18. vers. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. when he compares you to the Clay, and himself to the Potter, you being stubborn or refractory in the hand of the Lord, and would have none of his instructions, when he called you to walk in that good old way, but your answer was, *You would not walk therein*, Jerem. 6. 16. did not the Lord prophecy to make you another vessel as seemed him good? which in all likelihood was to be a Vessel of dishonour, for it seems good unto the Lord, when persons will not be allured by Mercy, to be cut off by the Axe of his Justice, *Mat. 3. 10. John 15. 1, 2, 3.* Verses, therefore who art thou, or how canst thou finde fault, saying, *Who hath resisted his will?* when it is evident that thou hast so resisted his will, being Clay marred in the Potters hands. But if the Objection be made, That he had mercy on some of the House of *Israel*, and so made them Vessels of honour, and yet some hee made Vessels of dishonour; To that I answer, It is very true, that hee did

make some of that Lump Vessels of honour, but they were such as were
 A&.2.37 pricked in their heart for their sins,
 and did purifie their heart through
 beleeving, and obeying the truth, and
 so Christ became the Author of their
 eternal Salvation, *Heb. 5. 9. 1 Pet. 1.*
vers. 22. for it was that which the Lord
 hath promised Souls that did purge
 themselves from the unbeleef in their
 hearts, as you may see, *2 Tim. 2. 20.*
But in a great House there are not only
Vessels of Gold, and of Silver, but
also of Wood, and of Earth, and some
to honour, and some to dishonour,
vers. 21. if a man therefore purge
himself from these, he shall be a vessel
unto honour, sanctified and meet for
the Masters use, and prepared unto
every good work.

And now I shall give you a brief re-
 view of those words that the Apostle
 Paul makes use of, *Rom. 9.* they are
 the words of the Prophet *Jeremy, Jer.*
18. 1. to 17. and so onwards, And the
Word of the Lord came unto me say-
ing, Go down to the Potters house, and
there will I cause thee to hear my
words; and I went down to the Pot-

ters

ters House, and behold he wrought a work on the wheel; and the vessel that he made with clay was marred in the hands of the Potter, and he made another Vessel as seemed the Potter good to make it; then the Word of the Lord came unto me saying, O House of Israel, can I not do with you as this Potter, saith the Lord? Behold, as the clay is in the Potters hands, so are yee in my hands, O House of Israel. At what instant I speak concerning a Nation, or Kingdom, to pluck up, or destroy; If that Nation turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them; but in what instant I speak concerning a Nation or Kingdom, to build or to plant it, if they do evil in my sight, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them; now therefore go, speak to the men of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, thus saith the Lord, Behold, I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you; return every one of you from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good, but they said

said there is no hope, but we will walk after our own devices, &c. and in vers. 17. he threatens to shew them his back, and not the face in the day of their Calamity, the which wee may see the Lord brought upon them, and yet he was just when he judged; and thus you see the Apostle answereth the Objection, and shews the *Jews*, *Rom. 9.* what the Lord had determined concerning them, and also made known by the Prophet *Jeremy* that hee could, according to the truth of his Justice (if they remained obstinate in doing evil in his sight) make them a dishonourable Vessel, as well as the Potter could make that Clay (which was not yeelding, and conformable to his hands) a vessel of dishonour. Thus I have shewed you the words of the Prophet, and the meaning of the Apostle, that he doth not stop the mouthes of those persons that say, the Lord of the whole earth cannot do unrighteousness, and therefore cannot Condemn the Childe, and cast it into Hell for the Fathers sin; neither can he Reprobate any but for their actual sin; but hee stops the mouthes of those *Jews*, and all such

as

as they
might fi
have gi
Mal 3
The
true, wh
That tha
eternal fi
ming fire
indeed, y
the only
remember
fire, was
kindled by
in the City
forth from
man, and so
the breath o
in his enemi
it is said of h
God as a co
fire did de
the Sodom
was not Hell,
but it was su
manded to co
destroy the Ca
which was as e
being without

as they are who do question why God might finde fault, although they before have given him just cause of offence, *Mal. 3. 8.*

