

Defence of Mr John Cotton
from the Imputation of
Self-Contradiction

A Defence of Mr John Cotton
from the Imputation of
Self-Contradiction

Dr John Owen

Quinta Press

Quinta Press, Meadow View, Weston Rhyn,
Oswestry, Shropshire, England, SY10 7RN

The format of these volume is copyright
© 2019 Quinta Press

For proof-reading purposes the line breaks are in the
same place as the original, hence the stretched text

A
DEFENCE
Of

Mr. JOHN COTTON
From the imputation of
SELFE CONTRADICTION,
charged on him by
Mr. DAN: CAWDREY
Written by himself not long
before his death.

hereunto is prefixed, an Answer to a late
Treatise of the said Mr. CAVVDREY
about the nature of SCHISME.

By *JOHN OWEN: D:D:*

Δεῖ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγλητον εἶναι, ὡς Θεοῦ οὐκονόμον
μὴ αὐθάδη μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην,
μὴ ἀσχροκερδῆ—*Titus 1:7.*

OXFORD,
Printed by H: HALL: for T. ROBINSON. 1658.

PREFATORY NOTE.

(from the Works of John Owen,
volume 13 page 278)

The two foregoing treatises had appeared in 1657, and in the year following our author had to reply to another work by his opponent Cawdrey, Independency further *Proved to be a Schism*. The latter had been previously engaged in a controversy on the subject of church government with Mr John Cotton, an eminent Congregationalist of New England, to whose work on *The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, Cawdrey had replied in his *Vindiciæ Clavium*, and in another work, *The Inconsistency of the Independent Way with Scripture and Itself*. A manuscript by Cotton in defence of his book had been committed to Owen, who cherished a respect for his memory, as it was the perusal of his work, *The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, which led our author to reconsider and modify his views respecting the nature and polity of the church. To meet the last assault of Cawdrey he gave the manuscript of Cotton to the press, and accompanied it with a lengthy preface in vindication of himself from the charges of his opponent. The disproof of the alleged contradictions with which he was reproached is complete, but it cannot be said

that there is much of novelty or importance in the statements contained in this treatise. After a lapse of twenty-two years, Dr Owen had again to vindicate his denomination from the same charge of schism, in very different circumstances, and against a more adroit and accomplished adversary. Accordingly, with the different works of Owen on the subject of schism, we have connected his pamphlet on the same subject in reply to Stillingfleet, though the interval just specified ensued before he broke a lance in controversy with the learned Dean of St Paul's.—ED.

CHRISTIAN READER,



I have not much to say unto thee concerning the ensuing Treatise; it will *speak* for itself with all impartial men; much less shall I insist on the commendation of its *Author*, who also being dead ἔτι λαλεῖται; and will *be so* I am persuaded, whilst Christ hath a Church upon the Earth; The Treatise itself was written sundry years ago, immediately upon the publishing of Mr *Cawdrey's Accusation* against him; I shall not need to give an account whence it hath been that it saw the light no sooner; it may suffice, that in mine own behalf and of others, I do acknowledge that in the doing of sundry things seeming of more *importance*, this
ought

ought not to have been *omitted*; The judgement of the *Author* approving of this vindication of himself as necessary, considering *the place* he held in the Church of God, should have been a rule unto us, for the performance of that duty, which is owing to his worth and piety, in doing and suffering for the Truth of God. It is now about 7 *months* ago, since it came into my hands; and since I engaged myself into the *publication* of it, my not immediate proceeding therein, being *sharply* rebuked by a fresh charge upon myself from that hand, under which this *worthy Person* so far suffered, as to be necessitated to the ensuing defensative, I have here discharged that engagement. The Author of the charge against him, in his Epistle *to that* against me, tells his Reader that *it is thought that it was intended by another (and now promised by myself) to be published to cast a Slur upon him*; so are our intentions judged, so our *ways*, by *thoughts* and *reports*; Why a *Vindication* of Mr Cotton should
cast

cast a slur upon Mr *Cawdrey*, I know not; Is he concerned in *Spirit* or *Reputation* in the Acquitment of a *holy, reverend Person*, now at rest with Christ, from imputations of *inconstancy* and self *contradiction*? Is there not room enough in the world, to bear the *good names* of Mr *Cotton* and Mr *Cawdrey*? but that if one be *vindicated* the other must be *slurred*? He shall find now by experience, what assistance he found from him who loved him, to bear his charge, and to repel it, without any such *reflection* on his *Accuser*, as might savour of an intention to *slur* him; *mala mens, malus animus*; the measure that men fear from others, they have commonly *meted* out unto them before hand; He wishes those *that intend to rake in the ashes of the dead, to consider whether they shall deserve any thanks for their labour*. How the covering of *the dead* with their own *comely garments*, comes to be a *raking into their ashes*, I know not; His name is alive, though he be dead; It was that, not his person, that was at-

to be wounded by the charge against him; to pour forth that *balm* for its *healing*, now he is dead, which himself *provided* whilst he was alive, without adding or diminishing one syllable, is no *raking into his ashes*; and I hope the δεύτεραι φροντίδες of the Reverend Author will not allow him to be offended that this friendly office is performed to a dead *Brother*; to publish this his defence of his own innocency, written in obedience to a prime dictate of the law of Nature, against the wrong which was not done him in secret.

But the intendment of this prefatory *discourse*, being my own *concernment*, in reference to a *late tract* of Mr *Cawdrey's*, bearing on its Title and Superscription, a vindication from *my unjust clamours and false aspersions*; I shall not detain the Reader with any farther discourse of that, which he will find fully debated in the ensuing Treatise itself; but immediately address myself to that, which is my present peculiar design; By what ways and means the
 difference

difference betwixt us is come to that issue wherein now it stands stated, in the expressions before mentioned, I shall not need to repeat. Who first let out *those waters of strife*, who hath filled their streams with *bitterness, clamour, and false aspersions*, is left to the judgement of all, that fear the Lord, who shall have occasion at any time to reflect upon those discourses; How ever, it is come to pass, I must acknowledge, that the state of the Controversy between us is now *degenerated* into such a useless strife of words, as that I dare publicly own engagements into *studies* of so much more importance unto the interest of truth, Piety, and literature, as that I cannot, with *peace* in my own retirements, be much farther conversant therein. Only, whereas I am not in the least convinced, that Mr *Cawdrey* hath given *satisfaction* to my former Expostulations, about the injuries done me in his other Treatise, and hath evidently added to the *number* and weight of them in this, I could not but lay hold of this opportunity given, by my dischar-

charging a former promise, once more to remind him of some miscarriages, exceedingly unbecoming his profession and calling; which I shall do in a brief review of his Epistle and Treatise. Upon the consideration whereof, without charging him or his way with *schism*, in great letters on the *Title-page* of this book, I doubt not but it will appear, that the guilt of the crime he *falsely, unjustly, and uncharitably* chargeth upon others, may be laid more equitably at his own door; and that the *shortness* of the *covering* to hide themselves, used by him and others from the inquisition made after them for *schism*, upon their own principles, will not be supplied by such outcries as those he is pleased to use after them, who are least of all men concerned in the matter under contest, there being no solid *medium*, whereby they may be impleaded. And in this discourse, I shall, as I suppose, put an end to my engagement in this *controversy*; I know no man whose patience will enable him to abide always in the consideration of things

things to so little purpose; were it not that men bear themselves on high by resting on the *partial* adherence of many to their *dictates*, it were impossible they should reap any contentment in their retirements from such a management of Controversies as this; *Independency* is a great schism, it hath made all the *divisions* amongst us, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, and all sectaries are Independents; they deny our *Ministers* and Churches, they *separate* from us, all errors come from among them, this I have *been told*, and that I have heard, is the sum of this Treatise; *who* they are of whom he speaks, how they came into such a *possession* of all Church state in *England*, that all that are not with *them* are *Schismatics*; how *de jure*, or *de facto*, they came to be so instated; what claim they can make to their present stations, without *schism*, on their own principles; whether, granting the *Church of England* as constituted when they and we began that, which we call Reformation, to
have

have been a True instituted Church they have any *Power* of rule in it, but what hath been got by *violence*; what, that is purely theirs, hath any pretence of establishment, from the scripture, antiquity, and the laws of this land? I say with these and the like things, which are incumbent on him to clear up, before his Charges with us will be of any value, our *Author* troubleth not himself. But to proceed to the particulars by him insisted on.

1. He tells the *Reader* in his *Epistle*, that his unwillingness to this *rejoinder* was heightened by the Necessity he found, of *discovering some personal weaknesses and forgetfulnesses in me, upon my denial of some things which were known to be true, if he should proceed therein*; for what he intimates of the *unpleasantness* that it is to him to discover things of that *importance* in me, when he professeth his design to be to *impair my Authority*, so far that the cause I own may receive no countenance thereby, I leave it to him, who will one day reveal *the secrets* of all hearts,

hearts, which at present are open and naked unto him; but how I pray are the *things* by me denied *known* to be true? seeing it was *unpleasant* and *distasteful* to him to insist upon them, men might expect that his *Evidence* of them, was not only *open*, *clear*, *undeniable*, and manifest as to its *truth*, but *cogent* as to their publication; The whole insisted on is, *if there be any truth in reports; hic nigræ succus loliginis, hæc est ærugo mera*; Is this a *bottom* for a *Minister* of the Gospel to proceed upon, to such charges as those insinuated; is not *the course of Nature* set on fire at this day, *by reports*? is any thing more contrary to the *royal law of charity*, than to take up reports as the ground of charges and accusations? Is there anything more *unbecoming* a man, laying aside all considerations of Christianity, than to suffer his *judgement* to be tainted, much more his words, and public expressions in charging, and accusing others to be regulated by reports? and whereas we are commanded to speak *evil of no man*, may we not on this
ground

ground, *speaking evil of all men*, and justify ourselves by saying it is so, *if reports be true*? The Prophet tells us, that a *combination* for his *defaming* and *reproach* was managed among his Adversaries, *Jeremiah 20:10*, *I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side, report say they, and we will report it*; if they can have any to go before them in the *Transgression* of that Law, which he who knows how the *tongues of men* are set on fire of Hell, gave out to lay a restraint upon them, *thou shalt not raise a false report*, *Exodus 23:1*. They will second it, and spread it abroad to the utmost, for his disadvantage and trouble; Whether this procedure of our Reverend Author, come not up to the *practice* of their design, I leave to his own conscience to judge. Should men suffer their *Spirits* to be heightened by provocations of this nature, unto a recharge from the same *offensive dunghill of reports*, what monsters should we speedily be transformed unto? but this being far from being the only place wherein appeal is

is made to reports and *hearsays* by our *Author*, I shall have occasion in the consideration of the severals of them, to reassume this discourse. For what he adds about the space of *time* wherein my former reply was drawn up, because I know not whether he had *heard any report* insinuated to the contrary to what I affirmed, I shall not trouble him with giving evidence thereunto: but only add, that here he hath the *product* of half that time, which I now *interpose* upon the review of my *transcribed papers*: Only whereas it is said that Mr *Cawdrey* is an *antient* man; I cannot but wonder he should be so easy of belief; *Aristotle, Rhetor. lib. 2. c. 18*, tells us, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, ἄπιστι δὲ ἐμπειρίαν, and not apt to believe; whence on all *occasions* of discourse *προστιθέασιν ἀεὶ τὸ ἴσως καὶ τάχα*; but he believes all that comes to hand with an *easy Faith*, which he hath totally in his own power, to dispose of at pleasure. That I was in *passion* when I wrote my review is his judgement; but this is but *man's day*; we are in expectation of
that

that wherein *the world shall be judged in righteousness*; It is too possible that my spirit was not in that frame in all things, wherein it ought to have been; but that the Reverend Author knows not; I have nothing to say to this, but that of the *Philosopher*—Ὁ Εἰς τίς Σοι ἀπαγγείλη ὅτι ὁ δεῖνά σε κακῶς λέγει, μὴ ἀπολογοῦ πρὸς τὰ λεχθέντα, ἀλλὸ ἀποκρίνου ὅτι ἀγνόει τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα προσιόντα μοι κακὰ ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ταῦτα μόνα ἔλεγεν, *Epic. Cap. 48.* Much I confess, was *not spoken by me* (which he afterward insisteth on) *to the argumentative part of his book*, which as in *an answer* I was not to *look for*, so to *find*, had been a difficult task. As he hath nothing to say, unto the *differences* among themselves both in *judgement* and *practice*, so how little there is, in his recrimination of the differences among us, as *that one and the same man differeth from himself*, which charge he casts upon Mr *Cotton and myself*, will speedily be manifested to all impartial men. For the *Treatise* itself whose consideration I now proceed unto, that I may reduce what I have to say unto it, unto the bounds intended,

in

in confining my *defensative* unto this preface to the treatise of another, I shall refer it unto certain Heads, that will be comprehensive of the *whole*, and give the Reader a clear and distinct view thereof.

I shall begin with that which is least handled in the two books of this *Reverend Author*, though the sum of what was pleaded by me in my *Treatise of Schism*. For the *discovery* of the true nature of Schism, and the vindication of them who were falsely charged with the crime thereof, I laid down two *Principles* as the foundation of all that I Asserted in the whole cause insisted on; which may briefly be reduced to these two *Syllogisms*.

1. If in all and every place of the New Testament where there is mention made of *Schism*, name or thing, in an *Ecclesiastical* sense; there is nothing intended by it, but a *division* in a particular Church; then that is the proper Scripture notion of Schism in the Ecclesiastical sense; but in all and every place, etc.: *ergo*,
the

the *Proposition* being clear and evident in its own light, the *Assumption* was confirmed in my Treatise, by an induction of the several *instances* that might any way seem to belong unto it.

My second principle was raised upon a *concession of the general nature of Schism* restrained with one necessary limitation, and amounts unto this Argument.

If *Schism in an Ecclesiastical sense*, be the breach of an *Union* of Christ's institution, then they who are not guilty of *the breach of a union* of Christ's Institution, are not guilty of Schism; but so is Schism, *Ergo*.

The *Proposition* also of this *Syllogism* with its inference, being *unquestionable*, for the confirmation of the *Assumption* I considered the nature of all *Church Union* as instituted by Christ, and pleaded the innocency of those whose defence in several degrees I had undertaken, by their freedom from the breach of any Church Union. Not finding the Reverend *Author* in his first *answer* to speak *clearly* and
and

and distinctly to either of those principles, but to proceed in a course of *perpetual diversion*, from the thing in question, with reflections, charges, etc.: All rather I hope out of an *unacquaintedness with the true nature of argumentation*, than any perverseness of spirit, in cavilling at what he found he could not answer; I earnestly desired him in my *review* that we might have a fair and *friendly meeting*, personally to debate these principles which he had undertaken to oppose, and so to prevent trouble to ourselves and others, in writing and reading things remote from the *merit* of the cause under agitation; what returns I have had hereto, the Reader is now acquainted withal, from his *rejoinder*, the particulars whereof shall be farther inquired into afterward.

The other parts of his two books consist in his charges upon me, about my Judgement in sundry particulars, not relating, in the least that I can as yet understand, unto the *Controversy* in hand; As to his excursions, about *Brownists*,

Anabaptists, Seekers; rending the peace of their Churches, separating from them, the errors of *the Separatists*, and the like, I cannot apprehend myself concerned to take notice of them; to the *other things* an Answer shall be returned, and a defence made, so far as I can judge it necessary. It may be our Author seeks a Relief from the *Charge of Schism* that lies upon him and his party (as they are called) from others, by managing the same charge against them, who he thinks will not return it upon them: but for my part, I shall assure him that were he not in my judgement more acquitted upon my principles than upon his own, I should be necessitated to stand upon even terms with him herein; but to have advantages from want of charity, as the *Donatists* had against the *Catholics*, is no Argument of a Good cause.

In the *first Chapter* there occurs not any thing of *real* difference as to the cause under agitation, that should require a *review*, being spent wholly in
things

things ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος And therefore I shall briefly *animadvert* on what seems of most concernment therein, in the *manner* of his procedure. His former discourse, and this also consisting much of *my words* perverted by adding in the close something that might wrest them to his own purpose, he tells me in the beginning of his third Chapter, that this is *to turn my testimony against myself, which is, as he saith, an allowed way of the clearest victory*, which it seems he aimeth at; but nothing can be more remote from being defended with that pretence than this way of proceeding. 'Tis not of *urging a Testimony* from me, against me, that I complained, but the perverting of my words, by either *heading*, or *closing* of them with his own, quite to other purposes than those of their own intendment: a *way* whereby any man may make other *men's words* to speak what he pleaseth; as Mr *Biddle* by his leading *questions*, and *knitting* of Scriptures to his expressions in them, makes an appearance of con-

straining the *word of God* to speak out all his *Socinian blasphemies*.

In this course he still continues, and his very entrance gives us a *pledge* of what we are to expect in the process of his management of the present business. Whereas I had said, that, *considering the various interests of parties at difference, there is no great success to be promised by the management of controversies, though with never so much evidence and conviction of truth*; to the repetition of my words he subjoins the instance of *Sectaries, not restrained by the clearest demonstration of truth*; not weighing how facile a task it is to supply *Presbyterians* in their room; which in his account is, it seems, to *turn his testimony against himself*, and, as he somewhere phraseth it, to *turn the point of his sword into his own bowels*; but *nobis non tam licet esse disertis*; neither do we here either *learn* or *teach* any such way of disputation.

His following leaves are spent for the most part in *slighting* the Notion of
Schism

Schism by me insisted on, and in reporting my arguments for it (*pp.* 8, 9, 12.) in such a *way* and manner, as argues that he either never understood them, or is willing to pervert them. The true nature and importance of them I have before laid down, and shall not now again repeat: Though I shall add that his frequent repetition of his disproving *that principle*, which it appears, that he never yet contended withal, in its *Full strength*, brings but little advantage to his cause, with persons whose interest doth not compel them to take up things on trust. How well he clears himself from the *charge of reviling* and using *opprobrious* reproachful terms, although he profess himself to have been *astonished* at the *charge*, may be seen in his justification of himself therein, *pag.* 16, 17, 18, 19, with his re-enforcing every particular expression instanced in; and yet he tells me, for inferring that he discovered *sanguinary thoughts* in reference unto them whose removal from their *native soil* into the wilderness, he affirms,

affirms, England's happiness would have consisted in, that *he hath much a-do to forbear once more to say the Lord rebuke thee*: for my part, I have received such a *satisfactory taste* of his spirit and way, that as I shall not from *henceforth* desire him to keep in any thing, that he can *hardly forbear* to let out, but rather to use his utmost liberty; so I must assure him that I am very little *concerned*, or not at all, in what he shall be *pleased to say*, or to forbear for the time to come; himself hath freed me from that concernment.

The first particular of value insisted on, is his *charge upon me* for the denial of all the *Churches of England to be true Churches of Christ, except the Churches gathered in a congregational way*: Having frequently, and without hesitation charged this opinion upon me in his first answer, knowing it to be very false, I expostulated with him about it in my *Review*. Instead of accepting the *satisfaction* tendered in my express denial of any such thought or persuasion, or tendering any satisfaction as to the wrong

done me, he seeks to justify himself in his charge, and so persisteth therein. The Reasons he gives for his so doing are not unworthy a little to be *remarked*.

