

**The Bloody Tenent  
Washed  
and made White in the Blood of the  
Lamb**



**The Bloody Tenent  
Washed  
and made White in the Blood of the  
Lamb**

by

**John Cotton**

**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

As is often common with books of this era there are pagination mistakes.  
There are two pages 119 and 120 and no pages 127 and 128. Pagination  
restarts after pages 196. In the original page 143 is misnumbered 134.

THE  
**BLOODY TENENT**

*WASHED*

**And made white in the blood of the  
Lamb: being discussed and discharged of  
blood-guiltiness by just Defence.**

WHEREIN

The great Question: of this present time are handled,  
*v i z .* How far Liberty of Conscience  
ought to be given to those that truly fear God? And how far  
restrained to turbulent and pestilent persons, not not on-  
ly raze the foundation of Godliness, but disturb the Civil  
Peace where they live? Also how far the Magistrate may pro-  
ceed in the duties of the first Table? And that all Magistrates  
ought to study the word and will of God, that they may frame  
their Government according to it.

DISCUSSED

As they are alleged from divers Scriptures, out of  
the Old and New Testament. Wherein also the practice of  
Princes is debated, together with the Judgement of An-  
cient and late Writers of most precious esteem.

*whereunto is added a Reply to Mr WILLIAMS'*

Answer, to Mr Cotton's Letter.

---

BY JOHN COTTON, Batchelor in Divinity, and  
Teacher of the Church of Christ at *Boston in New-England.*

---

LONDON,

Printed by *Matthew Symmons* for *Hannah Allen*, at the *Crown* in  
*Popes-Head-Alley.* 1647



THE  
**BLOODY TENET**  
WASHED AND MADE  
WHITE IN THE BLOOD  
OF THE LAMB

OR

The Bloody Tenet difficult and  
discharged of blood guiltiness, by  
Just defence.

**CHAPTER I**

**T**he *Bloody Tenet* (I mean the book styled by that name, tending to discuss an holy and wholesome truth of God, slanderously styled the *Bloody Tenent*) was put forth against the Royal Law of the love of the Gospel. *Mr Williams* sent me about a dozen years ago (as I remember) a letter, penned (as he wrote) by a Prisoner in *Newgate*, touching persecution for Conscience sake: and en-  
B treated

my judgement of it for the satisfaction of his friend. I was not willing to deny him any office of Christian love, and gave him my poor judgement in a private letter. This private letter of mine he hath published in Print after so many years, and there with a Refutation of it. If my letter was Orthodoxal and tending to satisfaction, and edification, why did he refute it? If corrupt, and erroneous (especially if bloody) why did he publish it?

The letter, and so the error contained in it, (if it was an error) it was private, and so private, that I know no man that hath a copy of it, no not my self who penned it (for ought I could find) but himself only, if I did offend him by the writing of such an error to him (though by himself entreated to express my judgement) let him remember, he pleadeth for liberty of conscience: I wrote my conscience and the truth of God according to my conscience, in the sight of God. Why should he punish me with open penance, and expose me (as much as in him lieth, before the world) to open shame, as a man of blood, for the liberty of my conscience? How will it stand with his own principles, to plead for liberty of conscience and yet to punish it? Besides let him remember, if I did offend him with such an error, it was but a private offence, and the rule of the Gospel required, he should first have convinced and admonished me privately of it, and so have proceeded upon my contumacy, at length to have told the Church, before he had published it to the world. But such as seek for new Apostles, must seek also for new Gospel, before this manner of dealing can be justified, by the Gospel of Christ. That book of his therefore being thus begun against the rule of the Gospel, no marvel if it swerve from the truth of the Gospel all along. He that setteth forth out of his way in the first entrance of his journey, no marvel if he wander all the day after.

---

## CHAPTER 2

*Of the title he prefixeth to my answer of the prisoner's letter.*

IN printing my answer to the prisoner's Letter, he prefixeth this title *The answer of Mr John Cotton of Boston in New-England professed*

*professedly maintaining Persecution for cause of Conscience.*

This Title trespasseth not only against the Creator of Christian love, which is wont to take even doubtful things in the fairest sense: but even against the Law of truth. For in the whole purport of my Answer to the Letter, both in stating the Question, and in answering Objections, I expressly profess, 1. *That no man is to be persecuted at all (much less for Conscience sake:) because all persecution is oppression for Righteousness sake.* 2. *I Profess further, That none is to be punished for his Conscience sake, though Erroneous, unless his Errors be Fundamental, or seditiously, and turbulently promoted, and that after due conviction of Conscience: That it may appear, he is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.*

Thus, whilst he pleadeth for Liberty of Conscience, he taketh Liberty to his Conscience openly to publish, That I do professedly maintain Persecution for cause of Conscience. When I do in express terms professedly Renounce it. This Liberty of Conscience setteth the Conscience at Liberty, *Calumniandi audacter.*

*Objection:* But it may be, by consequence, I do maintain Persecution for cause of Conscience, though in express terms I professedly Renounce it.

*Answer 1:* What if such a thing might be inferred by consequence? men's judgements and professions are not to be taken up from every unwary consequence, against their own positive and express Declarations, and Professions. It is justly taxed in *Bellarmino* as a slanderous Calumny, that he bringeth in *Luther, Calvin, Martyr, Bucer*, making God the Author of sin, which all of them in express terms do avoid; yet he would fasten such a blasphemous Tenet upon them (forsooth) by consequences. In like sort by the like consequences is the *Bloody Tenet* fastened upon me. When the eyes are blood-shotten, or look through a red glass, all things about them will appear red and bloody. But if this Tenet have any appearance of blood in it, It is because it is washed in the Blood of the *Lamb*, and sealed with his blood. And then though it may seem bloody to men of corrupt minds destitute of the truth, (as *Paul* seemed to such to be a Pestilent fellow) yet to faithful and upright souls, such things as are washed in the Blood of the *Lamb*, are wont to come forth white, as did the followers of the *Lamb*, *who washed their Robes white in the Blood of the Lamb* (Revelation 7:14).