The next thing you affirm, is not true, wherein you said I did affirm, *Sodom not suffering punishment in Hell fire.* That that fire which Saint *Jude* calls *eternal fire*, was meant only consuming fire; though it was consuming indeed, yet I did not affirm that to bee the only meaning of it, but you may remember, I said by the word *eternal fire*, was meant such a fire as was not kindled by man, neither did it happen in the City by accident, but it issued forth from God, being not kindled by man, and so was as eternal as himself, for *the breath of the Lord was ever a fire to his enemies*, *Dan. 7. 10.* From hence it is said of him, in *Hebr. 11. 29.* *Our God is a consuming fire*; the which fire did destroy the Natural bodies of the *Sodomites*, and that eternal fire was not Hell, as you blindly conceive; but it was such fire as the Prophet commanded to come down from Heaven to destroy the Captains, and their Fifties, which was as eternal as that of *Sodom*, being without kindling by man, or with-

without end, and it came not out of Hell, but from Heaven; and so you may see it, *Gen. 19. 24.* in these words, *Then the Lord rained upon Sodom, and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from the Lord out of Heaven;* and this was for the destruction of no more but their Natural bodies, for it is not Gods way to afflict the punishment of Hell before he hath tried Souls at the general Judgement, which shall not be till after the Resurrection; for the Sentence against the first sin, and the punishment thereof (which was the first death) was not inflicted upon *Adam* till after God had legally tried him; and Sir, let me tell you, that the very Devils are not yet in Hell, but their punishment is reserved until the Day of Judgement, *Iude vers. 6. Matth. 8. 29. Why art thou come to torment us before the time?* Which sheweth plainly, that the punishment of reprobate Angels, and reprobate Men, is not yet inflicted, but hath reference to time; and Sir, if I should ask you where Hell were, what answer would you give me? you would happily tell mee, it was where the Wrath of God

Repro-
bate An-
gels and
reprobate
men not
yet in pu-
nishment.

God w
that He
Christ
belev
deth on
And
tried by
it must b
be found
if so, the
of our
wrath of
if you d
places w
(though
there shall
where the
perpetually
they be at
And if y
the Earth,
foolishly ha
evident, th
Hell, for h
Air; and
the Devil is
the Judgem
have any rea
to being, th

God was, and then I shall conclude, that Hell were under your Coat, for Christ saith, *Ioh. 3. 36. That he that beleeueth not, the wrath of God abideth on him for ever.*

And truly Sir, if your faith should be tried by your works (as *James* saith it must be) then doubtless you would be found altogether unbeleeving; and if so, then according to the former words of our blessed Saviour, *That the wrath of God abides on such;* so that if you do conclude Hell to bee in all places where the Wrath of God is, (though I do indeed conclude, that there shall be a material place of Hell, where the Wrath of God shall remain perpetually) then Hell must of necessity bee at the place aforesaid.

And if you do conclude it to bee on the Earth, or under the Earth, as some foolishly have conceived, then it is most evident, that the Devils are not yet in Hell, for he is called *the Prince of the Air*; and hence it comes to pass, that the Devil is many times cast down by the Judgements of God; so that if you have any reason to prove Hell to be yet in being, then you might have some better

better ground, to say the *Sodomites* with their Children are in Hell, but having no reason to prove the *first*, you have little reason to say the *second*.

Parables
prove not
things.

But if you should suppose that *Luke* sixteenth would prove it in the *Parable*, I will shew you that that will bee no proof, for it was but a *Parable*, and I can as well affirm that the Trees went forth on a time to anoynt a King over them, *Judg. 9. 8.* And they said unto the Olive tree, reign thou over us. You may read unto the sixteenth verse, and see a large Discourse of it, which is a *Parable* as well as that *Luke* sixteenth, and so proves nothing, but is for illustration, and so that place *Luke* sixteenth is for illustration, by the which the Lord doth shew what shall be the condition of poor afflicted Souls that suffer in this Life, and also the condition of such who hate the poor afflicted people of God, and take their pleasure in this Life; so that God calls things that shall be in time, as if they were in present being.

Hence it comes to pass, that the Angel cries out, *Babylon is fallen*, *Revel. 14. 8.* and so *Revel. 18. 2.* which

Voyce

Voyce from Heaven was sixteen hundred years ago, and yet I doubt not but you would conclude with me, that Rome which is there called *Mystery Babylon* is not yet fallen; & so also *John* saith, *Revel. 20. 11, 12. That he saw the general Resurrection, and the last Judgement*; so that you may see God calleth things that shall be, as if they were; and thus I have answered your great Objection, *Luk. 16. 22.* But now because there is a Generation of Men, which affirm, That there is no Hell now in being, nor never shall be, and thereby are hardened in their ungodly practises, I shall shew you in a few words my judgement concerning Hell, that all men may see I abhor such an ungodly opinion.