The first is this: *He supposed me to be an Independent*, and therefore made that charge; the consequent of which supposition is much too weak to justify this Reverend Author in his Accusation; doth he suppose that he may without offence lay what he pleases to the charge of an *Independent*? but he saith secondly, that he “took the word *Independent generally, as comprehending Brownists, and Anabaptists, and other Sectaries*: But herein also he doth but delude his own conscience, seeing he *personally* speaks to me and to my design in that book of Schism which he undertook to confute; which also removes his third intimation, that he formerly intended *any kind of Independency*, etc. the rest that follow are of the same nature, and however compounded will not make a salve to heal the wound made in his reputation by his own weapon; for the
learned

learned author *called vox, populi*, which he is pleased here to urge? I first question whether he be *willing* to be produced to maintain this *Charge*; and if he shall appear; I must needs tell him, (what he here questions whether it be so, or no) that he is a *very liar*. For any *principles* in my Treatise, whence a denial of their *Ministers and Churches* may be regularly deduced, let him produce them if he can; and if not, acknowledge that there had been a more Christian and ingenuous way of coming off an engagement into that charge, than that by him chosen to be insisted on; *animos et iram ex crimine sumunt*. And again we have *vox populi* cited on the like occasion, *pag. 34*, about my refusal to answer whether I were a Minister or not; which as the thing itself of such a refusal of mine on any occasion in the world (because it must be spoken), is *purum putum mendacium*, so it is no truer, that, that was *vox populi* at Oxford, which is pretended; that which is *vox populi*, must be public; *publicum* was once *populi-*

populicum; now, set aside the *whispers*, of it may be two or three *Ardelios*,¹ notorious *triflers*, whose lavish impertinency, will deliver any man from the danger of being slandered by their tongues, and there will be little ground left for the report that is *fathered* on *vox populi*: And I tell him here once again (which is a sufficient answer, indeed, to his whole first Chapter) that I do not deny *Presbyterian Churches* to be true Churches of Jesus Christ, nor the ministers of them to be true ministers, nor do maintain a *nullity* in their *Ordination* as to what is the proper use and end of *Ordination*² (taking it in the sense, wherein by them it is taken,) though I think it neither administered by them in *due order*, nor to have in itself that force and efficacy, singly considered, which by many of them is ascribed unto it. Thus much of my judgement I have publicly declared long ago, and I thought I might have expected from persons *Professing Christianity*,

that

1 *Ardelio*, a busy-body, a meddler; a term borrowed from Phædrus, lib ii. fab. 5.—ED.

2 Vid. Gerard. loc. Com. de Minist. Ecclesiast. sect. 11, 12.

that they would not voluntarily engage themselves into an opposition against me, and waiving my judgement which I had constantly published and preached, have gathered up *reports* from *private* and *table* discourses, most of them false and untrue, all of them uncertain, the occasions and coherences of those discourses from whence they have been raised and taken being utterly *lost*, or at present by him wholly omitted. His following excursions, about a *successive ordination from Rome*, wherein he runs cross to the most *eminent lights* of all the Reformed Churches, and their declared Judgements, with practice, in reordaining those who come unto them with that *Roman stamp* upon them, I shall not farther interest myself in, nor think myself concerned so to do, until I see a satisfactory answer given unto *Beza* and others on this very point; and yet I must here again profess that I cannot understand that distinction of deriving ordination from the *Church of Rome*, but not from the *Roman Church*. Let him but seriously peruse these ensu-

ing words of *Beza*, and tell me whether he have any ground of a particular quarrel against me upon this account.

Sed præterea quænam ista est, quæso, ordinaria vocatio, quam eos habuisse dicis, quos Deus paucis quibusdam exceptis, excitavit? Certe papistica. Nam hæc tua verba sunt; Hodie si episcopi Gallicanarum ecclesiarum se et suas ecclesias à tyrannide Episcopi Romani vindicare velint, et eas ab omni idololatria et superstitione repurgare, non habent opus alia vocatione ab ea quam habent. Quid ergo? Papisticas ordinationes, in quibus neque morum examen præcessit, neque leges ullæ servatæ sunt inviolabiliter ex divino jure in electionibus et ordinationibus præscriptæ, in quibus puri etiam omnes canones impudentissime violati sunt: quæ nihil aliud sunt, quàm fædissima Romani prostibulin undinatio, quavis meretricum mercede, quam Deus templo suo inferri probibuit, inquinatio: quibus denique alii non ad prædicandum sed pervertendum evangelium: alii non ad docendum, sed ad rursus sacrificandum, et ad abominandum. βδέλυγμα

sunt ordinati, usque adeo firmas tecum esse censebimus, ut quoties tali cui-piam pseudoepiscopo, Deus concesserit ad verum Christianismum transire omnis illa istiusmodi ordinationis impuritas simul expurgata censeatur? Imo quia sic animum per Dei gratiam mutavit, quo ore, quo pudore, qua conscientia papis-mum quidem detestabitur, suam autem inordinatissimam ordinationem non ejurabit? aut si, ejuret, quomodo ex illius jure auctoritatem dicendi habebit. Nec tamen nego quin tales, si probe doctrinam veram tenere, si honestis moribus præditi, si ad gregem pascendum apti comperiantur, ex pseudoepiscopis novi pastores, legitime designentur; Thus he, who was thought then to speak the sense of the Churches of Geneva and France; in his book against Saravia about the divers orders of Ministers in the Church:

His plea for the Church-Authority of the Pope, notwithstanding his being an Idolater, a murderer, the man of sin, an adversary of Christ, because a Civil magistrate doth not by any moral Crime

or

or those whereof the *Pope is guilty*, lose his jurisdiction and Authority, considering the different principles, grounds, ends, laws, Rules, privileges, of the Authority of the one, and the other, and the several *tenures*, whereby the one doth hold, and the other pretends to hold his power, is brought in to serve the turn in hand, and may be easily laid aside?

And when he shall manifest, that there is appointed by Christ, one *single High-Priest* or Prelate in the house of God, the whole Church; and *that office* to be confined to one *nation*, one blood, *one family*, propagated by natural generation, without any provision of relief by any other way, person, or family in case of miscarriage; and when he shall have *proved* that such an *officer* as the *Pope of Rome*, in any one particular that constituteth him such an officer, was once *instituted* by Christ, I shall farther attend unto his *Reason* for his Authority from that of the *High-Priest's* among the Jews, which was not lost as to its
conti-

continuance in the family of *Aaron* notwithstanding the miscarriage of some individual Person vested therewithal; In the close of the Chapter he reassumes his charge of my *renouncing my own Ordination* which with great confidence, and without the least *scruple*, he had asserted in his *Answer*; of that assertion he now pretends to give the Reasons, whereof the first is this.

1. *The world looks on him as an Independent of the highest note*; therefore he hath renounced his ordination; and therefore *I dare to say so*. So much for that reason. I understand neither the *Logic* nor *morality* of this first Reason.

2. *He knows from good hands that some of the Brethren have renounced their Ordination*; therefore, he durst say positively *that I have renounced mine*, Proverbs 12:18.

3. He hath heard that I dissuaded others from *their ordination*, and therefore he durst say I renounced my own; and yet I suppose he may possibly dissuade
sua

suade some from Episcopal Ordination: but I know it not, no more than he knows what he affirms of me which is false.

4. He concludes from the principles in my book of Schism; because I said that to insist upon a succession of ordination from Anti-Christ and the Beast of Rome would if I mistake not keep up in this particular what God would have pulled down, therefore I renounced my ordination; when he knows that I avowed the validity of ordination on another account.

5. If all this will not do, he tells me of something that was said at a *public meeting* (*at dinner* it seems) with the *Canons of Christ-Church*, *viz:* that *I valued not my ordination by the Bishop of Oxford any more than a crumb upon my trencher*; which words whether ever they were spoken or no, or to what purpose, or in reference to what Ordination (I mean of the two orders) or in what sense, or with what limitation, or as part of what discourse, or in comparison of what else, or whether solely in reference

rence to the Roman succession, in which sense I will have nothing to do with it, I know not at all; nor will concern myself to inquire; being greatly ashamed to find men professing the Religion of Jesus Christ, so far forgetful of all common Rules of civility and principles of human society as to insist upon such *vain, groundless reports* as the Foundations of accusations against their Brethren! Nor do I believe that any one of the *Reverend Persons* quoted will own this information, although I shall not concern myself to make inquiry into their memories concerning any such passage or discourse.

Much relief for the *future* against these and the like mistakes may be afforded, from an easy observation of the different senses wherein the term of *Ordination* is often used; it is one thing when it is taken largely for the whole appointment of a man to the ministry; in which sense I desire our Author to consider what is written by *Beza* among Reformed, and *Gerhard* among the *Lutheran*

theran Divines; to omit innumerable others; another thing when taken for the imposition of hands, whether by *Bishops* or *Presbyters*; concerning which *single Act*, both as to its *order*, and *efficacy*, I have sufficiently delivered my judgement, if he be pleased to take notice of it. I fear indeed that when men speak of an *ordained ministry*; which, in its true and proper sense, I shall with them contend for, they often relate only to that solemnity, restraining the authoritative making of ministers singly thereunto, contrary to the intention and meaning of that expression, in Scripture, antiquity, and the best reformed Divines, both *Calvinists*, and *Lutherans*; and yet it is not imaginable how some men prevail by the noise and sound of that *Word*, upon the prejudiced minds of *partial* unstudied men. A little time may farther manifest, if it be not sufficiently done already; that another account is given of this matter by *Clemens*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Origen*, *Justin Martyr*, and generally all the first writers of the Christi-

ans, besides the Councils of old and late, with innumerable *Protestant Authors* of the best note, to the same purpose.

This, I say, is the ground of this mistake; whereas sundry things concur to the *calling of Ministers*, as it belongs to the Church of God, the *ground and pillar of truth*, the *spouse of Christ*, Psalm 45:9, and *mother of the family*, or *her that tarrieth at home*, Psalm 68:12, *unto whom all ministers are stewards*, 1 Corinthians 4:1, even in the *house of God*, 1 Timothy 3:15. and sundry *qualifications* are indispensably previously required in the persons to be called; overlooking the *necessity* of the qualifications required, and omitting the *duty and authority* of the Church, Acts 1:15–26, Acts 6:2–6, 13:2, 3, 14:23, the Act of them who are not the *whole Church*, Ephesians 4:11, 12, but only a *part* of it, 1 Corinthians 3:21. 2 Corinthians 1:24, 1 Peter 5:3, as to ministry, consisting in the approbation and solemn confirmation, of what is supposed to go before, hath in some men's language gotten the name of *ordination*, and an interpretation

tion of that name, to such an extent, as to *enwrap* in it, all that is *indispensably* necessary to the constitution or making of *ministers*; so that where that is *obtained*, in what order soever, or by whom soever administered, who have first obtained it themselves, there is a lawful and sufficient calling to the ministry! Indeed, I know no error about the institutions of Christ, attended with more pernicious consequences to the Church of God, than this; should it be practised, according to the force of the *principle* itself. Suppose six, eight, or ten men, who have themselves been formerly ordained; but now perhaps, not by any *ecclesiastical censure*, but by an act of the civil *magistrate*, are put out of their places, for *notorious ignorance* and *scandal*; should concur and ordain a hundred ignorant and wicked persons like themselves, to be ministers: must they not on this Principle, be all accounted *ministers* of Christ, and to be invested with all *ministerial power*; and so be enabled to propagate

their kind to the end of the world; and indeed why should not this be granted, seeing the whole bulk of the *papal ordination* is contended for as valid; whereas it is notoriously known, that sundry *Bishops* among them (who perhaps received their own ordination as the *reward of a whore*), being persons of *vicious lives*, and utterly ignorant of the Gospel, did sustain their pomp and sloth by selling *holy orders* as they called them, to the *scum* and refuse of men; but of these things more in their proper place.

Take then Reader, the substance of this chapter; in this brief recapitulation.

1. *He denies our Churches to be true Churches, and our Ministers true Ministers.*

2. *He hath renounced his own ordination.*

3. *When some young men came to advise about their ordination he dissuaded them from it.*

4. *He saith he would maintain against*

gainst all the Ministers of England, there was in Scripture no such thing as Ordination.

5. *That when he was chosen a Parliament man he would not answer whether he was a Minister or not; all which are notoriously untrue, and some of them, namely the two last, so remote from any thing to give a pretence or colour unto them, that I question whether Satan have impudence enough to own himself their Author; and yet, from hearsays, reports, rumours, from table talk, Vox populi, and such other grounds of Reasoning, this Reverend Author hath made them his own, and by such a charge, hath I presume, in the judgement of all unprejudiced men, discharged me from farther attending to what he shall be prompted from the like principles to divulge, for the same ends and purposes, which hitherto he hath managed, for the future. For my judgement about their ministry, and Ordination, about the nature and efficacy of Ordination, the state and power of particular Churches, my own*

station in the ministry, which I shall at all times, through the grace and assistance of our Lord Jesus Christ, freely justify against men and *devils*, it is so well known, that I shall not need here farther to declare it: for the true nature and notion of *Schism*, alone by me inquired after, in this chapter, as I said, I find nothing offered thereunto: only whereas I restrained the Ecclesiastical use of the word *Schism* to the sense wherein it is used, in the *places* of Scripture, that mention it with relation to Church affairs, which that it ought not to be so, nothing but *asseverations* to the contrary are produced to evince; this is interpreted, to extend to all that I would allow as to the nature of Schism itself, which is most false; though I said if I would *proceed* no farther, I might not be compelled so to do, seeing in things of this nature we may crave allowance to *think* and speak with the Holy Ghost: However, I expressly comprised in my proposition all the places wherein the *nature* of Schism is delivered under
what

what terms or words soever. When then, I shall be convinced, that such discourses as those of this Treatise, made up of diversions into things wholly foreign to the inquiry by me insisted on, in the investigation of the true notion and nature of Schism, with long *talks* about *Anabaptists, Brownists, Sectaries, Independents, Presbyterians, Ordination*, with charges and reflections grounded on this presumption, that this *Author* and his party, (for we will no more contend about that expression) are *in solidum* possessed of all true and orderly *Church state* in *England*, so that whosoever are not of them are *Schismatics*, and I know not what besides, he being

—*Gallinæ fillus albæ,*

*nos viles pulli nati infelicibus ovis;** I shall farther attend unto them. I must farther add, that I was not so happy as to foresee that because I granted the *Roman* Party before the Reformation to have made outwardly a profession of the Religion of Christ, although I expressed them to be *really a party combined*

c 4

together,

* Juv., xiii. 141.

together, for all ends of *wickedness*, and in particular, for the *extirpation* of the true Church of Christ in the world, having no state of *union* but what the Holy Ghost calls *Babylon* in opposition to *Zion*, our Reverend Author would conclude, as he doth, *pag.* 34, that I allowed them to be a true Church of Christ; but it is impossible for wiser men than I, to see far into the issue of such discourses; and therefore we must take in good part what doth fall out; and if the *Reverend Author*, instead of having his *zeal warmed* against me, would a little bestir his abilities, to make out to the understandings and consciences of *uninterested men*, that *All ecclesiastical power* being vested in the Pope and *Councils*, by the consent of that whole combination of men called the *Church of Rome*, and flowing from the *Pope* in its execution to an others; who, in the derivation of it from him, owned him as the immediate *fountain* of it, which they sware to maintain in *him*, and this in *opposition* to all Church power in any

ny other persons whatsoever; it was possible that any power should be derived from that combination, but what came expressly from the fountain mentioned. I desire our Author would consider the frame of spirit that was in this matter, in them, who first laboured in the *work of Reformation*, and to that end peruse the stories of *Lasitius*,* and *Regenuolscius*† about the churches of *Bohemia*, *Poland*, and those parts of the world, especially the latter from *pag. 29, 30, and forward*. And as to the distinction used by some between the *Papacy*, and the *Church of Rome*, which our *Author* makes use of to another purpose, than those did, who first invented it, (extending it only to the consideration of the possibility of salvation for individual persons living in that communion before the Reformation) I hope he will not be angry if I profess my *disability* to understand it. All men cannot be wise alike; if the *Papacy* comprise the Pope, and all Papal Jurisdiction and power, with the

sub-

* Joannes Lasitius wrote a large work on the Bohemian Brethren. The eighth book of this work, under title, "Historiæ de Origines et Rebus Gestis Fratrum Bohemorum," etc., was published by Comenius in 1649—Ed.

† Regenuolscius, or rather, according to his true name, Wingersclus, was the author of "Systema Historico-Chronologicum Ecclesiarum Slavonicarum."—Ed.

subjection of men thereunto; if it denote all the *Idolatries, false worship,* and heresies of that *society* of men; I do know that all those are confirmed by *Church Acts* of that *Church*: and that, in the *Church Public sense* of that Church, no man was a member of it—but by virtue of the union that consisted in that *Papacy*, it being placed always by them in all their definitions of their Church; as also, that there was neither *Church Order*, nor *Church Power*, nor *Church Act*, nor *Church confession*, nor *Church Worship* amongst them, but what consisted in that *Papacy*.

Now because nothing doth more frequently, occur than the objection of the difficulty of placing the dispensation of *baptism* on a sure foot of *account*, in case of the rejection of all *authoritative* influence from *Rome* into the ministry of the Reformed Churches, with the insinuation of a supposition of the *non-baptization* of all such, as derive not a title unto it, by that means, they who do so being supposed to stand upon an
unque-

unquestionable foundation, I shall a little examine the grounds of their *security*, and then compare them with what they have to plead, who refuse to *acknowledge* the deriving any sap or *nourishment* from that rotten corrupt stock.

It is, I suppose, taken for granted that an *unbaptized person* can never effectually *baptize*, let him receive what other qualifications soever that are to be superadded, as necessary thereunto. If this be not *supposed* the whole weight of the *objection* improved by the worst supposition that can be made, falls to the ground. I shall also desire, in the next place, that as we cannot make the *Popish baptism*, better than it is, so, that we would not plead it to be *better*, or any other than *they* profess it to be; nor pretend, that though it be *rotten* or *null* in the foundation, yet by *continuance* and time it might obtain validity and strength. When the claim is by *succession* from such a *stock* or root, if you suppose once a *total intercision* in the succession from that stock or root, there
is

is an utter end put to that claim; let us now consider how the case is with them from whom this claim is derived.

1. It is notoriously known, that amongst them the *validity* of the sacraments depends upon the intention of the *Administrator*: It is so with them, as to every thing they call a sacrament: now to take one step backwards: that *baptism* will by some of ours, be scarce accounted *valid*, which is not administered by a *lawful minister*; suppose now that some *Pope* ordaining a *Bishop* in his *stable* to satisfy a *Whore*, had not an intention to make him, a *Bishop*, which is no remote surmise; he being no *Bishop* rightly ordained, all the *Priests* by him afterward consecrated, were indeed no *priests*, and so indeed had no power to *administer* any *Sacraments*, and so consequently the baptism that may lie, for aught we know, at the root of that which some of us pretend unto, was originally absolutely *null* and *void*, and could never by tract of time, be made *valid*, or effectual, for like a muddy fountain,
the

the farther it goes, the more *filthy* it is: or suppose that any *Priest*, baptizing one who afterwards came to be *Pope* from whom all *Authority* in that Church doth flow and is *derived*, had no intention to *baptize* him, what will become of all that ensues thereon?