---

### CHAPTER 3

*A reply to the third Chapter of the Bloody Tenet discussed, what is a cause of Conscience in general.*

**I**N stating of the Question I propounded some distinctions for clearing of the Point. The 1. Was this in mine Answer to the Letter of the Prisoner.

*By Persecution for cause of Conscience, I conceive you mean, either for professing some point of Doctrine, which you believe in Conscience to be the Truth: or for practising some work, which you believe in Conscience to be a Religious duty.*

#### Discusser

*This distinction is not full and complete. For besides both these, a man may be persecuted for cause of Conscience, because he dare not be constrained to yield obedience to such Doctrines and worships, as are by men Invented, and Appointed; As the three famous Jews were cast into the fiery Furnace (in a non-conformity to the whole conforming world) before the Golden Image, Daniel 3:21 &c.*

#### Defender

Thus a man may find a knot in a Bulrush, yea thus a man that were disposed might find fault with the Comforts of God for not being full and Complete: with the Affirmative Comforts, because they do not express the Negative; and with the Negative, because they do not express the Affirmative. He that maketh it persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for professing such Doctrine, which he believeth in Conscience to be the truth, he maketh it (a Pari) Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for Renouncing such Doctrines, which he believeth in Conscience to be Erroneous. And he that maketh it Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for practising such a work, which he believes in conscience to be a Religious duty, He maketh it no less Persecution for cause of Conscience, when a man is punished for not practising such a work, which he believeth in Conscience to be a sin.

Chap. 4

---

## CHAPTER 4

*A Reply to his fourth Chapter touching the distinction of Doctrines, Some fundamental others circumstantial and less Principal.*

**I**n points of Doctrine (*I said in my Answer to the Prisoners Letter*) *Some are Fundamental, without right belief whereof, a man cannot be saved: others are circumstantial, and less Principal, wherein one man may differ from another in judgement, without prejudice of salvation on either part,*

### Discusser

*To this distinction (He saith) Truth dare not subscribe, for then thousands ten thousands should everlastingly be condemned, yea the whole Generation of the Righteous, who since the falling away, have and do err fundamentally concerning the true matter, Constitution, Gathering, Governing of the Church. And yet far be it from any pious Breast, to Imagine that they are not saved &c.*

### Defender

Fundamental doctrines are of two sorts: Some hold forth the foundation of Christian Religion, as the Doctrines of salvation by Christ, and of faith in his Name, Repentance from dead works, Resurrection from the dead; and the like. Others concern the Foundation of the Church, as the matter and form of it, and the proper Adjuncts accompanying the same: The Apostle speaketh of both these sorts of Foundations together, *Hebrews* 6:1–2.

I speak of the former sort of these only, namely the Foundation, or fundamental points of Christian Religion, which who so subverteth, and Renounceth, he renounceth also his own salvation. The other sort I look at as less principal, in comparison of these, though some of them have a fundamental use in Church order. It was pertinent to the Question propounded in the Prisoner's Letter, to express how far I allowed Toleration even in such fundamental Errors, as subverted the Foundation of Christian

Christian Religion. And in other Errors less dangerous, such as neither subverted Religion, nor Salvation, It would easily be conceived, that Toleration, might more easily be allowed.

How far *New English Churches* partake with the Old English Parish Churches in any of the Ordinances of God, and upon what ground, hath been declared in the Reply to the Answer of the other Letter. Where also it hath been cleared, how far off the Churches here have been from persecuting, or oppressing any of their Brethren for presenting light to them about this point: which may prevent and still the lamentation of peace, in the beginning of this fifth Chapter.

---

## CHAPTER 5

*A reply to his fifth Chapter concerning a distinction of Points of Practice.*

**I**n Answer to the Prisoner's Letter, I said in points of Practice, some concern the weightier *Duties of the Law*, as *what God we worship*, and *with what kind of Worship*: whether it be such, as if it be right, Fellowship with God is held: If false, Fellowship with God is lost.

### Discusser

*It is worth the inquiry, what kind of worship he intendeth, whether in general acceptation the Rightness or Corruptness of the Church, or the Ministry of the Church, or the Ministrations of the Word, Prayer Seals &c?*

*And because it pleases the Spirit of God to make the Ministry one of the foundations of Christian Religion (Hebrews 6:1–2) and also to make the Ministry of the Word and Prayer, in the Church, to be two special works (even of the Apostles themselves, Acts 6:2) I shall desire, it may well be considered in the fear of God.*

1. *Concerning the Ministry of the Word, if their new Ministry, and ordination be true, then the former was false: And if false, then will it not follow according to this distinction, that fellowship with God was lost?*

2. *Concerning*

2. *Concerning Prayer, the New English Ministers have disclaimed and written against the Worship of God by Common or set forms of Prayer, which yet themselves practised in England.*

*And though they were faithfully admonished for using the Common Prayer, yet at that time they satisfied their hearts with the practice of the Author of the Council of Trent etc. But now I ask, whether or no, fellowship with God in such prayers was lost? &c.*