In the first place I shall speak a little of the time of its being, and that I find in being in Scripture shall not be till the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to judge the world, *2 Thessal. 7. vers. 8.* where the Lord is said to come in flaming fire, to punish such as disobey him in his Gospel, and *Iude 14, 15. verses, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints, to execute judge-*

judgement upon all. Which sheweth; that neither Judgement, nor the execution of Judgement (which is the punishment of Hell) shall be untill the coming of the Lord; see also, *Revel. 22. 12.* *He shall come quickly, and his reward shall be with him, to give unto every one according to his works.* See *Mat. 25. 29, 30, 31.* So much briefly for the time of Hell in its being, although much more may be said.

Secondly in brief, for the place of Hell, which I conceive shall bee on Earth, where sin was committed; for which I refer you to *Isaiah 24. 21.* which saith, *And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord will punish the Host of High ones which are on high, and the Kings of the earth on the earth.* It is in that day when hee shall reign gloriously in the Hill of Zion, when the Sun shall be ashamed, and the Moon confounded.

And further, we know Hell is called utter darkness, viz. when the Lord hath with-drawn, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, which are but for signs and seasons, and for days and years; and these words shew that they are limited

as to time; which when they are taken away, the Earth will be utter darkness, and so the place where the Lord will punish. Further he saith, he will gather all Flesh to the valley of *Jehosaphat*, and plead with them there, and so much briefly to the place.

Now because I have thus said, that Hell is not yet in being, let not any ungodly Soul be hardned in his ungodly practices, to think that when they dye they shall not go to Hell, thou maist come there too soon; for if so be that a thousand years to the Lord be but as yesterday, and yet he have knowledge of time, then ten thousand years is but a moment to those which have no knowledge of time; but in the Grave there is no remembrance of time, so that from *Adams* death which was the first man, unto the time of his Resurrection, will be to him but a moment of time.

But if by these words you should conclude that I hold the Mortality of the *Soul*, I shall speak a word to it, although I have spoke to it before, yet a word now in its place may be seasonable, and that is this, All that is man

D dyerh

dyeth, and is mortal ; neither do I know, and I beleve you will be troubled to finde, that any other thing returns to God, than that Spirit, which is neither of man, nor from man, but was freely given from God, which indeed is immortal, and yet is in no capacity to receive joy, until the body is perfected with it. I could speak much to this particular, but that I see two sorts of persons that are ready to run upon the extremes, which for want of true understanding in that point do run into great absurdities.

In the last Clause of your Letter you say, The Anabaptist would have urged another Argument to prove no Children damned, but you say you refused it, and said, that was but running round.

To which I answer, That it did appear to me you were very weary indeed, and could not answer to one Argument, and therefore much less to many more. You writ to me that you were scarcely recovered of Sickness, and so that was one ground why you could not. We use to say, Sir, a bad shift is better than none, but while you were a
talking

talking of the flesh, namely contesting about your Tithes with your Neighbour, which was none of your Flock, you seemed to be very well.

But Sir, I marvell not much at your Apology, for I scarce ever met with any of your Coat but they had urgent business that wanted them at home, or a great way to Ride, or a Sermon to Teach, or some such like excuse; but were any of you at any place where you might have varieties for your Belly, or monies for your Purse, and no Sectaries in the way (as you call them) to trouble you, you would not bee in such great hast. Furthermore, you said I cried Victory by railing upon you, Sir, I pray you do not make me like your self, which usually do rayl in your Pulpit, as I am informed, and by your own confession; but I shall give you a review of those words, which you call rayling.

You may remember, when you were mounted on your Horse, and ready to be gone, when you could say nothing unto me, you had thought to stop my mouth with these words, saying unto me, you profess God hath spoke

to you, let us see you shew a sign.

Although I never had a tittle in my speech to that purpose, my answer was this (*which you call rayling*) that you are like to that adulterous Generation that seek a sign, and none shall be given them.

And furthermore I said, That if you were as careful to read the Scriptures, and being frequent in them, as you were, to look after your Tithes, you might have remembred, that *John the Baptist*, who was a very great Prophet, did shew no sign or mark at all, yet all that that he said was true, *Joh. 10. 41.* and this was the sum of that I said, which you call rayling.