It is endless to *pursue* the uncertainties, and entanglements, that ensue on this head of account; and sufficiently easy it is to manifest, that whosoever resolves his *interest* in gospel privileges, into this foundation can have no assurance of faith, nay, nor tolerably probable conjecture that he is *baptized*, or was ever made *partaker* of any ordinance of the gospel. Let them that delight in such *troubled waters*, sport themselves in them: for my own part, considering the state of that *Church* for some years if not Ages, wherein the fountains of all Authority amongst them, were full of filth and blood, their Popes upon their own confession being *made, set up* and pulled down at the *pleasure* of vile, impudent, domineering *strumpets*, and
and

supplying themselves with officers all the world over of the same spirit, and stamp with themselves, and that for the most part for hire, being in the mean time all *Idolaters to a man*; I am not willing to grant that their *Good and upright* intention is necessary to be supposed as a thing requisite unto my interest in any privilege of the Gospel of Christ.

2. It is an ecclesiastical determination of irrefragable Authority amongst them, that whosoever he be that *administers baptism*, so he use the *matter and form*, that baptism is *Good* and valid and not to be reiterated; yea, *Pope Nicholas* in his Resolutions and determinations upon the inquiry of the *Bulgarians*, (whose decrees are authentic and recorded in their *Councils*, Tom: 2. Crabb: p. 144), declares the judgement of that *Church* to the full: They tell him, that many *in their Nation* were *baptized* by an *unknown person, a Jew or a Pagan they knew not whether*; and enquire of him, whether they were to be

be rebaptized or no; whereunto he answers: *si in nomine S. S. Trinitatis, vel tantum in Christi nomine, sicut in Actis Apostolorum legimus, baptizati sunt, unum quippe idemque est, ut S. Ambrosius expressit, constat eos denuo non esse baptizandos*: if they were *baptized* in the name of the *Trinity* or of *Christ*, they are not to be baptized again. Let a blasphemous *Jew* or *Pagan* do it, so it be done the work is *wrought*, grace conveyed, and baptism valid. The constant practice of *women* baptizing amongst them, is of the same import: and what doth Mr *Cawdrey* think of this *kind of Baptism*? Is it not worth the contending about, to place it in the derived succession of ours? who knows but that some of *these persons*, baptized by a counterfeit impostor, on purpose to abuse and defile the institutions of our blessed Saviour, might come to be baptizers themselves, yea, Bishops, or Popes; from whom all ecclesiastical Authority was to be derived; and what evidence or certainty can any man have, that his
baptism

baptism doth not flow from this fountain.

3. Nay, upon the General account, if this he *required* as necessary to the administration of that ordinance, that he that doth baptize, be rightly and effectually *baptized* himself; who can in faith bring an infant to any, to be baptized, unless he himself saw that person rightly baptized?

As to the matter of Baptism then, we are no more concerned, than as to that of Ordination; by what ways or means soever any man comes to be a minister, according to the mind of Jesus Christ; by that way and means he comes to have the power for a due administration of that ordinance: concerning which state of things, our Author may do well to consult *Beza* in the place mentioned. Many other passages there are in this Chapter, that might be remarked, and a return easily made according to their desert of untruth and *impertinency*; but the insisting on such things, looks more like children's playing

ing at *pushpin*, than the management of a serious *disputation*: Take an instance; pag. 23, he seems to be much offended with my commending him; and tells me, as *Jerome* said of *Rufinus*, *I wrong him with praises*; when yet the utmost I say of him is, that I had received a *better character of him*, than he had given of himself in his book, p. 10. and that his proceeding was unbecoming his *worth, gravity, and profession*, pag. 46. or so Grave and Reverend a person as he is reported to be, pag. 121. wherein it seems I have transgressed the rule, Μήποτὸ εὖ ἔρδειν γέροντα.

The business of his *second Chapter* is to make good his former charge of my *inconstancy* and *inconsistency* with myself as to my *former* and *present* opinions, which he had placed in the *Frontispiece* of his other Treatise. The *Impertinency* of this Chapter had been intolerable, but that the *loose* discourses of it are relieved by a *scheme* of my *self-Contradictions*, in the close. His design, he professeth, in his *former discourse* was

d

not

not to *blast my Reputation*, or to *cause my person to suffer*, but to *prevent the prevalency of my way by the authority of my person*, That is, it was not his *intention*, it was only his intention for such a purpose! I bless my God I have good security, through grace, that whether he, or others like-minded with himself, intend any such thing or no, in those proceedings of his and theirs, which seemed to have in their own nature a tendency thereunto, my *reputation* shall yet be *preserved* in that state and condition as is necessary to *accompany* me in the duties and works of my generation, that I shall, through the hand of God, be called out unto. And therefore, being prepared in some measure to go through *good report* and *bad report*, I shall give him assurance, that I am very little concerned in such attempts, from whatever intention they do proceed; Only I must needs tell him, that he consulted not his *own reputation* with peaceable godly men, whatever else he omitted, in the ensuing Comparing

paring of me to the *seducers* in *Jude*, called *wandering Planets*, for their *inconstancy* and *inconsistency* with themselves, according to the exposition that was needful for the present turn.

But seeing the *Scheme* at the close must bear the weight of this charge, let us briefly see what it amounts unto, and whether it be a sufficient *basis* of the superstruction that is *raised* upon it; Hence it is that my *inconsistency with myself*, must be remarked in the *title page* of his first treatise; from hence must my *Authority* (which what it is I know not) be *impaired*, and myself be *Compared* to *cursed Apostates* and *Seducers*, and great *triumph* be made upon my self inconsistency.

The Contradictions pretended are taken out of two books, the one written in the year 1643. The other in 1656. and are as follow.

<i>He spake of Rome as a Collapsed, Corrupted Church-state. p. 40.</i>	<i>He says Rome we account no Church at all. p. 156.</i>
--	--

Crimen inauditum, C. Cæsar; is it meet that any one should be *tolerated*, that is thus *woefully* inconsistent with himself? what! speak of *Rome* as a *Collapsed Church in Italy*, and within thirteen or fourteen *years* after to say it is no *Church* at all; well! though I may say there is indeed no *Contradiction* between these *Assertions*, seeing in the *latter* place I speak of *Rome* as that *Church* is stated by themselves, when yet I acknowledge there may be *corrupted Churches both in Rome and Italy*, in the same *Treatise*; Yea I do not *find* that in the place directed unto, I have in *terms*, or in *just consequence* at all granted the *Church of Rome* to be a *Collapsed Church*: nay, the *Church of Rome* is not once mentioned in the whole page, nor as such is spoken of: and what shall we think of this proceeding? But yet I will not so far offend against my sense of my *own weakness, ignorance and frailty*, as to use any *defensive* against this *Charge*. Let it pass at any rate that any sober man, freed from
from

from pride, passion, self-fulness, and prejudice, shall be pleased to put upon it;

— — ὁδὲ ὀρῶν τοῦς νόμους
Λίαν ἀκριβῶς, συκοφάντης φαίνεται.

But the second *instance* will make amends, and take more of the weight of this Charge upon its shoulders: Take it then as it lies in its *triple Column*.

Gifts in the Person, and consent of people, is warrant enough to make a man a preacher in an extraordinary Case? only pag. 15. and pag. 40.

Denying our ordination to be sufficient, he says he may have that which indeed Constitutes him a minister, viz: Gifts and submission by the People p. 198.

I am punctually of the same mind still p. 40. Yet had said in his first book p. 46. as to formal teaching is required, 1. Gifts, 2. Authority from the Church, if he do not equivocate.

I must Confess I am here at a stand, to find out the *pretended Contradiction*; especially laying aside the word *only* in the first *Column* which is his and not mine. By a *Preacher* in the *first Place* I intend a *minister*: Gifts and Consent or *submission* of the People, I affirm in *both places* to be sufficient, to *constitute* a man a *minister* in extraordinary Cases;

That is, when imposition of *hands* by a Presbytery may not be obtained in due order, according to the appointment of Jesus Christ. That the *Consent* and *submission* of the people, which include *Election*, have nothing of Authority in them I never said: the superadded Act of the *imposition of hands* by a *Presbytery*, when it may be regularly obtained, is also necessary. But that there is any *Contradiction* in my words, (although, in truth they are not my words but an undue collection from them) or in this Author's inference from them, or any colour of *Equivocation*, I profess I cannot discern: in this place Mr *Cawdrey* οὐκ ἴδεν, ἀλλὸ ἐδόκησεν ὀδεῖν διὰ νύκτα σελήνην. Pass we to the third.

He made the Union of Christ and believers to be mystical, pag. 21.

He makes the Union to be Personal, pag. 94, 95.

I wish our Reverend Author for his *own sake*, had omitted this *Instance*; because I am enforced, in mine *own necessary defence* to let him know, that what
he

he assigns to me in his *second Column*, is *notoriously false*, denied and disproved, by me in the very place, and Treatise wherein I have handled the Doctrine of the *Indwelling of the Spirit*; and whether he will *hear* or *forbear*, I cannot but tell him, that this kind of dealing, is unworthy his *calling* and *profession*. His following Deductions and Inferences, whereby he endeavours to give countenance to this *false and calumnious charge*, arise from ignorance of the Doctrine that he seeks to *blemish* and oppose. Though the same spirit dwell in Christ and us, yet *He* may have him in *fulness*, we in *measure*; *Fulness* and *measure* relating to his *Communication* of Graces and Gifts, which are *arbitrary* to him; *indwelling* to his person: that the Spirit animates the Catholic Church, and is the *Author* of its *spiritual life* by a voluntary act of his power, as the *soul* gives life to the body by a necessary act, by virtue of its union,—for life is *actus vivificantis in vivificatum per unionem utriusque*, is the

Common Doctrine of Divines. But yet the soul being united to the body, as *pars Essentialis suppositi*, and the spirit dwelling in the *Person* as a free inhabitant, the union between Christ and the *Person* is not of the same *kind* with the union of *soul and Body*; let our Author Consult Zanchy on the second of the Ephesians, and he will not *repent* him of his *labour*; or, if he please, an Author whom I find him often *citing*, namely, *Bishop Hall*, about union with Christ. And for my Concernment in this charge I shall subjoin the words from whence it must be taken, *Pag.* 193 of my book of Perseverance.*

1. *The first signal Issue and effect which is ascribed to this Indwelling of the Spirit is Union; not a Personal Union with himself, which is impossible: He doth not assume our natures, and so prevent our Personality, which would make us one person with him, but dwells in our persons, keeping his own, and leaving us our Personality infinitely distinct; But it is a spiritual Union; the great union*

men-

* See vol. xi. of Owen's works, chap. viii.

mentioned so often in the Gospel, that is the sole Fountain of our Blessedness; our Union with the Lord Christ, which we have thereby. Many thoughts of heart there have been about this Union; what it is, wherein it doth consist, the causes, manner, and Effects of it; The Scripture expresses it to be very Eminent, near, durable, setting it out, for the most part, by similitudes, and Metaphorical Illustrations, to lead poor weak Creatures into some useful needful acquaintance with that Mystery, whose depths in this life, they shall never fathom. That many, in the days wherein we live, have miscarried in their conceptions of it, is evident; some to make out their Imaginary Union have destroyed the person of Christ, and fancying a way of uniting man to God by him, have left him to be neither God nor Man. Others have destroyed the Person of Believers, affirming that in their Union with Christ, they lose their own personality, that is, cease to be Men: or at least, those, are these Individual men.

I intend not now to handle it at large, but only (and that I hope without offence) to give in my thoughts concerning it, as far as it receiveth light from, and relateth unto, what hath been before delivered, concerning the Indwelling of the Spirit, and that without the least contending about other ways of Expression. So far there, with much more to the purpose; and in the very place of my book of Schism, referred to by this Author, I affirm as the head of what I assert, that by the indwelling of the spirit, Christ personal and his Church do become one Christ mystical, 1 Corinthians 12:12. The very expression insisted on by him, in my former Treatise; and so you have an issue of this self-Contradiction, concerning which, though reports be urged for some other things, Mr Cawdrey might have said what Lucian doth of his true History; γράφω τοίνυν περὶ ὧν μητὸ εἶδον, μητὸ ἔπαθον, μήτις παρὸ ἄλλων ἐπυθῆ-μην.

Let

Let us, then, consider the 4th, which is thus *Placed*.

1. *In extraordinary cases every one that undertakes to preach the Gospel must have an immediate Call from God* pag. 28.

2. Yet required no more of before but the Gifts and Consent of the People which are ordinary, and mediate Calls p. 15. neither is here any need or use of an immediate call, p. 53.

3. *To assure a man that he is extraordinarily called, he gives three ways, 1. Immediate revelation, 2. Concurrence of Scripture rule. 3. Some outward acts of Providence.* The two last whereof are mediate Calls, pag. 30.

All that is here *remarked* and Cast into three *Columns*, I know not well why, is taken out of that *one Treatise* of the *duty* of *Pastors* and *People*. And could I give myself the least *Assurance* that any one would so far concern himself in this *Charge*, as to Consult the *Places* from whence the words are Pretended to be *taken*, to see whether there be any thing in them to *answer* the *cry* that is made, I should *spare* myself the labour of adding any one *syllable* towards their vindication, and might most *safely*

ly so do, there being not the least colour of *opposition* between the things spoken of. In brief, *Extraordinary Cases* are not all of one sort and nature; in some an *extraordinary call* may be required, in some not. *Extraordinary calls* are not all of one kind and nature neither; some may be *immediate* from God in the ways there by me described; some *calls* may be said to be *extraordinary*, because they do in some things come short of, or go beyond the *ordinary rule* that ought to be observed in well *Constituted Churches*. Again, *concurrence of Scripture rules* and acts of outward Providence, may be such sometimes as are suited to an *ordinary*, sometimes to an *extraordinary Call*; All which are at *large* unfolded in the Places directed unto by our Author, and all laid in their *own order*, without the least shadow of Contradiction. But it may sometimes be said of good men as the Satirist said of evil Women; *fortem animum præstant rebus quas turpiter audent*. Go we to the next.

I *The*

1. *The Church Government from which I desire not to wander is the Presbyterial.*

2. He now is engaged in the independent way.

3. *Is settled in that way, which he is ready to maintain and knows it will be found his rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus.*

Hinc mihi sola mali labes: This is that inexpressible crime that I labour under; on account of this whole business I have given in my review, so that I shall not here trouble the reader with a repetition of what he is so little concerned in. I shall only add, that whereas I suppose Mr Cawdrey did subscribe unto the 39 Articles at his Ordination; were it of any concernment to the Church of God, or the interest of truth, or were it a *Comely* and a *Christian part* to engage in such a work, I could manifest *Contradictions*, between what he then solemnly *subscribed* to, and what he hath since *written* and *Preached*, manifold above what he is able to draw out of this alteration of my Judgement. Be it here

here then declared, that whereas I sometime apprehended the *Presbyterial, Synodical Government* of Churches, to have been fit to be *received* and walked in, (then, when I knew not but that it answered those principles which, I had taken up, upon my best inquiry into the word of God), I now profess myself to be *satisfied*, that I was then under a mistake; and that I do now *own*, and have for many years lived in the way and *practice* of that called *Congregational*. And for this Alteration of Judgement, of all men, I fear least a *Charge* from them, or any of them, whom within a few years, we saw reading the service book in their surplices, etc.: against which things, they do now *inveigh* and declaim. What influence the perusal of Mr *Cotton's* Book of the *Keys*, had on my thoughts in this business I have formerly declared. The *answer to it* (I suppose that written by himself) is now recommended to me by this *Author*, as that which would have perhaps prevented my Change;
But

But I must needs tell him, that as I have perused that *book*, *many years ago*, without the Effect intimated, so they must *be things* written with another *frame of spirit*, evidence of truth, and manner of reasoning, than any I can find in that book, that are likely for the future, to lay hold upon my *Reason* and understanding. Of my settlement in my present Persuasion I have not only given him an account formerly, but with all Christian *Courtesy*, tendered myself in a readiness *Personally* to meet him, to give him the proofs and reasons of *my persuasions*; which he is pleased to decline, and return, in way of *answer*, That I *Complimented* him, *after the mode of the times*; when no such thing was intended. And thereupon my words of *desiring liberty to wait upon him*, are expressed, but the end and purpose for which it was desired, are concealed, in an etc. But he adds another instance.

Men

Men ought not to cut themselves from the communion of the Church, to rend the body of Christ, and break the sacred bond of Charity; Duty, 1.48.

2. *He says separation is no Schism, nor Schism any breach of charity, pag. 48, 49.*

There is not one word in either of these cautions, that I do not still own and allow, p. 44. sure not without Equivocation.

I have before owned this *Caution*, as consistent with my present Judgement, as expressed in my Book of *schism*, and as it is indeed; wherein lies the appearance of *Contradiction* I am not able to discern: Do not I, in my *Book of Schism* Declare and prove, that men ought not to cut themselves from the *Communion of the Church*; That they ought not to *rend the body of Christ*, that they ought not to *break the sacred bonds of Charity*? Is there any word or tittle in the *whole Discourse* deviating from these Principles? How and in what sense *Separation is not Schism*, that the *nature of Schism* doth not consist in a *breach of Charity*, the Treatise instanced will so far declare, as withal to

Con-

Convince those that shall Consider what is spoken, that our *Author* scarce keeps close either to *Truth* or *Charity* in his framing of this *Contradiction*: The Close of the Scheme lies thus.

I conceive they ought not at all to be allowed the benefit of private meeting, who wilfully abstain from the public Congregations.

As for liberty to be allowed to those that meet in private, I confess myself to be otherwise minded.

I remember that about fifteen *years* ago, meeting occasionally with a *learned* Friend, we fell into some debate, about the *liberty* that began then to be claimed by men, differing from what had been, and what was then likely to be *established*; having at that time made no farther *inquiry* into the grounds and reasons of such liberty, than what had occurred to me in the writings of the Remonstrants, all whose *plea* was still pointed towards the advantage of their own interest, I delivered my judgement in *opposition to the liberty* pleaded for, which was then defended by my

learned Friend; Not many years after, discoursing the same difference with the *same Person*, we found immediately that we had *changed Stations*, I pleading for an *Indulgence* of liberty, he for restraint; whether that *learned* and *worthy Person* be of the same mind still that then he was, or no, directly I know not: But this I know, that if he be not, Considering the *Compass* of Circumstances that must be taken in, to settle a right *Judgement* in this *Case of Liberty*, and what alterations influencing the Determination of this *Case* we have had of late in this nation, he will not be *ashamed* to own his Change; Being a *Person* who despises any reputation, but what arises from the *Embracing* and pursuit of truth; my Change I here own; my *Judgement* is not the same in this Particular, as it was fourteen years ago; and in my Change I have good Company whom I need not to name. I shall only say, my Change was at least twelve years before the *Petition and Advice*; wherein the Parliament of the three Nations, is
come

come up to my judgement: And if Mr *Cawdrey* hath anything to *object* to my present judgement, let him, at his next leisure, consider the treatise that I *wrote* in the year 1648 about *Toleration*, where he will find the whole of it expressed. I suppose he will be doing, and that I may almost say of him, as *Polyeuctus* did of *Speusippus*; Τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐν πεντασυρίγγῳ νόσῳ δεδεμένον. And now, *Christian Reader*, I leave it to thy Judgement whether our Author had any just cause, of all his outcries, of my *inconstancy and self-Contradiction*; and whether it had not been advisable for him to have passed by this seeming advantage for the design he professed to manage, rather than to have injured his own *Conscience* and *Reputation* to so little purpose.