3. *God's People may live and die in such kind of worship notwithstanding light presented to them able to convince yet not reaching to a conviction, and to forsaking of such ways, which is Contrary to his Conclusion, That Fundamentals are so clear, that a man cannot but be convinced in Conscience after once or twice Admonition: And therefore such a person not being convinced, he is condemned of himself, and may be persecuted for sinning against his Conscience.*

4. *I observe here that Mr Cotton herein measureth to others, that which himself when he lived in such practices, would not have had measured to himself. As 1. That it might have been affirmed of him, that in such practices he did sin against his Conscience, having sufficient light shining about him. 2. That he should or might have been cut off by death, or Banishment, as an Heretic sinning against his Conscience, &c.*

### ***Defender***

1. *It needs no inquiry what worship I mean, whether Church, and Minister, or Ministrations of the Word, Prayer, Seals &c. For I mean none of these, as they are dispensed in the Churches of England. Though there have been corruptions in the order and dispensations of these things amongst them, (especially in the times when we lived there) yet neither their Churches, nor Ministry, nor Ministrations were such, or so false that fellowship with God could not be held of them, not only inwardly and secretly, but also outwardly and visibly: not only in inward conversion and conviction, but also in outward and visible Reformation according to light received. Take my words as I wrote them, and as he relateth them, and my meaning is plain enough: I speak of such worship, which if false, fellowship with God is lost: which cannot truly be avouched of any part of the Worship of God in England.*

It

It is not truly said, that the Spirit of God maketh the Ministry one of the Foundations of Christian Religion, *Hebrews* 6:1,2, for it is only a foundation of Church Order, not of faith, or Religion, the Apostle puts an express difference between faith, and Church Order, *Colossians* 2:5. Nor is it true and safe speech, to call the Fellowship or blessing of God vouchsafed to corrupt Churches, or Ministers, or Ministrations *to call it, I say unpromised, or to be beyond a word, or promise of God*. For it is a large and yet an express promise of the Covenant of Grace, that God will be merciful to our iniquities (*Jeremiah* 31:34). That he will be merciful to every one that prepar-eth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the Purification of the Sanctuary, 2 *Chronicles* 30:18, 19, 20, with many more such like. And therefore there wants not Promises of Grace and blessing to the People of God, notwithstanding some defects and impurities found in their Administrations. Neither will it follow, *that if our Ministry, and Ordination here be true, that then the former which we had in England was false, especially so false, as that according to visible Rule, Fellowship with God was lost*.

For the Rite of Ordination we do not look at it as any Essential Part of our vocation to the Ministry, no more than Coronation is an Essential Part of the Office of the King. And though we do not justly sundry things found in our Ministry, yet *Jehoshuah* the High Priest did not lose his Fellowship with God, though he was clothed with filthy garments, *Zechariah* 3:3, 4.

2. Concerning Prayer, though the *New English* Ministers have witnessed against the Common set-Form thereof, which yet our selves in our ignorance have sometimes used, and have therefore seen just cause to judge ourselves since: yet we did not thereby lose fellowship with God by such sins of Ignorance, no more than the People of God did in the days of *Hezekiah*, by sacrificing to God in the High places, when yet they did it to the Lord their God only, 2 *Chronicles* 33:17.

I know no such faithful Admonishers, as presented to us in *England*, *Arguments against the Common Prayer, which then seemed weak, but now are acknowledged to be sound, though such a thing possibly may be true, howsoever forgotten. But this I am persuaded to be utterly false*, that any of us satisfied our hearts with the *Practice of the Author of the Council of Trent, who used to read some of the choicest select*

*select Prayers out of the Mass-book. The Spirit of a child of God, though upon occasion he may receive such a Practice, yet he can never satisfy himself with the Practice of any godly man for the warrant of his Imitation without some further light (or at least apprehension of light) from the word.*

3. *It is readily granted, (that which is observed in the third place) That God's people may live and die in such kinds of Worship, though light from the Word, whether publicly or privately hath been presented to them able to convince.*

Nevertheless, that will not weaken the Conclusion (formerly mentioned, and afterwards further discussed) *That Fundamentals are so clear, that a man cannot but be convinced in Conscience of the Truth of them after two or three Admonitions: and that therefore such a Person as still continueth obstinate, is condemned of himself: and if he then be punished, He is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his own Conscience.* For both these may well stand together, and are far off from crossing or contrariying one another. A set form of Prayer, though it be unlawful, yet it is not such a Fundamental Error either in judgement or practice, as cutteth off from fellowship with God: That is only a resolute Assertion of the *Discusser*, but avouched without all colour or pretence from the Scripture. There is some resemblance and proportion between Praying and Prophesying; *Moses* used an unwarranted way and Form of Prophesying, when God Commanding him to speak to the Rock before the Congregation of *Israel*, He spake not to the Rock, but stroke it with his Rod, (for which he had no Commandment) and spake to the People and that in a Passion (and both without a Commandment) *Numbers* 20:8, 11. And yet this did not cut off his fellowship with God, nor God's gracious Presence with him in giving water to the People, no not at that time, God knoweth how to be present with his People, in blessing their Administrations, and forgiving their iniquities, though he do take vengeance of their Inventions, *Psalms* 99:8.