The last thing you say, appears to be full of confusion, for in the first Clause of your last Verse, in which you say, that such as wee, are given up, *The meaning thereof is this, That God hath given us up to be cast out of his favour, not only intending to harden us, but also to harden himself against us, not intending any means shall do us good, cutting us from mercy, delighting in our destruction; this is meant*

meant by giving up to a reprobate sense.

And yet now in the last Clause of your Verse you pray, That the Lord would open our eyes; so that in one place you cast us as far as you can into Hell, and say, That God hath done so in his account already. Do I wrong such a generation of men; if I should call them *Babels Brats*? I leave the Reader to judge. But as for your prayer I matter it not, whether you pray for us, or curse us (which is your most usual-practice) for I know that the prayers of such are abomination, according to the Word of the Lord, *Prov. 28. vers. 9.* I shall speak no more to the Letter at present, but exhort you to repent from your dead works, and believe the Gospel, and be Baptized for remission of sins, before the Decree pass, and there be no remedy.

The Servant of all men (for
Christs sake)

George Hamman.

Now Sir, having answered your Letter

ter, I shall not leave you so, but shall further clear the truth of what I have affirmed by word and writing, and that by several Reasons or Arguments, as followeth.

God not
changeable
in his De-
crees.

Arg. 1. That opinion that affirmeth God may change in what he hath absolutely *Decreed*, is false, and erroneous; but your Opinion, that Original sin bringeth *Adam* and all his Posterity, liable, or guilty to the second Death, (and yet we see *Adam* and all his Posterity are not punished with the second Death) maketh God changeable in what he hath absolutely *Decreed*; *ergo* your opinion is false and erroneous.

The Major part of the Argument I suppose will not bee denied, and that you know well that God changeth not, and therefore *the Sons of Jacob are not consumed*.

The Minor I shall thus prove, from *Gen. 2. 17.* which saith, *But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely dye, or, in dying thou shalt dye.* Here we may see God did absolutely *Decree*, and also declare his *Decree*, That if
Adam

*Ad-
shou
N
do
as the
secon
Justice
frustra
second
he had
point
When
this, T
Attribu
the Arg
he can d
according
If G
means to
his Justice
condary n
faction of
fice of his
In plain
is this, Th
had laid
his Jerem
pare life an
as would a*

Adam did transgress that Law, hee should dye.

Now if that Death included there do presuppose the second Death as well as the first, then if all do not dye the second Death as well as the first, Gods Justice is not satisfied, but his Decree frustrated, for God cannot bring any secondary means to frustrate that which he hath absolutely Decreed, or disappoint the satisfaction of his Justice. When I say he cannot, my meaning is this, That the Will of God, with the Attribute of his Truth, doth guide the Attribute of his Power, so that he can do nothing but what is righteous, according to truth.

If God may bring a secondary means to disappoint the satisfaction of his Justice, he may as well bring a secondary means to disappoint the satisfaction of his Mercy, whereby the Justice of his Mercy be not executed.

In plaineness of words, my meaning is this, That if the Lord would after he had said *Adam* should dye (and all his) eternally, and yet afterwards prepare life and glory for so many of them as would accept of it; may hee not as

well prepare a Hel for persons who have continued faithful unto death, whose reward is a Crown of Life?

But now to answer an Objection or two.

Obj. 1. The first Objection is from the example of Ninivie, for the Lord said, Forty days and Ninivie shall be destroyed, and yet it was not destroyed; from which word many conclude, that God doth change in his Decree.

God doth
not change
his Decree,
but doth
decree to
change his
Dispensa-
tion accor-
ding to the
actions of
the Crea-
ture.

Ans. To this I answer, That God did not change his Decree, but did decree to change his Dispensation of Mercy or Judgement, according to the Creatures obedience, or disobedience; for God had declared his Decree long before *Jonah* was sent to *Ninivie*, That at what instant he spake of a Nation, or Kingdom, to pluck up, or destroy, if they did repent of their evil, hee would repent of the evil he thought to do unto them, *Jerem. 18. 7.* but wee see *Ninivie* did repent, from the King on the throne, to the Begger on the dunghil. And hence it comes to pass, that God could not destroy them, though he told *Jonah* hee did intend such a thing as concerning them; and thus

thus we see God doth not alter in his Decree, although he doth Decree to alter his Dispensation of Mercy or Judgement, according to the Creatures actings.