Being sufficiently tired with the consideration of things of no relation to the cause at first proposed (but, *this saith he*, this the *independents*, this the *Brownists* and *Anabaptists*, etc.), I shall

now only *inquire* after that which is set up in opposition to any of the principles of my *Treatise of Schism* before mentioned, or any of the *propositions* of the *sylogisms* wherein they are comprised at the beginning of this Discourse; remarking in our way some such particular passages as it will not be to the *disadvantage* of our reverend Author to be reminded of. Of the nature of the thing inquired after, in the third chapter I find no mention at all; only he tells me by the way that the *Doctor's* assertion, that my Book about *Schism*, was *one great schism*, was not *nonsense*; but *usual Rhetoric*, wherein *profligate sinners* may be called by the *name of sin*; and therefore a book about *Schism*, may be called a *schism*; I wish our Author had found some other way of excusing his *Doctor*, than by making it worse himself.

In the *fourth Chapter* he comes to the business itself; and if in passing through *that*, with the rest that follow, I can fix on any thing rising up with
any

any pretence of opposition to what I have *laid down*, it shall not be omitted; for things by myself asserted, or acknowledged on all hands, or formerly ventilated to the utmost, I shall not again trouble the *Reader* with them: such are the positions about the *general* nature of *Schism*, in things *natural* and *political*, antecedently considered to the limitation and restriction of it to its *Ecclésiastical* use; the departure from Churches, *voluntary* or *compelled*, etc.; all which were *stated* in my first Treatise, and are not directly opposed by our Author; such, also, is that doughty *Controversy* he is pleased to raise, and pursue about the *seat* and *subject* of Schism with its restriction to the *instituted worship of God*, pag. 18, 19; so placed by me, to distinguish *the Schism* whereof we speak, from that which is *natural*, as also from such *differences* and breaches as may fall out amongst *men*, few or more, upon *civil* and rational accounts; all which I exclude from the enjoyment

of any *room* or place in our consideration of the true nature of *schism*, in its limited *Ecclesiastical sense*. The like also, may be affirmed concerning the ensuing strife of words about *separation* and *schism*; as though they were, in my apprehension of them, inconsistent; which is a *fancy* no better *grounded* than sundry others which our *Reverend Author* is pleased to make use of. His whole passage, also, receives no other *security* than what is afforded to it by turning my *universal proposition* into a *particular*: What I say of *all places* in the Scripture where the *name or thing* of *schism* is used in an *ecclesiastical sense*, as relating to a *Gospel Church*, he would restrain to that one place of the *Corinthians*, where *alone* the word is used in that sense. However, if that one place be all, my proposition is *universal*: take then, my proposition in its extent and latitude, and let him try *once more* if he please, what he hath to object to it, for as yet I find no instance produced to alleviate its truth. He much, also, in-

sists

sists, that there may be a *separation in a Church* where there is no *separation from a Church*, and saith this was at *first by me denied*: that it was denied by me he cannot prove; but that the contrary was *proved* by me is evident to all impartial men, that have Considered my Treatise; although I cannot allow that the *separation* in the Church of *Corinth* was carried to that height as is by him pretended; namely as to *separate from the ordinance of the Lord's supper*; their disorder and division *about* and in its *Administration* are reproved, not their separation from it: only on that supposition made, I confess I was somewhat surprised with the delivery of his judgement in reference to many of his *own party*, whom he condemns of *schism* for not administering the *Lord's supper* to all the Congregation, with whom they pray and preach. I suppose the greatest part of the most godly and able ministers of the *Presbyterian* way in *England*, and *Scotland*, are here cast into the same condition of

Schismatics with the Independents. And the truth is, I am not yet without hopes of seeing a fair coalescency in love, and Church Communion, between the reforming *Presbyterians* and Independents; though for it they shall with some, suffer under the unjust imputation of schism.

But it is incredible to think whither men will suffer themselves to be carried *studio partium*; and ἀμετρία ἀνθολκῆς; Hence have we the strange notions of this Author about Schism; decays in Grace are Schism, and *errors in the Faith* are *Schism*; and Schism and *Apostasy* are things of the same kind, differing only in degree; because the one leads to the other; as one sin of one kind doth often to another; drunkenness to whoredom, and envy and malice to lying; and *differences* about civil matters, like that of *Paul* and *Barnabas* are schism; and this by one blaming me for a departure from the sense of *antiquity*, unto which these *insinuations* are so many monsters. Let us, then, proceed.

That

That *Acts* 14:4, 19:9, 18: are pertinently used to discover and prove the nature of schism in an *evangelically-ecclesiastical sense*, or were ever cited by any of the *Antients* to that purpose, I suppose our Author, on second consideration, will not affirm. I understand not the sense of this Argument, *the multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews, and part with the Apostle*, therefore, schism in a Gospel Church state, is not only a division in a Church; or that it is a separation into new Churches, or that it is something more than the breach of the Union appointed by Christ in an instituted Church; much less doth any thing of this nature appear from *Paul's separating the Disciples* whom he had converted to the Faith from the unbelieving, hardened *Jews*, an account whereof is given us, *Acts* 19:9. So, then, that in this chapter there is any thing produced *de novo* to prove that the precise Scripture notion of Schism, in its ecclesiastical sense, extends itself any farther than differences

ferences, divisions, separations in a Church, and that a particular Church I find not; and do once more desire our Author that if he be otherwise minded, to spare such another trouble to our selves, and others, as that wherein we are now engaged, he would assign me some *time* and *place* to attend him for the clearing of the truth between us.

Of Schism, *Acts* 20:30, *Hebrews* 10:28, *Jude* 19, there is no mention; nor are those places interpreted of any such thing by any Expositors *new* or *old*, that ever I yet saw; nor can any sense be imposed on them inwrapping the nature of *Schism* with the least colour or pretence of Reason.

But now, by our Author, Schism and Apostasy, are made things of one kind, differing only in degrees, *pag.* 107. so confounding *Schism* and *heresy*, contrary to the Constant sense of all antiquity. *Acts* 20:30. The Apostle speaks of men speaking *perverse things*, to draw away *Disciples*; that is teaching them false doctrines, contrary to the
truths

truths wherein they had been by him instructed; in his *Revealing unto them the whole counsel of God*: verse 27. This by the *Antients* is called *heresy*, and is contradistinguished from *Schism* by them constantly: So *Austin* a hundred times. To draw men from the Church, by drawing them into *pernicious errors, false doctrine*, being the cause of their *falling off*, is not *schism*, nor so called in Scripture, nor by any of the *Ancients*, that ever yet I observed. That the design of the *Apostle* in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, is to preserve and keep them from *Apostasy* unto *Judaism*, besides that it is attested by a cloud of witnesses, is too evident from the thing itself to be denied, *chapter 10: 25*: he warns them of a common entrance into that fearful condition, which he describes, *verse 26*: their neglect of the *Christian Assemblies*, was the door of their *Apostasy* to *Judaism*. What is this to *schism*? would we charge a man with that crime whom we saw neglecting our assemblies, and likely to fall into *Judaism*

daism; are there not more forcible considerations to deal with him upon; and doth not the Apostle make use of them? *Jude* 19: hath been so far spoken unto already, that it may not fairly be insisted on again. *Parvas habet spes Troja, si tales habet.*

In the entrance of the *fifth* Chapter he takes advantage from my question, *p.* 147. *who told him that raising causeless differences in a Church, and then separating from it, is not in my judgement schism*; when the first part of the *assertion* included in that interrogation, expresseth the *formal* nature of Schism, which is not destroyed, nor can any man be exonerated of its guilt, by the subsequent crime of separation, whereby it is aggravated. *1 John* 2:19 is again mentioned to this *purpose of schism*, to as little purpose, so also is *Hebrews* 10:25: both places treat of Apostates, who are charged and blamed under other terms than that of *Schism*. There is in such departures, as in every division whatever, of that which was in U-
nion

nion, somewhat of the general nature of *schism*: but that particular crime and guilt of schism in its restrained Ecclesiastical sense, is not included in them.

In his following discourse he renews his former Charges of denying their ordinances and *ministry*, of *separating* from them, and the like; as to the former part of this Charge I have spoken in the entrance of this *discourse*; for the *latter*, of *separating from them*, I say we have no more separated from them than they have from us; our right to the celebration of the ordinances of God's worship, according to the light we have received from him, is, in this nation as good as theirs; and our plea from the Gospel we are ready to maintain against them, according as we shall at any time be called thereunto. If any of our judgement deny them to be *Churches*, I doubt not but he knows who comes not behind in returnal of Charges on our Churches. Doth the Reverend Author think or imagine, that we have not in our own judgement more reason to deny their
their

their *Churches* and to charge them *with Schism*, though we do neither, than they have to charge us therewith, and to deny our *Churches*? can any thing be more fondly Pretended than that he hath proved that we have separated from them; upon which, *pag. 105*, he requires the performance of my promise to retreat from the state wherein I stand, upon the establishment of such proof. Hath he proved the due administration of Ordinances amongst them whom he pleads for? Hath he proved any Church Union between them *as such*, and us? Hath he proved us to have broken that *Union*? what will not self-fulness and prejudice put men upon?

How came they into the sole *possession* of all Church state in *England*; so that whoever is not of them, and with them must be charged to have separated from them? Mr *Cawdrey* says indeed, that *the Episcopal* men and they agree in *substantials*, and differ only in *circumstantials*; but that they and we differ in *substantials*; but let him know they admit

mit not of his *compliances*; they say he is a *Schismatic*, and that all his party are so also; let him answer their Charge *solidly* upon his own principles; and not think to own that which he hath the weakest *claim* imaginable unto, and was never yet in possession of. We deny that since the Gospel came into *England*, the *Presbyterian Government*, as by them stated, was ever set up in *England*, but in the *wills* of a party of men; so that here as yet, unless as it lies in *particular Congregations*, where our right is as good as theirs, none have *separated* from it, that I know of; though many cannot *consent* unto it. The first *Ages* we plead ours, the following were unquestionably *Episcopal*.

In the beginning of Chapter the sixth he attempts to disprove my assertion that the *Union of the Church Catholic visible* which consists in the professing of the saving doctrine of the Gospel, etc.: is broken only by Apostasy. To this end he confounds Apostasy and Schism, affirming them only to differ in degrees;
which

which is a *new* notion unknown to Antiquity, and contrary to all sound Reason; by the instances he produceth to this purpose he endeavours to *prove* that there are things which break this union, whereby this union is not broken; whilst a man continues a member of that church which he is by virtue of the union thereof and his interest therein, by no act doth he, or can he break that union.

The partial breach of that union which consists in the *profession* of the truth, is *error* and heresy, and not *Schism*. Our Author abounds here in new notions which might easily be discovered to be as fond, as new, were it worth while to consider them; of which in brief before. Only I wonder why giving way to such thoughts as these, he should speak of men with contempt under the name of *Notionists*, as he doth of Dr *Du Moulin*; but the truth is, the *Doctor* hath provoked him, and were it not for some considerations that are obvious to me, I should almost wonder, why this *Author* should sharpen his leisure and *zeal*
against

against me, who scarce ever publicly touched the grounds and foundations of that Cause which he hath so passionately espoused, and pass by him, who both in *Latin* and *English*, hath laid his Axe to the very Root of it, upon principles *sufficiently destructive* to it, and so apprehended by the best learned in our Author's way that ever these nations brought forth; but, as I said, Reasons lie at hand, why it was more *necessary* to give me this opposition; which yet hath not altered my Resolution, of handling this controversy in *another manner*, when I meet with *another manner* of Adversary.

Page 110. He fixes on the examination of a particular passage about the *disciples* of *John* mentioned *Acts* 19:2, of whom I affirmed that it *is probable* they were rather ignorant of the miraculous dispensations of the Holy Ghost, than of the person of the Holy Ghost; alleging to the contrary that the words are more plain and *full than to be so eluded*, and that for ought appears,

f

John

John did not baptize into the name of the Holy Ghost; I hope the Author doth not so much dwell at home, as to suppose this to be a new notion of mine; who almost of late in their critical notes have not either (at least) considered it, or confirmed it? Neither is the question into whose name they were expressly baptized, but in what doctrine they were instructed: He knows who denies that they were at all actually baptized, before they were baptised by Paul. Nor ought it to be granted, without better proof than any which as yet hath been produced, that any of the Saints under the Old Testament were ignorant of the being of the Holy Ghost. Neither do the words require the sense by him insisted on; ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ εὖ Πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν, ἠκούσαμεν, do no more evince the person of the Holy Ghost to be included in them, than in those other, John 7:39, Οὐπω ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον; the latter, in the proper sense He will not contend for; nor can therefore, the expression being uniform, reasonably for the former. Speaking of men openly and notoriously

toriously wicked, and denying them to be *members of any Church* whatever: he bids me *answer his arguments to the contrary from the* 1 Corinthians 5:7, 2 Thessalonians 3:13, 17; and I cannot but desire him that he would impose that task on them that have nothing else to do: for my own part, I shall not entangle myself with things to so little purpose. Having promised my Reader to attend only to that which looks toward the *merit of the cause*, I must crave his pardon, that I have not been able to make good my resolution: meeting with so little or nothing at all which is to that purpose, I find myself entangled in the old diversions that we are now plentifully accustomed unto: but yet I shall endeavour to recompense this loss, by putting a speedy period to this whole trouble, despairing of being able to tender him any other satisfaction, whilst I dwell on this discourse. In the meantime to obviate all strife of words if it be possible for the future, I shall grant this Reverend Author that in the general large notion of *Schism*,

which his opposition to that insisted on by me hath put him upon, I will not deny but that *He* and *I* are both *Schismatics*, and any thing else shall be so, that he would have to be so, rather than to be engaged in this contest any farther. In this sense he affirms that there was a *Schism* between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and so one of them at least, was a *Schismatic*; as also, he affirms the same of two lesser men, though great in their generation *Chrysostom* and *Epiphanius*; so error and heresy, if he please shall be *Schism* from the Catholic Church; and *scandal* of life shall be *Schism*: And his argument shall be true, that schism is a breach of union in a Church of Christ's institution, therefore, in that which is so only by call, not to any end of joint worship as such; of any union; that which consists in the *profession* of the saying truths of the Gospel, and so there may be a schism in the *Catholic Church*; and so those *Presbyterians* that reform their Congregations, and do not administer the sacraments to all promiscuously, shall be

be guilty of Schism; and, indeed, as to me, *what else he pleaseth*, for my inquiry concerns only the *precise limited nature of Schism*, in its evangelically ecclesiastical sense.

Neither shall I at present (allotting very few hours to the despatch of this business, which yet I judge more than it deserves) consider the scattered ensuing passages about *Ordination, Church Government, number of Elders*, and the like; which all men know, not at all to belong unto the main controversy which was by me undertaken; and that they were against all laws of disputation, plucked violently into this contest, by our Reverend Author. One thing I cannot pass by, and it will upon the matter put a *close* to what I shall at present offer to this Treatise; having said that Christ hath given no direction for the *performance of any duty of worship of sovereign institution*, but only in them and by them (meaning particular Churches) he answers that, if *I would imply that a Minister in or of a*

Particular Church may perform those ordinances without those congregations, he contradicts himself, by saying a particular Church is the seat of all ordinances, but why so, I pray? May not a particular Church be the seat of all ordinances subjectively, and yet others be the object of them, or of some of them? but saith he, if he mean those ordinances of worship are to be performed only by a minister of a particular congregation, what shall become of the people? I suppose they shall be instructed and built up according to the mind of Christ, and what would people desire more. But whereas he had before said, that I denied a Minister to be a Minister to more than his own Church: and I had asked him who told him so; adding that explication of my judgement, that for so much as men are appointed the objects of the dispensation of the word, I grant a Minister in the dispensation of it to act ministerially, towards not only the members of the Catholic Church, but the visible members of the world also in contradistinction thereunto; he now tells me

me a story of passages between the *learned* Dr Wallis and myself, about his question in the *Vespers* 1654. namely, that as to that question *An potestas ministri Evangelici ad unius tantum ecelesie particularis membra extendatur?* I said that, Dr Wallis had brought me a challenge, and that *If I did dispute on that question, I must dispute ex animo*; although I grant that a Minister, as a Minister may *preach* the word, to more than those of his own congregation, yet knowing the sense wherein the *learned* Dr Wallis maintained that question, it is not impossible but I might say, if I did dispute I must do it *ex animo*; for *his bringing me a challenge*, I do not know that either he did so, or that I put that interpretation on what he did; but I shall crave leave to say, that if the *learned* Dr Wallis do find any ground, or *occasion* to bring a *challenge* unto me, to debate any point of difference between us, I shall not waive answering his desire, although he should bring Mr *Cawdrey* for his second; for the present I shall only

say, that as it is no commendation to the moderation or ingenuity of any one whatever thus to publish to the world private hearsays, and what he hath been *told* of private conferences; so if I would insist on the same course, to make publication of what I have been told hath been the private discourse of some men, it is not unlikely that I should occasion their shame and trouble: yet in this course of proceeding a progress is made out in the ensuing words, and Mr *Stubbes* (who is now called my *Amanuensis*, who some five years ago transcribed about *a sheet of paper for me*, and not one line before or since;) is said to be *employed, or at least encouraged*, by me to write against the *learned Dr Wallis*, his *Thesis* being published; this is as true as much of that that went before, and as somewhat of that that follows after; and whereas it is added, that I said what he had written on that subject, was *a scurrilous, ridiculous piece*, it is of the same nature with the rest of the like reports. I knew that Mr
Stubbes

Stubbes was writing on that subject; but not until he had *proceeded* far in it; I neither *employed* him, nor *encouraged* him in it, any otherwise than the consideration of his *papers*, after he had written them, may be so interpreted; and the reason why I was not willing he should proceed, next to my desire of continuance of *peace* in this place, was his using *such expressions of me*, and some things of mine, in sundry places of his discourse, as I could not *modestly* allow to be divulged; the following words to the same purpose with them before mentioned, I remember not; nor did ever think to be engaged in the consideration of such transgressions of the common rules of *human society* as those now passed through; Reports, hearsays, talks, private discourse between friends, allegations countenanced by none of these, nor anything else, are the weapons where-with I am assaulted. *I have heard, I am told, if reports be true, 'twas vox populi at Oxford, is it not so? I presume*
he

he will not deny it, are the ornaments of this discourse: strange! that men of experience and gravity should be carried by the power of these temptations not only to the *forgetfulness* of the royal law of Christ, and all Gospel rule of deportment towards his professed Disciples: but also be engaged into *ways* and practices, contrary to the dictates of the law of nature, and such as sundry heathens would have abhorred. For my own part, had not God by his providence placed me in that station, wherein others also that fear him are concerned in me, I should not once turn aside to look upon such heaps as that which I have now passed over: my judgement on most heads and articles of Christian Religion is long since published to the world, and I continue through the grace and patience of God preaching in public answerably to the principles I do profess; and if any man shall oppose what I have delivered, or shall so deliver, in print or in the pulpit, or in divinity lectures, as my
judg-

judgement, I shall consider his opposition, and do therein, as God shall guide: with evil surmises, charges upon hearsays, and reports, attended with perpetual excursions from the Argument in hand, I shall no more contend.

Some few observations on scattered passages, will now speedily issue this discourse. *Page 112.* To that Assertion of mine, that if *Rome* be no particular Church, it is no Church at all, for the Catholic Church it is not, he replies, that *though it be not such a particular Congregation* as I intend, yet it may be *a particular Patriarchal Church*: But, 1: then it seems it is a particular Church, which grants my inference.