4. Though I do maintain (as the Apostle doth) a Clearness of Fundamental Points of Religion and Worship (such Fundamentals I say, without which, Fellowship with God cannot be had) and though I grant, that in subverting such Fundamental Points, and persisting therein after once or twice Admonition, a

man sinneth against his own Conscience, and is therefore censurable by the Church, yea and by the Civil Magistrate also, if after Conviction he continue to seduce others unto his Damnable Heresy; yet *I do not herein measure to others, that which myself, when I lived in such practices, would not have measured to myself.*

For I thank God, God never left me to live in any such Practices, as to fall into any Fundamental Error, much less to Persist therein after Conviction and Admonition, and least of all to seduce others thereinto. If God should leave me so far, as to fall fearfully into this three-fold degree of Heretical wickedness, what am I better than other men? better myself cut off by death, or Banishment, than the Flock of Christ to be seduced and destroyed by my Heretical wickedness.

## CHAPTER 6

*A Reply to his sixth Chapter Discussing Civil peace, and the Disturbance of it.*

**I**N this Chapter, the Discusser undertaketh to declare what Civil peace is, and to show, that the Toleration of different Religions, is no Disturbance of Civil Peace.

*First, for Civil peace, what is it, saith he, but Pax Civitatis, whether English, or Irish, Spanish or Turkish City.*

### *Reply.*

Be it so, and if the Civil State, or Common-wealth contain many Cities, or Towns, and so become a whole Country or Common-wealth, let Civil Peace be the peace of the Country, or of the Common-wealth. But what is then the peace of the City, or Country? Is it not *Tranquillitas Ordinis* the tranquillity of order in every Society, wherein the Public Weal of the City, or Country is concerned? And is it not the proper work of the Civil Magistrate to preserve the Civil Peace, and to prevent or reform the disturbance of the Tranquillity or Peace any such Societies, in whose Peace, the Peace or Weal of the City or Society is concerned? Suppose a society of Merchants or Clothiers,

or Fishmongers, or Drapers, or the like: if the Weal of the City or Country be concerned in these, (as it is much concerned in them all): It is not for the safety of the Civil State to suffer any of these so to be disturbed, as wholly to break up, and to be dissolved.

*No matter (saith the Discussor) though they do wholly break up into pieces and dissolve into nothing. For nevertheless the Peace of the City is not thereby in the least measure impaired or disturbed: because the Essence or being of the City is Essentially distinct from those particular Societies &c. The City was before them, and standeth absolute and Entire, when they are taken down &c.*

***Reply.***

If by Peace be meant (as in Scripture Language it is) all welfare, It would argue a man that liveth in the world, to be too much Ignorant of the state of the world, *to say that in the breaking up and dissolving of such particular Societies, the Peace of the City or Country is not in the least measure impaired, or disturbed.*

For 1. Though such Societies of Merchants and other Trades, be not of the Essence of the City; yet they be of the integrity of the City. And if the defect of one Tribe in *Israel* was a great trouble to all the Common-wealth of *Israel* (*Judges* 21:2,3) then sure the breaking up and dissolving of so many particular useful Societies cannot but much impair and disturb the Peace and welfare of the City and Country.

2. Though these Societies of Trades be not of the Essence of the City, yet they are amongst the conservant causes of the City: as without which the City cannot long flourish, no nor well subsist. Common sense will acknowledge so much.

Now then if all these particular Societies and several Companies of Trades, they and their peace and welfare do much concern the welfare and peace of the City and Country, and therefore it behoveth the Civil Government to provide for their peace and welfare: I demand, whether the Church also, (which is a particular Society of Christians) whether, I say, the Peace and welfare of it, do not concern the Peace and welfare of the City or Country where they live?

*If it be denied it is Easily proved:*

First, *David* saith they shall prosper that love the Peace of *Jerusalem*, and seek the good of it; *Psalms* 122:6 &c. And *Solomon* saith, *where the Righteous rejoyce their is great Glory*, *Proverbs* 28:12. And what is the Church, but a Congregation of Righteous men? If the Rejoicing of the Church be the glory of a Nation, surely the disturbing, and distracting, and dissolving of the Church, is the shame and Confusion of a Nation.

2. Consider the Excellency and Preheminence of the Church above all other Societies. *She is the fairest amongst women*, *Canticles* 1:8, and 6:1, *She is the City and House of God*, *Revelation* 21:2; *Psalms* 48:1; 1 *Timothy* 3:15. The world and all the Societies of it, are for the Church, 1 *Corinthians* 3:21, 22. The world would not subsist, but for the Church: nor any Country in the world, but for the service of the Church. *And can the Church then break up, into pieces, and dissolve into nothing, and yet the Peace and welfare of the City, not in the least measure impaired or disturbed?*

3. It is a matter of just displeasure to God, and sad grief of heart to the Church, when Civil States look at the estate of the Church, as of little, or no concernment to themselves, *Zechariah* 1:15; *Lamentations* 1:12.

*Objection 1.* *Many glorious and flourishing Cities of the world maintain their Civil Peace: yea the very Americans, and wildest Pagans, keep the Peace of their Towns, and Cities, though neither in the one, nor in the other can any man prove a true Church of God in these places.*

*Answer.* It is true, where the Church is not, Cities and Towns may enjoy some measure of Civil Peace, yea and flourish in outward prosperity for a time, through the Patience and Bounty and Long-sufferance of God. *The times of Ignorance God winketh at* *Acts* 17:30. But when the Church cometh to be Planted amongst them, If then Civil States do neglect them, & suffer the Churches to corrupt, and annoy themselves by pollutions in Religion, the staff of the Peace of the Common-wealth will soon be broken, as the Purity of Religion is broken in the Churches. The Common-wealth of *Rome* flourished five hundred years before the Kingdom of God in his Church came amongst them: and the decays of the Common-wealth occasioned by the persecutions of the Church, were Repaired by the Public establishment of  
the

the Churches peace in Christian Emperors. But when the Churches began to pollute themselves by the Idolatrous worship of Images, and the Christian Emperors took no care to reform this abuse in Churches, the Lord sent in (amongst other barbarous nations) the *Turks* to punish, not only degenerate Churches, but also the Civil State for this wickedness. And therefore the Holy Ghost upbraideth them for their continuance in Image worship, though the *Turk* were let loose from the River *Euphrates*, to scourge them for it, *Revelation* 9:14, 20. Go now, and say, the estate of the Church whether true, or false, (pure or corrupt) doth not concern the Civil Peace of the State.