Hence it comes to pass, though *Adam* should have enjoyed all *Paradisical* glory, & not been rooted up for ever, yet for his disobedience he was rooted up, & drove out of the Garden, with the loss of all that aforesaid injoyment; and God that seeth things before time that shall be in time, and calleth things that shall be as if they were, saw *Adam* the very same day that hee did Transgress, not only dying (in dying thou shalt surely dye) but also saw *Adam* and his posterity returned unto Earth from whence hee was taken; so the Sentence is true in his account, that calls things that shall be as if they were. So much briefly to the first Objection.

Obj. 2. The second Objection is, That the Promise did intervene Adams Sin, and the Sentence.

Ans. I answer, That makes not to the taking away of the Punishment of it; hence it comes to pass, though the Promise hath been made flesh, and dwelt

dwelt amongst us, and hath been dead and risen again, yet no whit of the punishment is abated ; so that God can as well cease to be, as he can cease to be ~~un~~faithful in the true execution of the Attributes of his Justice or Mercy.

But I conceive the reason why the Promise did intervene, was, because he would not leave his Creatures without some comfort, as if he should have said, *Adam*, there was a time when thou mightest have eaten of every Tree in the Garden, unless that Tree in the midst, and in pleasure, and not in sorrow, but now thou shalt eat in sorrow all the days of thy life, until thou returnest unto that lump of Earth from whence thou wast taken, therefore thou maist see what thou hast got by harkning to the voyce of the Serpent, and thy Wife, yet this let me speak to thy comfort, *The Seed of the Woman shall break the Serpents head* ; that is, though the Serpent had thought by his subtilty to have buried thy honour in the dust for ever, and so to have destroyed the work that I had been doing Six days, in one hour, yet I will have him to know, that my Wis-
dom

dom is unsearchable, and my ways past finding out ; that I have found a way to involve my Son in the flesh, not to take upon him the *Nature of Angels*, but the Seed of *Abraham*, whereby hee may take away the Victory from the Grave ; though thou must needs dye, and be like water spilt upon the ground, yet I have used a means that thou shalt not be for ever expelled, 2 Sam.

14. 14.

So know this to thy comfort, and let the Serpent know this to his shame, though my word be established in the Heavens, that the Heavens and Earth shall pass away, yet not one word of mine shall pass away unexecuted, and so I shall take the words of the Lord before named, 2 Sam. 14. 14. and shew you why God brought in the promised Seed, to intervene sin and the sentence, that is, though his *Decree* cannot be broken, nor his Justice go unsatisfied, but that Man must dye for that Original Sin, no man or woman to be exempted, but must all be banished by death.

But *Jesus Christ* was to bring life and immortality to light ; herein is the saying made good, O *Death where is thy*

thy sting! O Grave where is thy Victory! the sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the Law, but thanks be to God, who hath given us victory through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This place the Apostle useth, I Cor. 15. to prove the very thing that I am now a proving of. If you should ask me, whether Christ brought nothing for the Sons of Men more than a *Resurrection*, I should answer yes, many things, he brought *heavenly Paradisical glory* for all such as would accept of it upon those conditions that he offered it. Much more might be said to this Objection and Argument, but my time at present is precious.

Arg. 2. If the Sin against the First Covenant made the Sinners liable but to the first Death, then *Adam*, and all since in his loyns, were liable but to the first Death.

But the Sin against the first Covenant made the Sinners liable but to the first Death.

Ergo Adam and all his posterity stand guilty by that Sin only of the first Death.

To the proof of this Argument I shall

shall give you to understand what I mean by the first *Covenant*, and that you may see, was excellent enjoyments (I mean) excelling in Prerogative beyond all other Creatures, inasmuch as they were all under him, and whatsoever name he gave them they shall be called by ; and also, had he not sinned, he should have enjoyed that pure earthly Paradisical enjoyment, which was the glory of the first *Covenant*, from which glory hee fell by transgression of that Law, or that Original Sin, as you so call it.

First, That he sinned against no other *Adams sin* *Covenant* but that *Covenant*, because being only there was never no *Covenant* made of against a second Life, or a second Glory, not till the first *Covenant* after *Adam* had sinned, and therefore brings not could not sin against such a *Covenant*, it Condemnation to being not made, nor he in a capacity to Hell. sin against any such thing.