2. It was a particular Church of *Christ's institution*, that I inquired after; doth our Author think that Christ hath appointed any *Patriarchal Church*? a *Patriarchal Church*, as such, is such from its Relation to a *Patriarch*: and he can scarce be thought to judge Patriarchs to be of *Divine institution*,
who

who hath cut off and abjured Episcopacy.

The *Donatists* are mentioned again, p. 113. And I am again Charged with an attempt to vindicate them from schism; my thoughts of them I have before declared to the full; & have no reason to retract anything from what was then spoken, or to add anything thereunto; if it may satisfy our Author, I here grant they were *Schismatics*, with what aggravations he pleaseth; and wherein their *schism* consisted, I have also declared: but he says, I undertake to exempt some others from schism (*I know whom*), that suffer with them in former and after ages, under the same imputation; I do so indeed; and I suppose our *Author* may *guess* at whom I intend,—himself, amongst others; I hope he is not so taken up in his thoughts, with charging schism on others, as to forget, that many, the greatest part and number of the true Churches of Christ do condemn him for a Schismatic, a *Donatistical* Schismatick:

matic: I suppose he acknowledges the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church; the *Lutheran* I am persuaded he will not deny, nor perhaps the *Grecian*, to be so: The *Episcopal* Church of England, he contends for; and yet all these, with *one voice* cry out upon him for a *Schismatic*: and as to the plea of the last, how he can satisfy his conscience, as to the rejection of his lawful *superiors*, upon his own principles, without pretending any such crime against them, as the *Donatists* did against *Cæcilianus*, I profess I do not understand: new mention is made of *Episcopal ordination*, p. 120, And they are said to have had their successive ordination from *Rome* who ordained therein; so indeed some say, and some otherwise; whether they had or no, is nothing to me, I lay no weight upon it; they held I am sure, that place in England, that without their approbation no man could publicly, preach the Gospel; to say they were *Presbyters*, and ordained as *Presbyters*, I know not what satisfaction can arise

arise unto *Conscience* thereby. Party and argument, may be countenanced by it; they profess they ordained as *Bishops*, that for their lives and souls they durst not ordain but as such; so they told those whom they ordained, and affirm they have open injury done them, by any one's denial of it: As it was, the best is to be made of it; this shift is not handsome; nor is it ingenuous, for any one, that hath looked into *Antiquity*, to charge me with departing from their sense in the notion of *schism*, declared about the 3rd & 4th Ages, & at the same time to maintain an *equality* between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; or to say that *Bishops* ordained as *Presbyters*, not as *Bishops*: Nor do I understand the excellency of that order which we see in some Churches, where they have two sorts of Elders; the one made so, by *ordination* without *Election*, and the other by *Election* without *ordination*; those who are ordained, casting off all power and Authority of them that ordained them; and those who are elected, immediately

immediately rejecting the greatest part of those that *chose* them.

Nor did I, as is pretend, plead for their *Presbyterian* way in the year [16]46; all the ministers (almost) in the county of Essex, know the contrary; one especially, being a man of great ability, and moderation of spirit, and for his knowledge in those things, not behind any man, I know, in *England* of his way, with whom in that year, and the next following, I had sundry conferences at public meetings of ministers, as to the *several ways* of Reformation, than under proposal. But the frivolousness of these imputations, hath been spoken of before, as also the falseness of the Calumny, which our Author is pleased to repeat again, about my turning from ways in Religion.

My description of a particular Church he once more blames as applicable to the *Catholic Church invisible*, and to the *visible Catholic Church* (I suppose he means as such) when a participation in the same ordinances numerically, is assigned

signed as its difference; He asks, whether it becomes my ingenuity to interpret the *capability* of a *Church's* reduction to its primitive constitution by its *own fitness* and capacity to be so reduced, rather than by its *external hinderances* or furtherances; But with what ingenuity or modesty, that question is asked, I profess I understand not; and, page 134, he hath this passage: (*only I take notice of his introduction, to his answer, with thanks for the civility of the inquiry in the manner of its expression; my words were these: whether our Reverend Author do not in his conscience think there was no true Church in England 'till, &c, which puts me into suspicion, that the Reverend Doctor was offended that I did not always (for oft I do) give him that title of the Reverend Author, or the Doctor, which made him cry out he was never so dealt withal by any party as by me; though upon review, I do not find, that I gave him any uncivil language, unbeseeming me to give or him to receive; and I hear that*
some-

somebody hath dealt more uncivilly with him in that respect, which he took very ill.

Let this Reverend Author, make what use of it he please, I cannot but again tell him, that these things become neither *him*, nor any man professing the *Religion of Jesus Christ*, or that hath any respect to *truth* or sobriety; can any man think, that in his conscience, he gives any credit to the insinuation which here he makes, that I should thank him for calling me *Reverend Author*, or *Reverend Doctor*, or be troubled for his not using those expressions? Can the mind of an *honest man* be thought to be conversant with such *mean* and *low thoughts*? For the Title of Reverend, I do give him notice that I have very little valued it, ever since I have considered the saying of *Luther*; *Nunquam periclitatur Religio nisi inter Reverendissimos*. So that he may, as to me forbear it for the future, and call me, as the *Quakers* do, and it shall suffice. And for that of *Doctor*; it was conferred on me by the *University* in my *absence*,

and against my *consent*, as they have expressed it under their *public* seal: nor doth any thing but *gratitude*, and *respect* unto them, make me once own it; and freed from that obligation, I should never use it more, nor did I use it, until some were offended with me, & blamed me for my neglect of them. And for that *other*, whom he mentions, who before this, gave so far place to *indignation*, as to insinuate some such thing, I doubt not but by this time he hath been *convinced* of his mistake therein, being a *Person* of another manner of ability and worth, than *some others*, with whom I have to do; and the truth is, my manner of dealing with him in my *last reply*, which I have since myself not so well approved of, requires the *passing* by such returns. But you will say then why do I preface this discourse, with that Expression; *with thanks for the civility of the inquiry in the manner of its expression?* I say! this will discover the iniquity of this Author's procedure, in this particular: His inquiry was,

was, *whether I did not in my Conscience think that there were no true Churches in England, until the Brownists our Fathers, the Anabaptists our elder brothers, and ourselves, arose and gathered new Churches*; without once taking notice, or mentioning his *titles* that he says he gave me, I used the words, in a sense obvious to every man's first consideration, as a reproof of the expressions mentioned; that which was the true cause of my words our *Author* hides in an *&c*: that which was not by me once taken notice of, is by him expressed; to serve an end of drawing forth an evil surmize and suspicion, that hath not the least colour to give it countenance; Passing by all indifferent Readers, I refer the *honesty* of this dealing with me, to the judgement of his own conscience; setting down, what I neither *expressed*, nor took *notice* of, nor had any *singular* occasion in that place so to do, the words being often used by him, hiding, and concealing what I did *take notice* of, and express, and which to every man's

view was the occasion of that passage, that conclusion or unworthy insinuation is made, which a Good man ought to have abhorred.

Sundry other particulars there are, partly false, and calumniating, partly impertinent, partly consisting in mistakes, that I ought at the first view, to have made mention of; but on several accounts, I am rather willing here to put an end to the Reader's trouble and my own.

The Preface



THE Servants of the Lord (saith *Paul*) must not strive, but be Gentle towards all men, 2 Timothy 2:24, how much more towards their Brethren? But what if a Brother, should become an Adversary (whether *Adversarius litis*, or *Personæ*,) and speak hard words, yea and write a Book against his fellow Servants? *Job* telleth us, though he could, yet he would not speak as they do, *Job* 16:4,5. And for the book against him, He would take it and bind it upon his shoulder, And yet I do not think he meant to cast it behind his Back, but that he would bear it as a *light load*, and in case

B

of

of his Innocency, He would *wear* it as his *Crown*: And for that end, would declare unto Him *the Number of his steps*, Job 31:35,36,37? Yet though such a Book might seem to Impartial and Judicious minds written with a *Spirit of Bitterness*, and contempt, and in a Style suitable, yet the *Servants of the Lord have not so learned Christ*, nor the Truth (as it is in Jesus) as to Return *Evil for Evil*, or Reviling for Reviling. Hard words are not Given, but as the Lord commandeth, if not in his Ordinances, yet in his Providence: And either they are *Deserved*, & then they are an excellent Balm which will not break the head: or *undeserved*, and then the Lord will Requite Good to him that suffereth evil. It is no new Thing for God's own Servants to be taken with *Paroxisms* (as Paul and Barnabas were, Acts 15.) that is, with *Pangs of Passion*, And that is the worst I conceive of the tartest Passages of Mr *Cawdrey's Reply*. For I see by his
dealing

dealing with Mr *Hooker*, that he *can write with more meekness, and moderation, when the Lord helpeth him*: Let me therefore briefly give Account of such Passages of mine, as have seemed most offensive to Him: and that in such terms, as may not unbeseem either myself, or the cause.

CHAP. I

THE first offence he taken, is against my *Inconstancy*, and (that which is the fruit of it) my manifest and manifold *Contradictions* to myself to the number of about 21: Inconstancy in the general He Intimateth in the Text of *James* in his Frontpiece, *James* 1:8.

A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.

To which I will *Rejoin* no other Answer than a Text of like Authority, and alleged (I hope) with more Pertinency, *Matthew* 11:7, *What went*

*you out into the wilderness to see?
A Reed shaken with the wind?*

The *Contradictions* are set forth in *great letters* in the Title Page and afterwards particularly in an ample *Scheme* in 3 Columns in the end of his reply, let us consider of them in order.

The 1st Contradiction.

1. *The Keys were given to Peter as an Apostle, as an Elder, as a Believer. So the Sense is most full. The Keys, Page 4.*

1. *The power of the keys is given to Peter, not as an Apostle nor as Elder, but as a Professed Believer. The Way, p. 27.*

1. *Peter Received not the keys, merely as a Believer, but as a Believer publicly professing his Faith, &c. The Way Cleared, Part 2, p. 39. To like Purpose Mr Hooker, Surv. Part 1, p. 203.*

The Reconciliation of this Seeming *Contradiction* were obvious and easy; take the words as they stand in the *Scheme*; for so it might be said, *Brethren*, are sometimes put for private members of the Church, and Contradistinguished from such as bear office in the Church. As when it is said in the *Synodical Letter* (Acts

15:23) *The Apostles, Elders, and Brethren*. Sometimes Brethren are put more generally, as Comprehending all the members of the Church, both officers and private members as *Galatians 6:1*: and frequently elsewhere: In the former Sense, the Passage in the *Keys* speaketh, when it saith, *the sense of the words will be most full, if Peter be conceived as Receiving the Keys in the Name both of the officers, and private members, to wit, in the Name of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren*. In the latter sense, the words of the Scheme might be taken to Run, That the Power of the keys was given to *Peter*, not as an Apostle (for then it had been Given only to the Apostles:) nor as an Elder (for then it had been only to *Elders*) but as a *Professed Believer*. And under the General Name of *Professed Believers*, not only private Brethren, but *Apostles*, and *Elders* may be comprehended. For all the Apostles & all the *Elders* are professed Be-

lievers: And so all of them may claim their Interest in the Power of the keys, according to the several measure and latitude of Power assigned to them in the Scriptures. But I will not so answer; because in the *Way* the context speaketh of such Brethren, as have not power to exercise the *Pastoral Ministry* of the word & Sacraments. But notwithstanding that the Assoylment of the contradiction is no less fair and clear. For Mr *Cawdrey* well knoweth (and so doth any *Logician*;) That to a contradiction, It is a necessary Requisite (amongst others;) That both speak *ad Idem*. But here it is otherwise. In the *Keys* I spake of such a power of the *keys*, as *Peter* Received Formally, standing in the room of an Apostle and of an Elder, and of a Professed Believer: that is, such a Power as *Peter* having Received might exercise in his own person, and each one of them respectively. In *The Way*, I spake of such a power, as the Brethren of the Church
have

have Received not formally (farther than concerneth their own liberty) but virtually only.

For though the Brethren have not a *formal Power* to exercise the *Pastoral ministry* of the word and Sacraments, yet they have a *virtual Power* to exercise them by choosing and calling forth such Officers as have a *formal Power* to exercise the same. And there is nothing in the *Keys*, or in the *Way*, or in the *Defence*, that contradicteth this. So that both these two Passages (in the *Keys*, and in the *Way*) are so far from making a Contradiction (and that so far from making a Contradiction (and that so *flat as never any more*) as that they do not indeed amount to an *Opposition*. In an *Opposition* both parts cannot be true: here both are true. *Peter* considered as standing in the Room of an Apostle, Elder, and Professed Believer, did receive Formally all the Power of the keys: The Body of the Brethren have received, through the power of their liberty Formally;

yet all other Parts of Church Power which belongeth to Officers, they have Received only virtually and this very distinction is expressed *in terminis*, in the very same Page (27. of The Way) whence this ἐναντιόφανεσ is fetched. As for his Exaggeration of the Contradiction, That is was as *flat*, as never any more, though he to make this Comparative Speech seem less *hyperbolical*, do tell us in *Parentheses*, That Contradictions do not *Recipere magis & minùs* (and therefore if they make any Contradiction at all It must needs be as flat, as ever any was:) He may be pleased to Consider, That such a *Parenthesis*, though it make his Speech, less *hyperbolical*, yet it maketh it the more *irrational*; If I should say *Nero* was as wicked a man as ever any was, and yet presuppose all men were equally wicked (wickedness in men did not *Recipere magis & minùs*) there were very little *Reason* in Such Exaggeration.

In my former Answer to this Contradiction

(entitled, *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared*) I said the words whereon the Assertor grounded this *Contradiction*, were his own not mine. For He reporteth me to say (in the *Keys* page 4.) That the keys were delivered to *Peter* as an *Apostle*, as an *Elder*, as a *Believer*. But in his Preface (*Section 5. Number 1.*) He confesseth;

That the words are not mine *in terminis*: but in sense (he saith), they be. For I said take *Peter* not as an *Apostle* Only, but as an *Elder* also, and a *Believer* too, all may well stand together.

Whereupon he Inferreth; *Doth not this discourse clearly hold forth this Proposition, as the sense of that Text, The keys were delivered to Peter as an Apostle, as an Elder, as a Believer too? all may well stand together.*

Answer. That discourse of mine is so far from *clearly holding forth* that Proposition, that it clearly holdeth forth the contrary in express terms:

my

my express terms be, *Take Peter considered not only as an Apostle &c. now if not only as an Apostle, than not as an Apostle, For if they were delivered to him as an Apostle, then to all the Apostles, and only to the Apostles: which my words in Terminis do expressly Deny.*

But, saith he, *This Apology maketh it worse, For if it be so that whatsoever is Attributed to any as such, is given to all such universally, reciprocally, and only to such: Now Assume.*

But the keys were given to Peter as an Apostle, Therefore they were given only to the Apostles, and not to the Believers as such.

But here the Assumption is *Palpably false*, not at all delivered by me, but dragged out of my words against the letter and against the sense of them. I say the *keys* were not given to *Peter* as an Apostle only: why then not to him as an Apostle, but as He is jointly considered with other Officers and Brethren. When therefore

fore he Appealeth to the Judgement of any *Logician*, whether to say *Peter* Received *the keys* as an *Apostle* only, but as an *Elder* also, and a *Believer*, be not as much as to say, *Peter* had the *Power of the keys* given *Him*, as an *Apostle*, as an *Elder*, and as a *Believer*: Verily if that were the Judgement of all *Logicians* I should conclude, either that *Logic* had forsaken the world, or at least that myself were forsaken of *Logic*.

When *Christ* Promised the keys to *Peter*, though he spake Indefinitely, keys, yet he meaneth universally all the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And to put all the *keys* into *Peter's* hand as an *Apostle*, though it would communicate them indeed to all the *Apostles*, yet since the *Death* of all the *Apostles*, all the *Churches* and all the *Elders*, have been left destitute of the *Power* of the keys.

And if so, then why do we blame the *Seekers* who have cast off all *Churches*,

ches, and all Ordinances, 'till new Apostles come?

Again the *Replier* Argueth thus on the contrary (from that Passage in the way page 27:) *If the keys were given to Peter, not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, then to all Believers, and only to Believers. But (saith the Way) the keys were given to Peter not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, therefore they were given to all Believers (Women and all) and only to Believers.*

Answer. It hath been showed above, That in that Place in *the Way*, I speak expressly of *Professed Believers*, to have received all the power of the keys not *Formally*, but *virtually*. So that if there be some Power of the keys which they cannot exercise *Formally* as Brethren, yet they may exercise the same *virtually*, by choosing and calling forth such, as may formally exercise the same for them: which presupposed I answer to the *Major*, If the Power of the keys (which was to continue

tinue in the Church) were given to *Pe-*
ter, not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder,
but as a Believer, then it was *Given to*
all Believers, and only to believers, &
to such whom Believers shall orderly
choose, and call forth to execute the
same. As to instance in a like example,
If heat be Given to fire, as such, then
to all Fire, and only to fire, & to such
other things, as Fire communicateth
his virtue to. When therefore the
Publishers of the keys say, *The Power*
of the keys may be disposed in a due Al-
lotment into divers hands. The Repli-
er had no cause to say, *Herein they nei-*
ther Agree with me, nor with them.
They say it is put into diverse
hands, And he saith it is Given only to
Believers: And is not this a Contradi-
ction?

Answer. No verily; for when I say It
is given to Believers as such, and ex-
press *virtually*, as well as *Formally*,
The meaning is clear, It is given to all
Believers, and only to Believers, and
by them Communicated to such, as
they

they do orderly choose and call forth, to the exercise of the same. And the *publishers of the keys* I doubt not, will say as much. When I said (in *The Way*) That the brethren might not administer sacraments in Defect of all Officers, And therefore made it appear that one sort of men (the brethren) had not Received all the Power of the keys Formally. The Replier returneth, *Truly this is to Discover the Contradiction the more. For if the Power of the keys be Delivered to Believers as such, then the Power of Administering the Sacraments is Given to them: for that is a Part of the Power of the keys.*

Answer. It is wearisome to repeat so often the same answer, yet let me say it once more, and leave it; He that saith, *Believers*, Receive all the Power of the keys as Professed Believers, He saith all of them have Received the Power, and they only, and such as Receive their Power from them. And this is the force of *quatenus*

nus Tale; That whosoever Receive anything as such, all such do Receive it, & none but such as *Derive* it from them.

But saith the Replier, *In the Way*, he giveth the greater part of Church power to the body of the Church (page 45) to wit, to Ordain, and in some cases) to excommunicate *all their Church Officers*: which are highest Acts of *Rule* (as elsewhere he speaketh:) Therefore he may not *Deny them the lesser*, which is to *Administer the Sacraments*.

Answer. The answer is ready at hand, and was ready at his hand (in Part 2: of the *Congregational way cleared* page 29) where I Distinguish *Potestas* into *officiariam* and *honorariam*. Excommunication by the Brethren is the highest Act of *Honoraria Potestas*: but not of *Officiaria Potestas*. To Preach the word with Authority, and to Administer the Seals of it, are acts of the highest office-Power in the Church. Popish Divines would take it

it very ill, if any Act of Church Power were said to be higher than *Consicere corpus Domini*. But excommunication largely taken is an Act of a Power proper to a Community. Any community hath power *ex Naturae rei*, to Receive into their Communion, & to cast out of their Communion. Every sound Body hath a power to cast out his own superfluous humours, and to cut off his own Putrid members: As for *Ordination*, though we look at it (with Dr *Ames*) as *adjunctum consummans* of the People's Election, and vocation of their Officers (and therefore not utterly Excentrical from the People's power;) yet our Churches do not Practice it ordinarily, where they have Elders of their own, or can Procure other Elders to Join with them.