*Objection 2. The Peace of the Church (whether true or false) is spiritual, and so of an higher and far different nature from the peace of the Country, or People, which is merely and Essentially Civil and human.*

*Answer 1.* Though the inward peace of the Church be spiritual and heavenly: yet there is an outward peace of the Church due to them (even from Princes and Magistrates) in a way of godliness and honesty, 1 *Timothy* 2:1,2. But in a way of ungodliness, and Idolatry, it is an wholesome faithfulness to the Church if Princes trouble the outward peace of the Church, that so the Church finding themselves wounded and pricked in the house of their friends, they may repent, and return to their first Husband, *Zechariah* 13:6; *Hosea* 2:6, 7.

*Answer 2.* Though the peace of the Country or Common-wealth be Civil and humane, yet it is distracted and cut off, by disturbing the spiritual purity, and peace of the Church. *Jehu* cutting short his Reformation, God cut short the coasts of the Civil State, 2 *Kings* 10:31,32.

*Answer 3.* Civil Peace (to speak properly) is not only a peace in civil things, for the Object; but a peace of all the persons of the City, for the Subject. The Church is one Society in the City, as well as is a Society, of Merchants, or Drapers, Fishmongers, and Haberdashers, and if it be a part of Civil Justice, out of regard to Civil Peace, to protect all other Societies in peace according to the wholesome Ordinances of their Company, is it not so, much more to protect the Church-Society in peace, according to the wholesome Ordinances of the Word of Christ?

Chap. 7.

---

## Chapter 7

*A Reply to his seventh Chapter: Discussing what it is to hold forth a Doctrine or Practice in an Arrogant and impetuous way tending of itself to the disturbance of the Civil Peace.*

**H**ERE 2. things he complains of, 1. That I have not declared what this Arrogant and impetuous way is: 2. That he cannot but express his sad and sorrowful observation, how it pleaseth God to leave me, to take up the Common Reproachful Accusation of the Accuser of God's Children, That they are arrogant and impetuous.

### *Defender.*

I did not think it needful to declare what an Arrogant and Impetuous way was, seeing his Request was, not that I should compile a discourse of mine own: but that I should return an Answer to the Letter of his friend. And it is an Answerer's part not to Expatiate into declarations, but distinctly and closely to remove Objections. Besides himself is not ignorant of this point, nor needeth to be taught, what an Arrogant, and impetuous way is. For he himself telleth us (in his 8th Chapter) *That the Civil Peace may be broken by holding forth a Doctrine or practice, with railing or reviling, daring or challenging speeches (which is a way of Arrogancy:) or with force of Arms, Swords, Guns &c.; which is a way of Impetuosity.*

But if it be desired that I should declare myself herein, thus briefly take it. He holdeth forth an erroneous Doctrine, or Practice, in an Arrogant and Impetuous way, not only who carrieth it in a reviling and daring way (which is a disturbance to Civil Peace:) But also be who refuseth to subject his spirit to the spirit of the Prophets in a holy Church of Christ (contrary to 1 *Corinthians* 14:32.) which is a disturbance to the peace of the Church. And withall, he that shall oppose such as dissent from his Errors, either by violent means (as the *Circumcellians* did by Clubs, and Swords, and as *Zedekiah*

*Zedekiah* did *Micaiah* with Fists, 1 *Kings* 22:24) or by censorious reproaches, and by rejecting Communion with them even before conviction, or admonitions, all these are ways of Arrogance, and Impetuousness, and tend to the disturbance either of civil, or of Church Peace, or of both.

But for the 2. His sad and sorrowful Observation, that God hath left me to take up the common reproachful Accusation of the Children of God; as if they were Arrogant, and Impetuous in their way, on what ground the *Discussor* takes this up, I confess I cannot Imagine, unless,

*Conscius ipse sibi, de se putat omnia dici*

There is not the least jot or tittle in my Letter, that applieth this Accusation of Arrogance, or impetuousness to any of the Children of God at all. Nor had I the least thought of himself, when I wrote that Letter, who (for ought I can remember) did then keep communion with all his Brethren, and held loving acquaintance with myself.

As for these six Cases the speaketh of (or rather, ways) wherein the Children of God have opposed the stream of the times, and have thereupon been taxed as Arrogant and impetuous Troublers of the State, & yet were none such, I willingly allow them to stand good, save only they might as well be reduced to 2 or 3 Heads, as branched out into 6. But howsoever, they are nothing pertinent to the Point in hand: none of them being ways of Arrogancy, nor Impetuousness, but of well Ordered, and Christian faithfulness, and Magnanimity. If any of them did put forth acts of Impetuous violence, (as *Elijah* did in putting the Prophets of *Baal* to death, 1 *Kings* 18:40) It was done by virtue of an extraordinary calling, or else by the consent of the King and people then present.

Besides as none of the six ways wherein the Messengers of God walked against the stream of the times, were ways of Arrogance, and impetuousness, so much less were these holy men of God Impetuous, in holding forth any Error, or evil practice; which is the Point in hand.