So that Sir, take notice of this one thing by the way, that as the Grave, and the misery tending thereunto, as sickness, weakness, and such like infirmities, is that which a Creature receiveth as punishment for the sinning against that pure earthly Paradisical *Covenant*. So

Punish-
ment in
Hell only
for trans-
gression a-
gainst the
second
Covenant

1 So the Gulf of Hell, with eternal misery, is the punishment of Sin committed against that second Covenant, the which is a Covenant of heavenly Paradisical glory; so that as the glory of the second Covenant doth surmount the glory of the first, so the loss of the thing Covenanted, with the punishment thereunto, doth farre surmount the injoyment of the first, with the punishment annexed thereunto.

Now to prove my Minor Proposition by a plain text, as Gen. 3. 19. *In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou returnest to the ground, for out of it wast thou taken, dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.* Compare this with the seventeenth verse of the same Chapter, where he saith, *Cursed is the ground for thy sake; and also telleth him, that it shall bear thorns and thistles.* So if you take good notice what the Lord denounces as punishment to him and his seed, (which is only earthly) and inflicted only upon the outward man, no whit eternal, neither inflicted upon the inward man; and thus I have proved my Minor Proposition, that *Adams Sin*
was

was but against the first Covenant, which sin lost but the injoyment of the first Life, with that earthly Paradisical glory.

Arg. 3. If *Adam* in his best condition (as he stood in Paradise before the Fall) were but an earthly man, and all his injoyments were but earthly injoyments; then he could lose no more than what he had to lose, which was earthly. *Adam and all his injoyments before he fell were but earthly.*

But *Adam* in his best condition was but an earthly man, all his injoyments were but earthly injoyments.

Ergo all that he lost was but earthly injoyments.

The Minor I shall thus prove, 1 Cor. 15.44. *There is a Natural body, and a Spiritual body, so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living Soul, the last man Adam was made a quickning spirit, verse 45, howbeit that was not first which is Spiritual, but that which is Natural, and after that which is Spiritual, vers. 46. The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from Heaven, vers. 47. Thus you see the first man Adam was but earthly,*

ly, and also his enjoyments as earthly as himself.

Obj. If it should be objected and said, That the Lord made Adam an immortal Soul.

Ans. To which I answer, that God breathed into *Adam* the breath of Life, and so hee became a living Soul; it should appear he was a dead Soul before, for many times in Scripture the Mortal part of Man is called the Soul, *Joshua* 10. 28. it is proved in, and so oftentimes in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh Chapters of *Joshua*, and *Adam* and all his Posterity had such mortal Souls, that had not *Christ* risen to have brought a Resurrection; that is to say, that mortal Body out of the dust, we had been like the beasts that perished, *1 Cor.* 15. 18. And so much briefly to the third Argument.

Arg. 4. The Fourth Argument, To prove why *Adams* sin did not bring any of his Posterity to be liable unto the second Death. If the punishment due to that Original sin of *Adam* in Paradise be no other than what God hath declared in the Sentence, which is no other but

but upon the outward man, then none of the Sons of *Adam* shall be Damned for that sin of *Adam* in Paradise.

But that punishment due to *Adam* in Paradise is no other than what God hath declared in the Sentence, *Gen. 3.* ergo none of the Children of *Adam* shall suffer in Hell for that Sin; and that it was but a loss of earthly injoyments, with deformities, and corruption, I have proved it at large.

Arg. 5. To prove that Sin in Paradise did not make him, or any of his Posterity liable to eternal Death, is as followeth.

That Opinion, which (in the ex- *The af-*
tent of it) will make the Devil to *firming*
speak truth, and God to lye, is an ab- *that A-*
surd and blasphemous opinion. *dams Sin*

But the Opinion that saith, That *brought*
that Sin of *Adam* in Paradise maketh *the second*
all the Sons of *Adam* guilty, and liable *Death, ju-*
to eternal Death, affirmeth that the *stifies the*
Devil speaks true, and the Lord li- *the Devil to*
eth: *speak*
truth, and
makes God

Ergo that Opinion is absurd and blasphemous. The Major will be easily granted.

Of Original Sin.