As for that last words in the Scheme of the first Contradiction, I know not whether the *Replier* put any weight, or stress, in that, in the first *Column*, the keys are said to be given (to
 wit,

wit, partly) to Believers, and in the same Column again to the *Fraternity*, with the *Presbytery*, in the second Column to Professed Believers, In the third to Believers Publicly Professing their Faith: And (in Mr Hooker's Judgment) Not to *Believers* as Believers, but as Believers Covenanting.

But if it be requisite to say any thing to this, I would say. 1. That the *Fraternity*, and *Professed Believers*, and *Believers Publicly Professing* their Faith, are all one. And the common Name of *Believers* is often put for all the rest, They that were *Added to the Church* (Acts 2:47: and 41:) and called by the common name of Believers Acts 2:44 and 4:32 when Mr *Hooker* saith *the Power is not Given to Believers as Believers*, but as Believers Covenanting, He meaneth the same that I do, by *Professed Believers*.

As for women (whom the Replier cast in our way before) though they be Believers and so partake in the same common Salvation, as also in the word

and seals: yet because of the frailty of their sex, they are expressly exempted by the Apostle from any Act of Power in the Church. *1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and 1 Timothy 2:11-12*. Yet that Impeacheth not the Generality of the Proposition; That all the *Fraternity* of Believers have Part in the Power of the Keys: *That all men once Die* is the general Proposition of the Apostle *Hebrews 9:27*, which is not Impeached by the Translation of *Enoch* and *Elijah*.

Having thus cleared the first Answer to this contradiction, Let us weigh next what he saith to the second Answer, which saith he is given to help out the former, for I had said.

2. *If there had been some Differences between the Keys and the Way, in some expressions: yet it lay rather in Logical Terms, then in the Doctrine of Divinity, or Church Practice, and such is this, about the first subject of the Power of the Keys.*

What saith the Replier to this? He Returneth a double exception.

1. Saith He, *Had it been only a lesser*

ser Difference about a Logical Notion (as he minceth it) the Assertor had not observed it. But a difference (of the highest magnitude) to Contradiction, in Delivering a New way is very Remarkable. How shall we be brought to Agree with them that contradict not only one another, but one man himself.

Answer 1. It was not any weakness of the first Answer, that needed a second to Help it out, but variety of fit matter for a just Defence produced it: It needed no help, but to clear itself from groundless exceptions.

Answer 2. The seeming Difference between the *Way* and the *Keys* (if any be in this point) it lieth rather in *Logical expressions*, than in the Doctrine of Divinity, or Church Practice. For whatever the Different Judgements of men of our way may be, touching the first subject of the Power of the *Keys* (some Placing it in the Body of the Church, others Dividing it between officers and Brethren:) yet in the *Doctrine of Divinity* we all Agree with one Accord, that

the Church (even the Body of Churchmembers) have power to choose their officers, to Admit members, and to censure offenders: And that the officers only have Power to Preach the word with office and Authority, and to Administer the Sacraments. And according to this unity of judgement is the uniform Practice of our Churches. And therefore let *mincing* be left to the *curious Cooks* to prepare their shred meat for queasy stomachs; or let it be left to such as would make the best of a bad cause: we neither *Distrust our Cause* to be of God, nor do fear any thing more than it should be hid, and clouded with prejudices and calumnies from such as know it not, and yet seek the Truth in sincerity. And therefore let the *Replier* be pleased to consider, whether the Difference be indeed any more than in a *Logical Notion*: and whether they be the words not only of an *Assertor*, but of an *Avenger*, to style it a *Difference of the highest magnitude*? Surely if there were not some more then
common

common zeal and Indignation in the cause, A *Contradiction in Logical Terms*, would not be counted a *Difference of the highest magnitude in Divinity*: nor would such Difference in words so easy to be reconciled, be blown up to so high an opposition, as a *Contradiction*.

2. His second exception is, *That Howsoever the first Subject is indeed a Logical Term, yet the matter Discoursed is Doctrinal Divinity: And whatsoever the Practice be, It is a Contradiction in Divinity as well as in Logic.*

Answer: But I hope it hath appeared, there hath been found no Contradiction at all, neither in Logic nor in Divinity, though there have wanted no *Industry* to search it, not *animosity* to charge it. And therefore your Question is easily Answered, *How shall we be brought to Agree with them, that Contradict not only one another, but one man himself?* For here is yet no Contradiction found of one man to himself, nor any Appearance of Contradiction neither in one

man nor other, unless it be only in *Logical Terms*, and scarce therein. But If the *Replier* defer his Agreeing with *Divines* or Churches, in any way of Religion, till he meet with such as neither *Contradict themselves*, nor one another, He must neither be Protestant nor Puritan (as they have been called) nor of the *Presbyterian*, nor *Congregational* way.

What if it be said (in the way, page 45.) *The brethren of the Church might Proceed (to wit, upon just, and weighty grounds) against all their officers is well as one? yet is such cases our Churches are never wont to proceed, but in the Presence, and with the Consent and approbation of other Churches?*

Why the saith he their Doctrine and Practice agree not, which is the greater Blemish.

How hard is it for a heart *leavened with Prejudice* to take good things in good part? A free man, *sui juris* having his father's consent) might marry a wife (if he would) without the Brethren's consent: And for *Adultery*, he might

might put her away also without their Consent, And yet he will not do either, without their consent, and Approbation. Is this man's Judgement contrary to his Practice, and is it the greater Blemish? what say we to *Paul*? He Received his *Gospel*, *neither of man, nor by man*. And he might have Preached it every where boldly and confidently, and have called an *Anathema* upon all such as had gainsayed Him, whether *Angels or Apostles* Galatians 1:8-9, yet he chose rather to go up to *Jerusalem* to confer with the *Apostles* about his whole Gospel, Galatians 2:1-2, and that lest he had *Run in vain*, or should *Run in vain*. What then? shall we say Then *Paul's Doctrine and Practice Agree not, which is the greater Blemish?* God forbid. Christian Prudence and Religious care to Prevent offence, will condescend to clear Righteous Proceedings to all judicious and equal minds. And yet neither cross his own judgement of his own Right, nor blemish (but rather Honour) himself by Approving it to others.

3. I gave a third Answer to the former Charge of Contradictions, which he saith, I *Added to succour both the former.*

But the Truth is, they need no succour to Defend themselves against such exceptions: but it is an Honour to truth, to have many witnesses to attend upon it.

I said it for the third Answer, "That it were no just matter of calumny, If in some latter Tractate, I should Retract or express more commodiously, what I wrote in a former less safely: as *Augustine &c.*

Whereto he replyeth, Truly Sir, *It had been no just Calumny so to do, but matter of Honour and Reputation rather. But to write Contradictions, and to take no notice of them, till observed by others: and then to be so far from Retracting, as to stand upon Justification of them, is nothing like Augustine's Practice, and so falleth short of his Reputation.*

Answer: Though *Augustine* Retracted, what he was convinced of, to be erroneous, or unsafe, yet he did not Retract

tract what everyone objected against him, (not only what *Faustus*, or *Petilius* or *Julian* objected, but not so much as what *Jerome* himself objected,) but justly stood upon his own Defence. Had *Vindex* his objections been Convictions, Reason, and (I hope) conscience, would not have suffered me to Justify known Errors. He doth himself bear me witness, That he hath sometimes heard, I have often *changed my opinions*. And (I thank God) I take it for no shame to change for the better.

But to confess I am *convinced*, when I am not, and to Retract what a Stranger (though a Brother) conceiveth erroneous, to wit, in his Judgement, but not in mine own, It were as much as to live by another man's Faith, and not mine own: and with all to cast myself under that Reproach, which the Title of his Book implicitly casteth upon me.

*A wavering minded man is unstable
in all his ways.*

*In the conclusion of his Preface he saith, there
are in that Prefatory Epistle to the Way,
and*

and in that other to the keys, other Differences observed, between the Author and the Prefacers, but the Author is not pleased to take Notice of them.

It is too hard perhaps to Reconcile others to himself.

It is well if he can Reconcile himself to himself.

Answer. This is the word not of an *Assertor* but of an *avenger*, (whose heart is hot, *Deuteronomy 19:6*), But Though Mr *Cawdrey* know not so much, yet I have taken Notice of those Differences, and have Advertised the Prefacers of the same, whom it concerned. My letters to them are not present at hand with me: If they were I should not think it meet to publish them. In the Preface to the *Keys*, the Prefacers note a Difference between me and them about the *Prophecying of Private Brethren*, concerning which I sent them word, I *Discerned* no Dissent at all between them and me in that Point, though they had Added a case or two of liberty, more than there they did express.

Whether

Whether it be too *hard* for me or no to Reconcile others with myself it is enough, that I *keep the unity of the Spirit with them in the bond of Peace*: and that I have learned *Placidè ferre contra Sentientes*.

But howsoever I hope (by the help of Christ) I shall soon *Reconcile myself to myself*, unless the Replyer can prevail with me so far, as to make me not only to *fall out* with myself, but to *fall off* from the Truth too, or else convince me that I have so fallen, and yet even so I hope the Lord will help me rather to Reconcile myself to the Truth, than myself to myself.

CHAP. 2

Touching the second Pretended contradiction, with the 3,4,5.
The second Contradiction which the Replyer chargeth is delineated in the Scheme thus.

2. *The*

1. *The keys are given to the Church of Believers, The Way* page 1 that is a combination, of Faithful men, as Mr Hooker.

2. *The key of knowledge belongeth to all the faithful, whether joined to any particular Church or no. The Keys* page 11.

2. *The key of knowledge is given not only to the Church, but to some before they enter into the Church,* Keys, page 2.

Answer. This term the *key of knowledge* is taken from our Saviour's words, in *Luke 11:52*, where he Reproveth the Lawyers, who had taken away the *key of knowledge*, and neither entered in themselves, nor suffered others to enter. The words argue, that the *entering in* was not into the visible Church: for into that the *Lawyers* had entered, and were willing to admit others. He speaketh therefore of *entering into the state of Grace*, and so into the kingdom of Grace and Glory. The solution then is plain and easy, The key of knowledge (or Faith) belongeth to all the faithful, whether Joined to any particular Church or no. For by it they enter into the Kingdom of Grace and Glory. But if we speak of

of the keys of a Particular visible Church, they are all given to the Church or Congregation of Believers.

Touching the third Contradiction.

The third Contradiction is decipered thus.

3. *The key of Order is common to all the members of the Church: Keys page 8. Then say we, to Women and Children.*

3. *It is not every place, or Order in the Church, that giveth Power to Receive Ordinances, much less to Dispense them, as Children and Women. Way Cleared part 2, page 19.*

Answer. 1. It hath been Answered above, that *such General Propositions* hold true, notwithstanding some known *particular exceptions*. It is appointed to all men once to Die: which is an undoubted Truth, though *Enoch* and *Elijah* never Died.

Answer 2. The Children of Church-members are in *Order* to Baptism, but excluded from the Lord's Table. 1 *Corinthians* 11:28.

Women have some *parts of the key of Order*

Order, whereby they have power to walk *Orderly* themselves, and in a private way to help others to walk *Orderly* also, *Acts* 18:26; *Titus* 2:3,4,5.

Only they have not *Power to Admit* members, choose Officers, censure Offenders. But if they have any part of the *power of the keys*, the Proposition is true, yea and it were true also, though they had been kept from all Interest in the Exercise of the keys.

Touching the fourth Contradiction.

The fourth Contradiction is thus laid out.

4. *Ordination is a work of Rule.* The Way, page 49. *Ordination and Jurisdiction (both Acts of Rule) pertain indifferently to all the Presbyters,* *ibid.* page 49.

4. *As for Election, & Ordination of Officers these things the brethren may do (if need be) without Officers,* The Way, page 45, 101.

4. *Ordination is not an Act of Supreme Jurisdiction, but of Order rather,* Hooker's Survey, part 2. 75.

Answer. Ordination, They that make the least of it make it an *Act of Prayer*, & such Prayer, by which the less is blessed of the

the greater; as it is in all Prayer which is Joined with Imposition of hands; which Argueth, it is an Act of *majority* of Power: and majority of Power may without a *Solæcism* be called, *Rule*: though not office-Rule, yet Honourable pre-eminence. I nowhere call it an *Act of Supreme Jurisdiction* which is that Mr *Hooker* Denies; and seemeth to Deny it, not *Positively* neither, but *comparatively* rather. *Ordination* (saith he) *is not an Act of Supreme Jurisdiction, but of Order rather*, then there is no contradiction here. Nor will it be found in the other *clause*, for though Ordination and Jurisdiction be said (in the *Way* page 49) to pertain indifferently to all the Presbyters: yet that is expressly spoken in opposition to the *Lord Bishops*, who usurped both into their own hands, as their peculiar prerogative: and though I say, (elsewhere in the *Way*), that in Election & Ordination of Officers, the Brethren may act (if need be) without Officers: yet the very word of limitation (if need be) Argueth,

eth, that in *ordinary cases*, ordination pertaineth to the *Presbyters*, as other Acts there mentioned do pertain to the Presbyters, and Brethren met together: but as for *Election*, I take it to pertain principally to the Brethren.

Touching the 5th Contradiction.

The 5th Contradiction followeth in this sort.

5. *The key of Authority, or Rule is committed to the Elders of the Church, and so the Act of Rule is the proper Act of their office*, Keys, page 20.

The People discerning, and approving the Justice of the censure give consent and Obedience to the will and Rule of Christ, Keys page 15, 37, 41.

The People stand in an Order, even an orderly Subjection according to the Order of the Gospel, page 11.

5. *In case the Officers do Err and give offence they shall be governed by the whole Body of the Brethren*, The Way, page 100.

The Church exerciseth several Acts of Authority over the Elders, The Way, page 101.

The People have some stock of Power and Authority in the Government of the Church, page 36.

They Rule the Church by Appointing their own officers. *ibid.*, page 16.

Answer. 1. The former Column in all the three Places speaketh of *Elders* walking in the right Administration of their office

office then in Propriety of speech the *Key* of Authority and Rule is committed to them, 1 *Timothy* 5:17, and is there made the proper Act of their office, Then it is that the People Discerning the will and Judgement of Christ in their Judgement, they do give *Consent* and *Obedience* to the will of Christ in Censures Advised by them, Then it is also that they walk in orderly subjection to their Elders, *Hebrews* 13:17.

But the latter Column speaketh of the Power of the Church over the Elders chiefly in case of the Elders *mal-Administration* of their office, or misgovernment of themselves. But then the Power which the Church putteth forth, It is not office Power (which is properly Authority:) but *Potestas honoraria*.

Answer 2. In Column the second when it is said; The People have some *stock of Power* and Authority in the Government of the Church, *Keys*, page 36. They are the words of an objection, not of mine own Affection, And though

D

some

some where I speak of Acts of Authority over the Elders, I do clearly explain myself in the *Keys* (page 36) That Authority is taken in a large sense, and after a sort, when it is Acknowledged, in the people over the Elders, As

1. When a man acteth according to his own will freely, he is then said to be *αὐτεξούσιος*, *Dominus sui Actus*, so the People in all the Acts of liberty, which they put forth, they are *Domini sui Actus* Lords of their own Actions.

2. The people by sundry Acts of liberty (as in Election of officers, in sending forth their messengers, in concurrence with their Elders, in the Admission of members, and censure of Offenders, in the Determination and Promulgation of Synodical Acts) They have a great *stroke* and Power in the Ordering of Church Affairs: which may be called *κράτος*, or *Potestas*, a Power which many times (in Common speech) goeth under the Name of Rule or Authority. But in proper speech, It is indeed a Privilege, or liberty, an *ἐξουσία*,
or

or Power rather than Authority. It is a common speech usual amongst our best Divines, That the Government of the Church is mixed of a *Monarchy*, an *Aristocracy*, and a *Democracy*. In regard of Christ the Head, the Government of the Church is Sovereign and *Monarchical*. In regard to the Rule by the Presbytery it is *Stewardly* and *Aristocratical*: In Regard of the People's Power in Elections, and censures, It is *Democratical*.

Chap. 3. Touching the sixth Contradiction.

The sixth Contradiction is thus Presented.

6. *Examination is one of the highest Acts of Rule: and therefore cannot be performed, but by some Rulers.* Keys, page 16.

The Church cannot Excommunicate the whole Presbytery, because they have not received from Christ an office of Rule without

6. *If all their officers were found Culpable either in Heretical Doctrine, Or in scandalous Crimes, the Church hath Lawful Authority to proceed against them all. The Way,* page 45.

In case of offence given by an Elder, or the whole Eldership
D 3 ship

6. *Excommunication is not an Act of the Power of office, but of judgement, Nor an Act of highest rule but of supreme Judgement seated in the Fraternity.* Surv. part 3, page 45.

As a Church of

without their officers, *ibid.*

No Act of the People's power doth properly bind unless the Authority of the Presbytery Join with it. *Ibid.* page 36.

ship together, the Church hath Authority to require satisfaction, and if they give it not, to Proceed to Censure. *Ibid.* page 101.

of Brethren can not proceed to any public Censure without the Elders so not the Elders without concurrence of the People, Preface to the Keys, page 4.

Answer 1. Here is indeed a Discrepancy in Expressions between the *Way*, and the *Keys*. But it was not my Act, that any such Discrepancy should have been extant. The truth is, That many years ago, (and some years before the suppressing of the Bishops in England) I was *seriously* moved by some of our Brethren, and fellow Elders here, to Draw up an *Historical* Narration of our *Church-way* together with some familiar grounds of the same briefly. In short time as God Helped, I dispatched it, which when our brethren had perused, I saw they did not close with it. Yet a Brother going for England, got some where a Copy of it, and Presented it to some of the *Congregational* way there:
and

and I afterwards heard, that neither did they close with it: and in particular not with that Passage, which is here recited, as a part of the Contradiction. Which since appeareth more openly, by the *Asterisk* put upon that Passage, and upon sundry other in the Book: But before I saw that, and had only heard, That they did not fully Accord, I hoped it had met with a timely suppression, rather than an impression: for I heard no more of it, for two, or three years after: Meanwhile perceiving That one main Point of Dissatisfaction, was the Authority given to the Fraternity, I considered more seriously and Distinctly, of the whole Power of the *Keys*, and expressed my Apprehensions in that Treatise of the Keys, which our brethren here did well Accept, and so did the brethren (of like Judgement) in England, and some of them were pleased to Attest it with the Preface which is now extant before it: yea I have heard (as well as some other of our Brethren here) by some letters from England, that

Reverend Mr *Rutherford* (who was a great Part of the Assembly at Westminster) offered to the Dissenting brethren, That if they would come up to the Treatise of the Keys, themselves would meet them there. But this was sundry years, after the Treatise of the *Way* had been finished, and carried to England, and (as I hoped) suppressed. But it seemeth some Brother there, having got a Copy of it, being zealous of the Authority of the *Fraternity*, and Perceiving that their Authority was not so fully Acknowledged in the *Keys* as in the *Way*; He caused his Copy of the *Way* which was indeed abrupt in the entrance, and imperfect otherwise) to be Published in Print: which when I saw, It troubled me not a little, as knowing, That the Discrepant Expressions in the one, and in the other, might trouble friends, and give Advantage to Adversaries. Afterwards Mr *Hooker* coming down from *Connectiquol*, to consult with the Elders here about his Book; He pleaded seriously for the Placing of
all

all Church power, primitively, in the Body of the Church, and also for their Judiciary Power of Censure over the Presbytery, suitable to what I had delivered in the *Way*; Now, though I cannot say, that his Reasons did prevail with me, to lter the Placing of the *First Subject* of the *Power of the Keys*, from what I had delivered in the Treatise of the *Keys*: yet Perceiving that some men's Judgements did more Adhere as to his Judgement, so to the former course of the *Way*: others to that of the *Keys*, I suffered both to stand as they did, especially seeing I could not help it, the Book of the *Way* being published without my Consent; and both the *Way*, and the *Keys* being dispersed into many hands (past my Revoking) and Refuted by some; So that if the Replier find some *Discrepancy* in one of these books from the other, Let him know that the Doctrine of the *Way* (in such few Points wherein it differeth from the *Keys*) was not then mine when the *Keys* were published, much less when the *Way* was

published, which was many years after, though it had been penned many years before. And yet take all the Discrepancies, and weigh them (I will not say with Candour but with Rigour) and I do not yet remember, not can I yet find any of them, but they lie rather in Difference of *Logical Notion*, than in *Doctrine of Divinity*, or Church Practice, as I said before.