Chap. 8.

---

## CHAPTER 8

*Somewhat more of holding forth Error in a way of Arrogance, and Impetuosity.*

**Discusser.**

*The Distinction now in Discussion concerns not Truth and Error, but the manner of holding forth, or divulging.*

**Defender.**

The distinction doth expressly speak of holding forth things Erroneous and unlawful, *either in a meek and peaceable way, or with such Arrogance and Impetuosity, as tendeth and reacheth (even of it self) to the disturbance of Civil Peace.* And therefore it cannot be said with truth, that the distinction concerneth not Truth and Error; The distinction expressly concerneth both the sinful matter held forth [things erroneous and unlawful] and the sinful manner of holding it forth, with such Arrogance and impetuosity, as tendeth to the disturbance of Civil Peace.

**Discusser.**

*I Acknowledge such may be the way, and manner of holding forth (either with railing or reviling, daring or challenging, speeches, or with force of Arms, Swords, Guns, Prisons &c.) that it may not only tend to break, but may actually break the Civil Peace.*

**Defender.**

Then the distinction is acknowledged to have a real Truth in it. What lacks it yet, but that it may stand?

**Discusser.**

*Yet those instances (to wit those 6 mentioned in Chapter 7) are Cases of great Opposition and Spiritual Hostility, and Occasions of the breach of the Civil Peace: yet the matter and manner pure, holy, peaceable and inoffensive.*

**Defender.**

Then these six instances do nothing concern the distinction  
in

in hand, which speaketh of holding forth for the matter things Erroneous, and unlawful: and for the manner in a disturbant way to Civil Peace. But it seemeth it something, if any thing, (though nothing to purpose) he said in the Discussion of a distinction, it may go for a Discussion.

**Discusser.**

*Moreover I answer, That it is possible, and common for Persons of soft and gentle nature and spirits, to hold out falsehood with more seeming meekness, and Peaceableness, then the Lord Jesus or his servants did or do hold forth the everlasting Gospel; So that the Answerer would be requested to explain, what he meaneth by this Arrogant and Impetuous holding forth of any Doctrine, which very manner of holding tendeth to break the Civil Peace, and cometh under the Cognizance, and Correction of the Civil Magistrate etc.*

**Discharge.**

Himself hath said it, and done it already in this Chapter, and I have done the same, (somewhat more largely) in the Chapter next foregoing.

---

## CHAPTER 9

*A Reply to his ninth Chapter, Touching the Causes of Civil Dissentions, and uproars about Matters of Religion.*

**Discusser.**

*Whence then arise Civil Dissentions and uproars in matters of Religion? I Answer, 1. When a State liveth and lieth in the guilt of a false God, false Christ, false Worship: then no wonder, if sore eyes be troubled at the appearance of life,—whereas good eyes are not troubled at the Light. Vigilant and watchful Persons, Loyal and Faithful are not so troubled at the true, no nor at a false Religion of Jew or Gentile.*

D

*Discharge.*

*Discharge.*

This is as little to the purpose, as that which went before. The distinction spake of holding forth Erroneous and unlawful things, in a way tending of itself, to the disturbance of Civil Peace. This Discussion holdeth forth another way tending to the disturbance of Civil Peace, not of itself, but by occasion or by Accident, to wit, when the holding forth of Light and Truth disturbeth the sore Eyes of a corrupt State. If *per se*, and *per Accidens* (of itself, and by occasion) be all one: If the holding forth of Truth, and Error be all one, then this Discussion hath shaken the distinction of holding forth Error, not in an humble and meek way, but in a way of Arrogance and Impetuousness. But when he saith, *vigilant and faithful Persons are not so troubled, no not at the false Religion of Jew or Gentile*: If he mean not so much troubled that the false Religion, as corrupt States be at the true Religion: there may be truth in the speech, but it only argueth, That corrupt nature is more zealous in the defence of its own will-worship, then the faithful be in the defence of the Truth. But surely the faithful are called to contend Earnestly for the Faith, (*Jude 3*) and have as much cause to be troubled at the holding forth of the Worship of *Baal*, as corrupt States be at the holding forth of the Worship of *Jehovah*. If his meaning be, that vigilant and faithful Persons, are not so troubled at the false Religion of *Jew or Gentile*, but that they can Tolerate them to live amongst them in a Civil Body, we say so too: And therefore be *Indians*, who have submitted to the Government of this jurisdiction, are not compelled to the Profession or acknowledgement of our Religion, either by Force of Arms, or Penal Laws. But yet if Christians should seduce Christians to turn Apostates from the Faith, and to embrace *Judaism*, or *Paganism*: Or if *Jews* or *Pagans* living amongst us should openly blaspheme the God of heaven, & draw away Christians to *Atheism*, or *Judaism*, I should not account them either vigilant, or faithful Christians, that were not troubled at such a destroying of the true Religion, and propagating of the false. *Paul* blamed the false Teachers to be the Troublers of the Churches of *Galatia*, *Galatians 5:10,12*; *Acts 15:24*.

**Discusser.**

2. *Breach of Civil Peace may arise when false and Idolatrous practices are*

are held forth, and yet no Breach of Civil Peace from the Doctrine, or Practice, or the manner of holding them forth, but from the wrong and preposterous way of Suppressing, and preventing and extinguishing such Errors by weapons of wrath and Blood, Whips, Stocks, Imprisonment, Banishment, Death, by which men are commonly persuaded to convert Heretics, and to cast out unclean spirits, which only the finger of God can do, that is, the mighty Power of the Spirit of the Word. It is light alone that is able to dispel and scatter such mists and fogs of darkness in the souls and Consciences of men.