The Minor I shall prove, for God saith, Gen. 2. 17. If thou eatest thou shalt surely dye, but the Devil said, Gen. 3. to the Woman, Yee shall not dye, but be like gods, &c. Now if this Death, that the Lord said they should dye, be meant punishment in Hell, (as you blindly conceive) and yet wee see that all Adams posterity, which sinned in him, or are become sinners by him, are not punished in Hell, which you say is meant by that Death, then God speaks not true, in saying they shall surely dye, when he intends they shall not.

And the Devil speaks true when hee saith they shall not dye, and wee see they do not so dye; if that Death which God saith they shall surely dye, bee meant the second Death, this is to make the Devil speak true, and God a Liar. O horrid Blasphemous Opinion! be ashamed of it.

Obj. Peradventure you will say, That God sent Christ to take away the guilt and punishment of that Original sin, which is as false and ridiculous as the other.

O blinde guide! is this any more in effect

effect
Son to
to be
said th
they sh
Not
dye, y
they m
than to
briefly
A we
and tha
surely
the mat
to pass
rightcou
gards not
appears
much, tha
that the D
of John, i
from the
Arg. 6.
loweth, T
plain texts
meaning of
nious.
But that

Of Original Sin.

51

effect than to say, That God sent his Son to make the Devils words appear to be true, and his own false? the Devil said they should not dye, God said they should.

Now that they might not indeed dye, you say, God sent his Son that they might not dye, which is no less than to make God a Lyar. And so much briefly to your blasphemous opinion.

A word or two what I say to this, and that is in these words, *Thou shalt surely dye*, is only meant the death of the material Body; and hence it comes to pass, that as well the righteous as unrighteous dye, none exempted, he regards not the person of any; so that it appears clearly, our God is a God of truth, that cleareth not the guilty, and that the Devil, according to the words of *John*, is a Lyar, and hath been so from the beginning.

Arg. 6. The last Argument is as followeth, That Opinion which crosseth plain texts of Scripture in the plain meaning of them, is false, and erroneous.

But that Opinion which affirmeth,

E 2

That

Of Original Sin.

That all Infants as they come into the World are guilty of such a Sin as makes them liable to the second Death, namely, to be punished in Hell, and so lye under the Wrath of God, is against plain texts of Scripture, in the plain meaning of them.

Ergo such an Opinion is absurd and erroneous.

Only the Minor will be questioned, the which I shall prove from *Matth. 9. 14.* where Christ saith, *Little Children are heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven*, Take notice, Sir, these were not Beleevers sprinkled Children, neither were they Baptised, neither were they brought for that purpose. Thus you see your Opinion speaks against plain text of Scripture, Christ saith, *They are heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven*.

And as for the answer of that Objection in *Psal. 51. 5.* I refer you to the place where I have answered it, in its time and place, in the letter.

And now I shall take notice of an absurdity that will follow, and so will leave, as to the Arguments you do affirm in this your Opinion, That all

Infants that dye in their Infancy, none excepted, must needs be damned; for you did affirm, That *David* was guilty of that Sin that brought Damnation, and if *David* were guilty, then all Children, for *David* in your sense was an Elect Person, and yet if he had died in his Infancy he had been damned, according to your expression from Psalm fifty; so that upon this account all Children in their infancy stand at enmity with God; and if so, then shew mee what reconciliation there can be according to Scripture account, without the manifestation of Repentance and Faith towards God, for Christ saith, *Except you beleve, you shall dye in your sins, John 8. 24.* which Children cannot do, although you would blindly conclude from *Matth. 18.* that those little ones there were Children, which cannot be proved; for though Christ did take a little one, yet he took not little ones, and neither are little ones capable to suffer for Christ, and so consequently not capable to be offended.

Secondly, Faith is a perswasion of the minde, flowing from the understanding, but Children having no understanding

standing can have no faith, so that God saith, *I speak not to your Children, which neither know nor understand;* and so much for the absurdity which necessarily will follow, That all Infants must be damned, if that which you say be true, and so I shall leave as to that particular.

Chap. 8. 24. which Children cannot do, although you would blindly conclude from Mark. 16. that those little ones these Children which cannot see of though Christ did take a little one, yet he took not little ones, and yet he is little ones capable to suffer for Christ, and so consequently not capable to be offended. Secondly, Faith is a principle of the mind flowing from the understanding, but Children having no understanding

by they
them by
First,
teaching f
ments of
did comp
you may
words,
thing is co
Prophets
Priests bea
the people
shall be don
you may i
prophetic t