Answer 2. This further; let me Acquaint both the Replier, and the Reader withal, that sometimes there hath grown a Question, amongst us whether all Excommunication to be an Act of *Officiaria Potestas*, or not some *Honoraria* only? If of *Officiaria*, It cannot be Dispensed by the Brethren only, as the first Column hath it. If of *Honoraria*, It may, and so the second Column hath it: and then the Contradiction is not *ejusdem*.

Neither is this Censure dispensed by the brethren (as I conceive) one of the highest Acts of Rule (which is to deliver unto Satan 1 *Corinthians* 5:5) but Reacheth

eth only to cast their Elders, out of Administration of office to them, and out of Church Communion with them. The Truth is, *Ego libenter in eorum me numero esse Profiteor, qui proficiendo Scribunt, & Scribendo proficiunt*; which gave some occasion to Add the third Answer given above to the first Contradiction, Some things in the way which I delivered more laxly, I express more distinctly in the Treatise of the *Keys* which followed after: and some things more fully and clearly, in the *Way Cleared*, than in either of the former.

Answer 3. When I say No Act of the *People's* part, doeth properly bind, unless the Authority of the *Elder* join with it (*Keys* page 36) I would be understood to speak it as I meant it, of the Elders walking without offence; in the Right Administration of their office, and Conversation of their lives.

Answer 4. When Mr *Hooker* saith, Excommunication is not an Act of *Office*, *Power*, nor of *Rule*, but of supreme *Judgement* seated in the *Fraternity*,

ty, I easily grant that the Excommunication dispensed by the *Fraternity* is not an Act of *Office-Power*; But it may Justly be Inquired, whether Excommunication, being Dispensed by the Elders with the consent of the Church, be not an Act, as of the Churches honourable Judicial Power, so of the Elder's Office-Power, and the Rule in the Church? For as the Pastoral Preaching of the Elders is *Official*, and so *Authoritative*, though the Preaching of other Brethren (as of the Sons of the Prophets) be not so: so why may there not be the like Difference, observed here? To deliver unto Satan seemeth to be an Act of *Judicial Office-Power*, as when in another case it is said, *The Judge delivereth a man to the Officer, and the officer casteth him into Prison*, Matthew 5:25. He that *casteth unto Prison* is an Inferior officer. The Judge must therefore be a Superior officer, that delivereth an offender to the officer, to be cast into Prison. In the Excommunication of the *Incestuous Corinthian* (where both the Elders and Brethren

Brethren concurred) the sentence might well be delivered in Terms that express an Act of highest Authority, To *deliver unto Satan*. But where the Church is called to Act against their *Elders* (who corrupt them with false Doctrine) there the Apostle Requireth the Church, to *mark them, and Avoid them*, Romans 16:17,18, which may express an Act of liberty, and *Judicial Power*, but not of Authority.

CHAP. 4.

Touching the seventh Contradiction and eighth.

The seventh Contradiction is thus gathered.

7. *It was a sacrilegious Breath of Order, That Commissaries and Chancellors wanting the Key of Order (no Ministers) have been invested with Jurisdiction. Yea and more then Ministerial Authority, above those Elders, who labour in word and Doctrine. The Keys page 16.*

7. *There is a Key of Power given to the Church (with the Elders) as to open a door of entrance to the Minister's calling, so to shut the door of entrance against them in some cases &c. The Keys p. 9. Yea to Censure all their Elders (without Elders) The Way p. 45. as before.*

Ans.

Answer. The power given to the *Commissaries, Chancellors &*: I justly called a *Sacrilegious Breach of Order* in more Respects than one.

1. In that being no *Ministers*, they exercised more *than Ministerial Authority* over the Elders. For Ministers do not exercise Authority over Elders, no nor over any Brother, but with consent of the Church. But these do it without, and against the Consent of the Church.

2. In that they exercise this Authority even in Churches wherein they have not Received the *key of Order*, and so stand not so much as in the Order of Members amongst them.

3. In that they proceed against them, not for crimes committed against the word of God, but for Neglect of Popish Canons or Human Traditions.

But now no Authority allowed to *Brethren* either in the *Keys* or in the *Way*, cometh near to this Breach of Order.

For 1. in *Joining* with the Elders
to

to open a door of entrance to *Minister's* calling, They put forth no Act of *Authority* (properly so called) at all: but only exercise a *liberty* and Power orderly which they have Received from the Lord Jesus, to elect their own officers, As the People's election of *Deacons* (Acts 6:2 to 5th) And their lifting up of their hands in the choice of Elders (Acts 14:23) doth declare. And when they do *shut them forth* it is not without their *Elders*, where their *Elders* are not wanting, or not wanting to their Duty. And even then, they put forth no Act of *Office Rule*, or *Authority* (properly so called) as the *Commissaries* do, but only an Act of Judicial Power common to the whole Church, 1 *Corinthians* 5:12.

2. The People do exercise this Power only in their own Church where themselves are members, and have Received a *key of Order*.

3. They proceed not against any, much less against their Elders, but for notorious offences, committed against the
the

the Word of God, in Doctrine or life, so that this Contradiction speaketh as little *ad idem* as any of the former.

Touching the 8th Contradiction.

The 8th Contradiction is represented thus.

8. *We are so far from Allowing that Sacraligious usurpation of the Minister's office, That private Christians ordinarily take upon them to Preach the Gospel Publicly, The Keys, page 6.*

8. *This is ordinarily Practised in England, and Allowed by the Independent Brethren. Yea they being but in the Notion of Gifted Brethren, no Ministers to other Congregations, do it ordinarily themselves.*

Answer 1. This Contradiction is not of *me* to my *self*, but of some others, who whether they be *Independents* truly so called, I do not know: sure I am, that Presbyterians and Independents are not *membra Dividentia*, though I see, that all that are not for *Popery*, or Episcopacy, or Presbytery, do commonly lurk under the style of *Independency*. I hope the replier would be loathe to Renounce the protestant Religion, because
there

there are found some contradictions, and greater than these, in one of them to another.

Answer 2. When I call it a Sacrilegious usurpation for *Private Christians Ordinarily* to take upon them to Preach the Gospel Publicly, & to Administer the Sacraments; yet this *latter of Administering the Sacraments the Replier leaveth out*, and so the Contradiction is not *ad idem*: which is a Common failing in this, and the rest. For I would not say that it is a Sacrilegious usurpation, for well gifted Brethren (where ordained Ministers cannot be had) there to Preach ordinarily and Publicly, especially if they be Approved by those that have Power, and requested thereto by the People, wherein I go further in giving way to the Prophecyng of Private Brethren, than my Reverend Brethren (the Prefacers to the *Keys*) do, who only Allow them to *Preach occasionally*, and not ordinarily, which I speak only to this end, That the Replier and others may know, there is more
consent

consent and Agreement in our Judgments, than they take notice of, or sometimes ourselves either. But if Private Brethren do *Administer the Sacraments* at all whether ordinarily, or Occasionally, It seemeth to me like the Fact of *Uzziah* in offering Incense.

CHAP. 5.

Touching the 9th Contradiction.

The 9th Contradiction is laid out thus.

9. *A Particular Church of Saints Professing the Faith (that is members without offices) is the first subject of all the Church Offices, with all their Spiritual Gifts & Power, Keys,* page 31.

9. *As the keys of the kingdom of Heaven are divers, so are the Subjects to whom they are committed diverse, Keys,* page 11. *The Apostles were the first subject of Apostolical power, ibid.* page 32. *A Synod is the first Subject of that Power whereby Error is convinced, and condemned, ibid.* page 47.

9. *The Power of the keys belongeth firstly to a Congregation of Covenanting Believers, Surv. part p. 219. The Power of the keys is in the Church of Believers, as in the first subject, ib. p. 195. That conceit is wide to make one first subject to this power, & yet others to share in this power, not by means of that, for this is to speak daggers, and Contradiction, ibid.*

Answer I.

Answer 1. This is one of those Differences, of which I spake before, that lieth rather in *Logical Notion*, than either in *Doctrine of Divinity*, or in Church Practice. Against which the exception made above, hath been Answered above, in clearing the first Contradiction.

Answer 2. There is no *colour of Contradiction* between the two former *Columns*. For when I say A Particular Church is the *first Subject* of all the Church Officers and their Gifts, I speak not of this or that particular Church, (which is but an *Individual*) but of a Particular Church taken *Indefinitely*, which (by mere error of the Printer) is without sense said, taken *Independently*, which is the Disadvantage of us, who live so far remote from the Press, that we can neither prevent their mistakes nor correct them afterwards. But take a Particular Church *Indefinitely* & it comprehendeth all *Particular Churches*: And that God hath given to Particular Churches all spiritual officers together

E

with

with their Gifts, for the Discharge of their offices, is Proved by evident Texts of Scripture, in that very Page of the *Keys* 31. I do not say (as some do) that the *Church* meaning the *Fraternity* is the *first subject* of all spiritual Gifts (for then they had received them *immediately* without officers:) but I say the offices and Officers, not devoid of Gifts, but furnished with their gifts, are given by Christ to the *Church freely*, and not to any other Person or Society, from whom the Church Receiveth them.

But this no whit crosseth, what is said in the second *Column*, That *Elders* are the *first subjects* of ordinary Ministerial Power, and Apostles of *Apostolical Power*, and Synods, of *Synodical Power*. A wife may be the first subject of her *own* Dowry, but yet her Husband is the first Subject *Recipient* of his wife with her Dowry.

Answer 3. As for what is said differently by my *Brother Hooker* in the third *Column*, as his Person and Gifts and
Friend-

Friendship were precious and dear to me whilst he lived: so now that he resteth in Glory, his Name and memory, and labour (saving some very few private Notions) are honourable, and blessed, with me, and I suppose with all that knew him. But in this *Logical Notion*, I crave leave, not so much to dissent from him (for he herein Dissented from me, who wrote first, rather than I from him) but leave I crave not to Retract what I formerly wrote in the *Keys* touching this Point, though I should as much suspect mine own judgment, where he Dissenteth from me, as where any man. It is true he taketh the Church of Covenanted Believers to be the first Subject of the power of the keys, which if he mean no more, than that they have all Church-Power either *formaliter*, or *Radicaliter*, and *Virtualiter*, then there is no Difference in our expressions; but if he mean that they are the first Subject of all Church-Power properly, two or three things Detain me from consen-

ting with him herein. 1. That which is the first Subject of any Power Receiveth it immediately without any other Intervening Subject. As *fire* being the first *Subject* of Heat, Receiveth not his Heat from any former Subject. But it is evident, That many a Church of Believers, hath not Received *Pastoral Gifts*, nor it may be any Gifts fit for office, 'till they fetch them from other Churches, and sometimes from some who are not members of any Particular Church at all.

2. The first Subject of any Power, as it hath immediately Received it: so it may immediately exercise it: as Fire (the first subject of Heat) can Heat without Intervention of any other subject.

But the Church hath not Power immediately to exercise *Pastoral Preaching*, or Administration of the Sacraments, 'till it have procured and chosen, and called forth some or other Gifted Persons to exercise the same.

3. I might Add a third Reason to
both

both the former. Whatsoever is properly the *first Subject* of any Power, It hath that same Power, or some other equivalent, and *analogical* to it, not only *radicaliter* and *virtualiter*, but *Formaliter* also. And because *formaliter*, therefore *radicaliter* and *virtualiter*. For whatsoever is in any Subject Firstly, (whether it be proper Adjunct, or proper effect, or any other proper Argument) it either floweth from the *form*, or from the *matter* so formed; As for instance, capacity of Learning, or *Risibility* is in Man, as in the first subject. The former floweth from the *Reasonable* soul: the latter from the *matter* of a man so formed. But neither of these are in man *radicaliter* or *virtualiter*, but only because they are in a man *formally*, and so either flow from the *form*, or from the *matter* so formed. Take another Instance, and of another sort. The People that have power to *elect a King*, though they have not *formally* kingly power, yet have they a *formal Power*, to submit

themselves to Kingly Power. And so having a formal Power to put one of the Relatives, they have a æquivalent and *Analogical* Power to put the other Correlative. For, *Posito uno Relatorum, Ponitur etiam & alterum.*

As for that which is quoted by the Replier from Mr *Hooker*, in the last clause of the third Column of this contradiction, I see not how it concerneth me, or contradicteth anything in the former Columns. For I do not make any first Subject of Church-Power, and yet others to share in that Power, but not by means of that. But as the *keys of the kingdom of heaven* are diverse: So I see no Inconvenience, that the first Subjects to whom the several keys are committed, may be diverse also. Neither doth the letter of the Text seem to me to gainsay that, *Matthew 16:18.* For though it speak, not to *Them* but to *Thee*; a Representing one state or Condition of men: yet say that one condition to be believers and take Believers in a large sense, It comprehendeth

deth all sorts of Professing Believers, whether Private members, or Elders, or Apostles, indeed all. But neither do I see any convincing reason seeing *Peter* stood in a threefold Ecclesiastical Relation (being both an Apostle, and an Elder, & a Professed Believer) why Christ committing the keys to him (saying to Thee will I give them) might not Intend to give all the keys; and the several sorts of them, according to the several Relations he stood in.

If it be said All that share in the subject to whom the keys are Given (in these words, *To Thee*) they all share alike in the same *equal Power* of the keys, because they have all the same Commission: I Answer it would indeed so follow, It there were no other *several Commissions*, granted in Scripture elsewhere, but only here; But clear it is from other Scriptures. That Power of *Authoritative Preaching*, and Administering the Sacraments, is Given only to Apostles, Elders, and such like officers: but Pow-

er of Privilege and Judgement, is given all the Fraternity.

CHAP. 6

Touching the 10th Contradiction
with the 11th, 12th, 13th.

The 10th Contradiction is thus held forth.

10. *Pastor and Flock are Relates: and so he is a Pastor to none but his own Congregation. This is the Common Tenent.*

10. *The members of any Church we Admit to the Lord's Table (if they bring letters testimonial) and their Children to Baptism. The Way p. 68. The Keys p. 17.*

10. *Administration of Sacraments is a Ministerial Act: and what Authority hath a Pastor to do it, or they to Receive it from him to whom he is no Pastor? Mr Hooker Surv. Part*

2. 64,65. *Pastors and Teachers might Pray and Preach in other Churches besides their own, but not Administer seals and Censures. Bartlet's Model, page 63.*

Answer 1. That Appearance of Contradiction is easily Removed, if our Doctrine and Practice be known, as it is, what a Pastor doeth in his own Congregation, and to his own Flock, he doeth it by Pastoral Power, and Authority,

thority, what he doth to the members of other Churches, abroad, or out of his own Congregation, He doeth it not *Authoritative*, but *Precariò*, and not in a constant, but in a transient way: which the communion of Churches doth not only Admit, but readily (as occasion serveth) Desire. What Mr *Hooker* doubted of in this Point, he Answereth himself at the end of the same *Page 65*.

If *Paul*, *Apollos* and *Cephas*, things present and things to come, be all Given to the Particular Church of Corinth (1 *Corinthians* 3:22) who yet had no peculiar Interest in them more than other Churches. By the same Right all the officers, and all their Gifts are theirs also, in the same way. Theirs they are not *κατὰ χρῆσιν* (for each Church hath his peculiar offices, as their own propriety): Then they are theirs *κατὰ χῆρσιν*, for their use, not *Authoritatively*, nor *Ordinarily*, but occasionally, as God giveth opportunity; *Ordinarily* as the *Officers* must attend to their own *Flock*, so must the *Flock* Depend upon their
own

own *Officers*. The officers have no Authority over any Flock, but that which the Holy Ghost hath committed to them: Neither can any other Flock command the employment of any of their Gifts, or any act of their office amongst them. But upon occasion, in a transient way, as they may have need of their Gifts, so they may have need of some Act of their Office, and accordingly may Desire it, and Receive it.

The 11th Contradiction which is
set forth.

11. *We Receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (say the same of Baptism) as a seal of Communion, not only with the Lord Jesus in our own Churches but in all Churches of the Saints.*
Keys page 17, Del. of 9.
Posit page 133,134.

11. *Baptism (and so the other Sacrament) dealeth up the External Communion with a Particular Church &c.* Mr H Surv. Part 3, page 27.

And he disputes against it, as to the Catholic Church.

Answer: When we say, that the Sacraments are Seals of Communion with the Lord Jesus not only in our own Church, but in all the Churches of the Saints,

Saints, we do not mean that they seal up the same measure of External Communion with other Churches, as with our own. They do not seal up this Communion, That their officers are our officers, and we their Flock: Or that we have the same Power over them, which we have over our own members. This were to seal up not a Communion but a Confusion of Churches; And this is that which Mr *Hooker* in the place alleged doth deny as ourselves also do.

The 12th Contradiction is thus
declared.

12. *It is an Act of the Elders' Power and Authority to Examine whether Officers, or members, before they be Received of the Church,* Keys page 21.

12. *As for Admission, Election, Ordination of Officers, Admission or shutting out of Members, these things the Brethren may do without officers,* The Way p 45, 101.

Answer: The Answer is Obvious, what the Elders do in this kind, *Ex Officio*, The Church may do the like in the want of Elders.

The

The 13th Contradiction is set before us thus.

13. *Ordination is then Complete when the People hath Chosen an Officer, and the Presbytery hath laid their Hands on him, Keys, p. 37.*

13. *But if the Church want a Presbytery, for want of Elders they want a warrant to Repair to the Presbytery of another Church to Impose hands upon their Elect Elders, Way, p. 50.*

Answer: In that place of the *Keys*, I only Assert and Prove, That a man of *Sufficient Gifts* chosen by the People of the Church, and Ordained by the Presbytery of his own Church, wanteth nothing to the complete Integrity of his calling. The *Right hand of Fellowship* given by the Elders of other Churches expresseth their Approbation of his calling, but addeth nothing to the essence, or Integrity of his calling.