Hence the Sons of men disquiet themselves in vain, and unmercifully disquiet others.

### Defender.

Then it seems, that if the *Mariners* of the *Ship* wherein *Jonah* sailed when he fled from the Presence of God, if they I say did cast *Jonah* over board into the Sea, this preposterous way of theirs in supposing the Error of his way, was it which raised the storm and Tempest, whereby the *Ship* was tossed to and fro, & disturbed, yea & in jeopardy to be sunk and destroyed. But the Text speaks to the contrary, when they had cast *Jonah* forth into the Sea, the Sea ceased from his raging, *Jonah* 1:15.

But what was the sin of *Jonah*? was it not some sin against the second Table, some act of unrighteousness against his Neighbour? It was a direct and immediate breach of a rule of his Prophetical Office, a sin against the second Commandment of the First Table. But was not the Sea, in which this tempest arose against *Jonah*, and against the whole *Ship* for his sake, was it not the Sea of *Tiberius*, which being within the Confines of the Holy Land, the Sea also was Holy, and would not suffer such a sin unpunished? No, the Sea of *Tiberius* is within the Confines of *Galilee*, and other parts of the Land of *Israel*; But this was the *Mediterranean* Sea, between *Joppa* and *Tarshish*, *Jonah* 1:3. But were not these *Mariners*, *Israelites*, who might have some special charge from God, to root out all Idolatry and false Worship from amongst them, which blinds not us *Gentiles*? No, they were *Pagans* and *Gentiles*, as appeareth in that every one of them cried out, unto his own God.

But why did not God send out the tempest to punish those *Pa-*

*gan Mariners* rather, for their Idolatry than *Jonah* for his Erroneous Practise in running away from the true God?

God in times past suffered all Nations to walk in their own ways, *Acts* 14:16. And so did his Vice-regents the good Kings of *Israel* do the like: *David* did not compel the tributary Nations to worship the God of *Israel*. No more doth our Colony here compel the tributary *Indians* to worship our God. But if an *Israelite* forsake God, he disturbeth not only the Common-wealth of *Israel*, but the Barks of *Pagans*, and *Heathen* states as *Jonah* did this *Ship*, by his departure from God. Therefore a Christian by departing from God, may disturb a *Gentile* civil State. And it is no preposterous way for the Governors of the state, according to the quality of the disturbance raised by the starting aside of such a Christian, to punish both it and him by civil censure.

Nor doth the Civil State in such punishments attend so much, how to procure the conversion of Heretics, or Apostates, or such like scandalous turbulent offenders: as how to prevent the perversion of their sounder people (*Gangrænā amoveas, ne pars sincera trahatur:*) or else to work the subversion of such, as do subvert both truth and peace.

And yet as legal terrors are ordinary means blessed of God to prepare hard and stout hearts to conversion: so such legal punishments God is in like sort pleased to bless to the confusion, and reformation of false Prophets, as was foretold by *Zechariah*, it should come to pass in the days of the new Testament, *Zechariah* 13:4,5,6.

*Objection.* Yes, but it is light alone that is able to dispel and scatter such mists and fogs of darkness in the souls and Consciences of men.

*Answer.* True: But yet the judgments of God are as the Light that goes forth, *Hosea* 6:5. And the judgments of men executed according to the Word, are sanctified of God to prevent the spreading of Idolatry and seducement to it; All *Israel* shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously, *Deuteronomy* 13:11. Nor is the righteous proceeding in Civil States a disquieting of themselves, or any unmerciful disquieting of others. For it is no disquieting to a just man to do Justice: and the disquieting of men in sin, it is no unmerciful dealing, but a compassionate healing either of themselves or others. The false Prophet reclaimed by stigmatizing with wounds

wounds in his hands, will freely acknowledge, thus was I wounded in the House of my friends (*Zechariah* 13:6). Friends are not unmerciful disquieters.

*Objection.* The Judgments of God which go forth as the light are not of the Judgments of his hand, but of his mouth, for so he explaineth himself in that place of *Hosea*, I have hewn them by the Prophets, I have slain them by the words of my mouth: And thy Judgements were as the light that goeth forth.

*Answer.* The Judgments of God, whether of his mouth or of his hand, do both of them go forth as light. For when the Judgments of God are upon the earth, (and he speaketh of the judgments of his hands,) *the Inhabitants of the world shall learn righteousness, Isaiah* 26:9. And that whereby we learn righteousness, is light. Besides when the Lord is said to have hewn, and slain his Apostate people by his Prophets, and by the words of his mouth; He doth not only mean the spirit hewing, and slaying of their souls, but also the temporal judgments, Famine, War, and Pestilence, which the Prophets threatened, and the Hand of God, and *Hazael* executed in the hewing and slaying of them.

## CHAPTER 10

*A Reply to his tenth Chapter, wherein he discusses the last Distinction.*

**P***ersecution for Conscience, is either for conscience rightly informed, or a blind and erroneous conscience.*

### **Discusser.**

*Both these Consciences are indeed persecuted: but lamentably blind and erroneous will those consciences shortly appear to be, which out of zeal to God (as is presented) have persecuted either, &c.*

### **Defender.**

This whole Chapter may stand for us, without Impeachment. We approve no persecution for conscience; neither conscience rightly informed, (for that we account the persecuting of Christ:) nor conscience misinformed with error: unless the error be  
pernicious,

pernicious, and unless the conscience be convinced of the error and perniciousness thereof, that so it may appear, the erroneous party suffers, not for his conscience, but for his sinning against his conscience.