But when I say that in want of a Presbytery of their own, they want a warrant to Repair to the Presbytery of another Church for his Ordination, I nowhere say, That the *Officer Elected*,

Elected, wanteth the complete Integrity of his calling, for want of the Imposition of hand, of the *Presbytery* of another Church. And yet that had been requisite to make up a pretence of a Contradiction. The Replier knoweth that a Church wanting a *Presbytery* of their own to lay hands upon an Elect Officer in our Judgement, they may appoint some of the *Elders* and graver Members of their own Body, to supply the Defect of their own *Presbytery*; which we account sufficient to the completing of his calling in such a case.

But when I said (in the *Way*) That the Church wanting a *Presbytery*, they wanted a warrant to Repair to the *Presbytery* of another Church to *Impose hands* upon their Elect Elders, I meant in way of Subordination to the Extrinsic Power. For it is against that which both Reasons Plead, which I there Alleged for that Purpose. But I nowhere dislike, That a Church wanting a *Presbytery* of their own may send

send for Elders of other Churches, to Assist them, and to Join with them in the Ordination of their Elect Officers.

CHAP. 7.

Touching the 14th Contradiction
with 15 and 16.

The 14th Contradiction is this laied out.

14. *Paul and Barnabas were Ordained to that Office (of Apostleship) by the Imposition of hands of some officers or Members of the Church, Way, p. 45.*

14. *In Acts 13:2,3 There is no Ordination to Office at all: for the Apostles had their office before Mr Hooker, Surv. Part 2, p. 83. This was not to put a new office upon them, but to confirm their sending to the Gentiles, ibid. p 60.*

14. *This was done in a Particular Church Keys, p. 29. The officers of one Church did what was done in an ordinary Way, Surv. Part 2, p. 83. Then is follow-*

eth (by Mr C.) his Doctrine that the Apostles who were officers in all Churches were ordained in a Particular Church: or that officers of a Church may be ordained in another Church: which he said was unwarrantable.

Answer I. When I say (in the *Way*) That *Paul and Barnabas*, were ordained
to

to the *Apostolic* office by Imposition of hands of some officers of the Church at *Antioch* (Acts 13:1,2,3) It is not Disproved (by Mr *Hooker*) saying that they had had their office before. For I nowhere say, That ordination Giveth the office, but only Approveth it and Solemnly (as it were), Installeth the elect officer into it, and sendeth him forth with a Blessing into the Administration of it. Neither when he saith, That there is no Ordination unto office at all, doth he contradict what I affirm, For his meaning is, to Deny it in Mr *Rutherford's* sense, who speaketh there of Ordination, as *Giving the calling* unto the office: which Mr *Hooker* Disproveth, and therein I concur with him. For it puts no New office upon them, but Bare witness to that calling, which the Holy Ghost has given them.

When Mr *Hooker* saith, The Officers of one Church did what was done in an ordinary way, He himself inferreth the consequence, *Therefore it is no Precedent for the Pastors of many Churches,*
what

what either they may or should do.

But the Inferences which Mr *Cawdrey* gathereth, as from my Doctrine out of that Text, either will not hold, or not hurt our cause. For this Inference will not hold, *That then the Officers of one Church may be ordained in another.*

For they were as much Officers of the Church of *Antioch*, as of any other Churches, It will only infer, That they who are officers in many Churches, may be *Ordained* in any one of them.

The other inference will in part follow That some of the Apostles (who were Officers in all Churches) may be *Ordained* in a Particular Church, when the Holy Ghost calleth for it. For they Act now not in their own Name, or Power, but in the great Name, and Sovereign Power of the Lord *Jesus*, who is Head of all Churches.

But what Prejudice is that to our cause? or wherein doth it contradict any of our Tenents?

The

The 15th Contradiction is thus Declared.

15. *What if the whole Presbytery offend? The readiest course is to bring the matter to a Synod, the Keys,* page 43.

15. *There is a readier and nearer way, The Brethren may censure them all, Way page 45. If the Congregation be found faithful and willing to Remove an offence by due censure, why should the offence be called up to a more public Judicature. Keys page 42.*

Answer. This contradiction is made partly out of the concealment of Part of *my* words in the first Column, and Partly out of the *Addition* of some words of his *own* in the second Column. In the former Column I say, *If the whole Presbytery offend, or such a Part as will draw a Party, or Faction in the Church with them, the readiest course then is, to bring the matter to a Synod where those words, such a Part as will draw a Party, or Faction in the Church with them, are given for the just Reason, why in such a case, the case of the offending Presbytery, or other such Leading members*

F

in

in the Church should be brought to a *Synod*, before it be censured in the Church. But in the words recited in the latter *Column*, I speak of the Congregation as Agreeing together, and both faithful and willing to Proceed against *Heretical* Doctrine and Scandalous crimes in whomsoever. And then they need not Trouble the *Synod* to clear the case, which is already clear unto themselves, so that this Contradiction speaketh not *ad Idem*. The one *Column* speaketh of a Church, Divided into *parts* and *Factions*, and their readiest course is to bring the matter to a Synod. The second *Column* speaketh of a Church both *faithful* and willing to Proceed against offences with one accord. And then they have sufficient Power within themselves, to judge that which is right, and to execute their Judgement. That which is Added of the *Replier's own words*, in the latter *Column*, doth help not a little to make up an Appearance of the Contradiction. In the *Keys* I had said (In the case above mentioned)

It

It is the *readiest* course to bring the matter to the Synod. In the *Way* he quoteth my words, as if I had said, *There is a readier and nearer way*. The Brethren may censure them all. If these words had been mine, there had been an *Appearance of Contradiction*.

To say this is the *readiest course*, and yet to say, a Discrepant course is a *readier and nearer way*, is (at least, *verbo tenus*) an apparent Contradiction. But the Truth is, Those words are *none of mine*, but the *Replier's own*. And so it will be an easy matter to make up Contradictions (*tot quot*) if we may take leave, in one sentence to *conceal* Part of the words necessary to make up the sense, and in another sentence to *Add* words of our own.

The 16th Contradiction is delivered thus.

<p>16. It belongeth to the civil Magistrate, to establish pure Religion, in Doctrine, worship and Government: partly by civil Punishment upon the wilful oppressors, and Disturbers of the same, Keys, page 50.</p>	<p>16. Yet the Brethren here call for, or Tolerate Toleration of all Opinions and Deny the magistrate Power to Punish any Pretending conscience Bartlet's Model, page 128.</p>	<p>16. See Mr Bartlet's Model, p. 25. Contra.</p>
---	--	---

Answer 1. This *Contradiction* labourereth of the same Disease (as the rest generally Do). It speaketh not *ad Idem*. Such as require the *Magistrate* to establish Pure Religion, in Doctrine, worship and Government, and to Restrain the wilful opposers and Disturbers thereof by civil Punishments, They speak of *Fundamentals in Religion*, and such opinions as apparently tend to *libertinism*, and licentious ungodliness, as Mr *Bartlet* expresseth it, *Model* page 126.

But the *Toleration* which they Allow
and

and call for, is of such opinions, as neither subvert the *Foundation* of Religion, nor Practice of Piety. Both these may be maintained without the least show of the face of Contradiction. Further I find this in Mr *Bartlet*, That himself and some others are not free, That Heretics should be put to Death, in case they keep their errors to themselves, and do not seek to seduce, and corrupt others. And though I grant, that such an Heretic after once or twice Admonition may be Rejected out of the Church (according to *Titus 3:10,11*) yet I do not find, that *Moses* condemned them unto *Death*, unless they became *blasphemers*, or *Idolaters*, or *Seducers to Idolatry*. What Christ, and *Moses* do both of them Tolerate, the Servants of Christ need not to be ashamed of such Toleration.

Answer 2. This Contradiction (for ought I can Discern) laboureth also *Crimine falsi*. For it seemeth a manifest untruth, what he speaketh in *Column 2.* That the Brethren call for, or Tolerate Toleration of all opinions, and

Deny the magistrate Power to punish any Pretending conscience, Mr *Bartlett* Alleged for the proof hereof, p. 128 saith no such thing, And the contrary he proveth, from the express Testimony of Mr *Burroughs*, Mr *Thomas Goodwin*, & others of that way.

The 8th Chapter. Touching the 17th
Contradiction with 18, 19.

17th Contradiction is thus set forth.

17. *Visible Saints though they be Hypocrites inwardly, are the matter of a visible church.* Mr *Hooker*, part 1, p 14, 15.

17. *You say Saints in outward Profession are the matter of a Congregational Church:* we judge that real Saints uttering in Discourse the Breathings of the *Holy Spirit*, and *experiences* of conversion, interested in a stricter conversation to be the matter. Dr *Holmes* Epistle to *Way* cleared, page 4.

Mr *Bartlett* speaketh something (this language) *Can their be Ability for spiritual & holy services, where the spirit is not yet given? Can there be communion between light and Darkness? Can they edify one another in the Faith, that have not the work of Faith wrought in them?* Model. p. 57. See more page 103.

Answer. What Mr *Hooker's* Judgement was,

was, is expressed in that first *Column*: what mine own, is declared, and I hope, cleared in the *Holiness of Church-members*. What Dr *Holmes* and Mr *Bartlett* do further require in it, they Declare what *Church-members* ought to be *de jure*, especially in their first constitution, rather than what they are, or are wont to be *de facto*, especially in their Declension. Again I see Mr *Bartlett* speaketh in opposition to the members of the *Parish Churches*, who are in many places Ignorant, loose, profane and scandalous livers, who are not indeed *visible Saints*, page 56.

It is true there is some work of the Spirit, wherever there is a visible Saint. But the Spirit giveth many Gifts to the edification of others (as to *Judas* and *Demas*) which often do not reach to the Regeneration of him that Receiveth them.

The 18th Contradiction is thus stated.

18. *The form of the visible Church is the Covenant, either explicit, or implicit: and the latter is sometimes fully sufficient.* Mr H. Surv. part 1, pages 47,48 and others.

18. *You say an implicit uniting, viz. A walking and communicating with you is a sufficient evidencing of the Form: we say, Their solemn confession of their faith & express open covenanting with the Lord to walk with such a body of Saints, in all ways of Christ to be manifest Form, D Holmes, ibid.*

18. *It is not general Profession will serve the turn, but there must be a peculiar engagement and appropriation to this or that particular body, Mr H. Surv. page 63. Yet he said An Implicit Covenant was sufficient.*

Answer. The expressions of Mr H. quoted in *Column 1:* and *Column 3:* will not amount to an *opposition* of himself, much less to a *Contradiction*. For though he make an *Implicit Covenant* sufficient, yet a *general Profession* will not serve the turn; to make an *Implicit Covenant*. For an *Implicit Covenant* must be with Reference to this or that particular *Body*; or else it is neither *Covenant* at all, nor *Implicit*. A *General Profession*

Profession enetereth not any man into any Relation with any Church, unless he offer himself to Join with them as Mr *Hooker* in that Place more largely, & truly openeth himself. Neither doth Dr *Holmes* his expression contradict him. For he that maketh the *explicit Covenant* the manifest form of the Church, He doth not gainsay the implicit covenant to be a *real* Form of the Church, though not so *manifest* but more obscure.

The 19th contradiction is thus delineated.

19. *We crave leave of the Author of the Keys, To Declare that we Assent not to all expressions, or all and every Assertion in it: As in these Particulars. About the Prophesying of Private Brethren.*

2. *That the Assembly (Acts 15.) was a Formal Synod.*

3. *That the Apostles Acted in it, as Ordinary Elders, Preface to Keys, page 6.*

19. *We do in this Epistle certify our Assent to the way of the Churches of New England saving that we do not fully close with some expressions passim in the Book: before some of which (10 at least, belike there are more) we minded to Note a star in the Margin. This we could not but say and do (pace Authotis) or we could not Assent, Epistle to the Way, page 2.*

19. *Yet they are angry that we call for a fuller Declaration of themselves, Epistle to the Way, p. 1. and Epistle to the Way cleared, page 2.*

Ans. I.

Answer 1. Though my *reverend Brethren* crave leave to dissent from me in some expressions (which they may safely and freely do without my leave, for I profess my spirit subject to the Prophets:) yet about the *Prophecy* of private Brethren, I must again Profess as I did before, That I do not *know*, wherein I Dissent from them: unless it be that I Allow somewhat more liberty to the *Prophecy* of private Brethren, than they do. The Allowance, which they give is with four limitations.

1. That it be done *occasionally*, and not in ordinary course.

2. By men of such *Abilities*, as are fit for office.

3. Not assuming this to themselves, but as they are allowed, and designed to it by such, as have Power.

4. That their *Doctrine* be subjected to the Teaching Elders of the Church. Grant these limitations, and I never scrupled (to my remembrance) the liberty of *Prophecy* by private Brethren,

thren, yea this liberty I should further grant, that though the private Brethren be not furnished, with abilities fit for public office, yet there be occasion, to call them forth to exercise their gifts; as in the sudden sickness or absence of the Minister, and other officers, why may not a private brother be called forth by the Church, or stirred up by the Spirit of God in himself to stand up, and with leave, instruct and exhort the Church, to make a Sanctified use of such a sudden stroke of Providence? Or what if a private Brother of good credit in the church shall observe the Doctrine of the Ministers not so much valued as we meet? why may he not take occasion, to speak some words of encouragement, and confirmation, both to the *Minister* and to the *Congregation*? *Jehoshaphat's Nobles*, though Princes, yet were but as *Private Brethren* in the Church, as bearing no Public Church office: yet they taught in the Cities of *Judah*, what Respect was due to the Ministry of the *Levites*,
whom

whom they brought with them, when my beloved Brethren do not acknowledge the Assembly of Apostles, Elders and Brethren, *Acts 15*. To have been a formal Synod of Messengers sent out of a set and combined Association from neighbour churches, They do not herein Dissent from me. For the two Churches of *Antioch* and *Jerusalem* were too far remote to stand in a set, or combined Association, and therefore they may well deny it to be a *Formal Synod*, according to the Form of Synods now in use in *Presbyterial* Churches. But that that assembly had the true matter and form of a just *Synod*, As I do believe it, so I do not see that my Brethren deny it. For the efficient cause of the *Synod*, the Church of *Antioch* sent messengers: and the Church of Jerusalem (whose officers were sent unto) they freely gave them a meeting, and the Church with them. For the matter of the *Synod*, they had the *Messengers*, officers, and Brethren of both Churches met together in the Name of Christ.

Christ. It is not necessary to the being of a *Synod* the convention of the Messengers and members of many Churches, The convention of two Churches (by themselves or Messengers) may make a Synod. If the convention of one Church may make a *Synagogue*, why may not the convention of two churches make a *Synod*? The form of a *Synod* they had, in Arguing, and disputing the case in hand, and freely giving in their *Judgements* from scripture grounds, and at length determining the whole cause with the Joint consent of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren, and Publishing the same by letters, and messengers to all the churches whom it concerned. The establishment of Peace and Truth in the churches, was the *end* of this *Synod*, as it ought to be the end of all. It is true, here was a consultation, in that the church of *Antioch* sent for counsel: and the Apostles and Elders met to consult, and consider the matter. But consultation was but one Act of the Assembly, many other *Formal Acts* of a
Synod

Synod they put forth besides which have been specified. The Apostles though they did put forth some Acts of their Apostolical Power, in helping to clear the Truth by explaining obscure Scriptures, and in Ratifying the conclusion with some greater *Plerophory* of the mind of the Holy Ghost: yet in Putting such things to Augmentation, and Disputation, and allowing Elders and Brethren liberty of Putting in their votes, and determining, and publishing the sentence, in the Name and with the common consent of all, herein they Acted as *Ordinary Elders* and messengers of churches, might and ought to do.

The *Notes* of about Ten *Passages* in the *Way*, wherein our Reverend Brethren in *England* (or some of them) say they could not fully close with them, without Affixing an *Asterisk* to them, If I knew where the Pinch of the Difficulty lay, I would Address myself, to give them fuller satisfaction either by condescending to them, or giving them just Reason why I could not, Meanwhile

I have learned (through Grace) not to *fall out with my Brethren*, for greater differences in judgement, then those be.

That which is added in the third Column, that they are offended (and, as you call it, *Angry with you*) for that you call for a fuller Declaration of themselves, for that, themselves can best give you an Account: for

1. It may be, they think it needless to Publish further declarations, because over & above the former Declarations, there have been published three, or four Pithy Pregnant Declarations of the same Argument; as Mr *Hooker's* surv: Mr *Norton's* Answer to *Apollonius*, the *Synod* at Cambridge, the Defence of the *Answer* to the nine Questions.

2. It may be they fear, If they should publish more declarations in this case, It would Add rather more Fuel to contention, then Prevail with the Spirits of men, contrary minded to Receive satisfaction.

CHAP.

CHAP. 9

Touching the 20th Contradiction and 21.

*The 20th Contradiction is thus Ex-
pressed.*

20. *It is generally asserted by them, that one Church hath not Power to Censure another.*

20. *A Synod hath Power to Determine, to withdraw Communion from them, if they cannot heal them, Keys, page 24.*

20. *The sentence of non-Communion denounced against whole Churches. Apologetical Narration p. 18, 19. If a Sentence denounced it is a Censure.*

Answer: To withdraw Communion from a church, is no more an Act of Power over a church, than it was to Join in Communion with them. Communion and non-Communion are Acts of the same power: both of them Acts of privilege or liberty. And if withdrawing Communion be not an Act of censure, then to determine so to withdraw, is no Act of an higher Nature.

Though

Though a *Censure* is a *sentence denounced*, yet every *sentence denounced* is not a *Censure*, unless it be *Denounced* by an higher power, than that of equals. When the Ten Tribes *denounced their Rejection* of service to *David's House* (1 Kings 12:16) It was not a censure more than theirs, who solemnly *Rejected the Rule of Christ: we will not have this man to Rule over us*, Luke 19:14.

The last Contradiction is declared
thus.

21. *We Say Instituted worship and Ordinances do not flow immediately from spiritual union, and Relation to Christ, and his members &c. Def. of 9. Pos. page 76.*

He must come at them in a right Order, to wit in Fellowship of the Church Surv. page 2.

21. *Then it followeth, that Hearing the word Preached Singing of Psalms and Baptism, belong not to any, but such as are members of a Particular Congregation.*

And yet they say Ordinarily hearing is no sign of a Church member, Surv. part 1, page 18.

21. *A Person hath his first Right to the Sacrament (and so to other Ordinances, because He hath an Interest in the Covenant of the Gospel, Surv. part 1, page 65.*

G

Ans.

Answer: Here is no semblance of Contradiction, Mr *Hooker Surv.* saith, a *Person* hath his first Right to a Sacrament, because he hath an interest in the covenant of the Gospel. The *defence* saith he hath not immediate Right till be a member of a Particular Congregation. And so saith the *Survey* too, in the Place Alleged. If *Immediate* Right, and *first* Right were all one, there were some colour for the Exception: but it is far otherwise; in having Christ, we have a first Right to all things, but not an Immediate Right but in God's way.

But neither hence will it follow, that Instituted Ordinances; as hearing the word, singing of Psalms, belong to none but to members of a Particular Congregation. For though they be given to such *firstly*, and *Immediately*: yet for their sakes to all that come in amongst them. The Children's Table and the Provisions thereof is *first Allowed* to the Children of the Family; yet in a Bountiful House-keeper's family, such part
of

of the Provisions may be Allowed to strangers, as they may be fit to partake in.

FINIS