And though it be true, there is a seared conscience in some, to which God hath in his judgment, given them up, that they may never see light, how clear soever, both in Scripture and nature: and though this seared conscience do not extenuate, but aggravate sin; and though a man by this seared conscience may commit some notorious capital crime, (as he that in *Ireland* burnt his own son in the fire, in the imitation of *Abraham*, and called in his Neighbours to rejoice in beholding the power of his faith:) and though such a man was justly put to death: yet it may not be said, he was punished for his conscience, but for that unnatural barbarous cruelty and murder, which he committed, and which his conscience could never have blinded him to commit, out of any natural human ignorance, or infirmity, but out of pœnal and judicial blindness, which God never leaveth men unto, but upon habitual and customary sinning against light of conscience.

## CHAPTER II

*A Reply to his eleventh Chapter touching Persecution for Conscience rightly informed.*

### Discusser.

**A***fter explication of the Point in these former Distinctions, the Answerer of the Letter giveth his Resolution to the Question in four particulars.*

1. *It is not lawful to persecute any for Conscience sake rightly informed, for in persecuting such, Christ himself is persecuted, Acts 9:4.*

*A man may as soon find darkness in the bright beams of the Sun, as in this clear Beam of Truth, that Christ Jesus in his Truth must not be persecuted.*

*Yet this I must ask, (for it will be admired by all sober men) what should be the Cause or Inducement to the answerer's mind to lay down such*

*such a Position for Thesis as this is, It is not lawful to persecute the Lord Jesus.*

*Search all Scriptures, Histories, Records, Monuments, consult with all Experiences; Did ever Pharaoh, Saul, Ahab, Jezebel, Scribes and Pharisees, the Jews, Herod, the bloody Neroes, Gardiners, Bonner, Pope or Devil himself profess to persecute the Son of God, Jesus as Jesus, Christ as Christ, without Mask or Covering?*

***Defender.***

It may seem though the Truth be as clear as the Beams of the Sun, yet the Discusser can espy a mote of admirable weakness in the delivering of such a Position, though never so true or clear. But let him cease his Admiration, unless it be to admire his own Fancy.

For I do not lay it down as a Position, that is not lawful to persecute the Lord Jesus: or that Christ in his Truth must not be persecuted. But my Position was, It is not lawful to persecute any for Conscience sake, rightly informed: And for a reason hereof, I gave this Principle, for in persecuting such, Christ is persecuted: Is it now become an admirable strange thing to give a Principle of Religion, not for a Position, (and yet if it were so, what strange thing were it?) but for the proof of a Position? Let me give you a like instant, *Gamaliel* layeth it down for a Position, that the Doctrine of the Apostles, if it be of God, the Priests and Elders cannot overthrow it: and he gives this principle for a reason of it, *lest in so doing, ye be found* (saith he) *to fight against God, Acts 5:38,39.* Now is this such a matter as will be admired of all sober men, that so wise a man as *Gamaliel* should lay down this as a Position, That men should not be found fighters against God? May not a man rather admire and adore the strange hand of God, that shall leave a man soberly to admire at such a thing, and to think all sober men will in like sort wonder at the same? But the truth is, Neither *Gamaliel*, nor myself, laid down that Principle for a Conclusion, nor for a Position: nor if we had, had we done anything for sober men to admire at.

2. Though it were true, (which the Discusser makes the Ground of his Admiration,) that no *Pharaoh*, or *Herod*, or *Nero*, did ever profess to persecute the Son of God, Christ as Christ, etc. yet,

yet it will not make it an admirable Point, that Christ as Christ is not to be persecuted. For though they do not profess to persecute Christ as Christ: yet they do it. And it is no admirable matter for all sober men to admire at, to tell men that persecute the Lord Jesus, That it is not lawful for them so to do: Did not Christ himself (the wisdom of the Father) tell *Saul* as much? *Acts* 9:5.

3. It is as clear, (to use his phrase) as the Sun beams, both in Scripture and other histories, and frequent experience, That Tyrants and Apostates have often persecuted Jesus as Jesus, Christ as Christ. The Scribes and Pharisees they knew that Christ was the Son of God, the Lord, and Heir of the Church: and therefore they said among themselves, *This is the Heir, come let us kill him, Matthew* 21:38. Nor could they be said, in persecuting Christ, to have seen against the Holy Ghost: if they had not been enlightened to know him who he was, and yet leavened with such malice, as to persecute him, as they did. Histories tell us, that *Julian* the Apostate persecuted Jesus as Jesus, and Christ as Christ, yea and professed so to do. And experience telleth, That if a Christian shall in *Turkey* seek to gain *Turks* from the service of *Mahomet*, to the Faith of Jesus: they will persecute such a Christian to death, and in him Jesus, as Jesus.

4. Let Tyrants and Persecutors profess what they will, that they do not persecute Jesus as Jesus, but under some other pretence: yet that varies not the Truth, nor impeacheth the wisdom of this Position, That it is not lawful to persecute any for Conscience rightly informed, or to persecute any for professing the Truth of Christ.

#### Discusser.

*One thing I see apparently in the Lord's overruling of the pen of this Answerer, viz. a secret whispering from Heaven to him, That yet he hath never left the Tents of such who think they do God good service in killing the Lord Jesus in his servants, and yet say if we had been in the days of our Fathers in Queen Mary's days, we would never have consented to such Persecution &c.*

#### Defender.

Verily this is a strange sight indeed, (and which all sober minds may

may well wonder at) *to see apparently, That he who layeth down this for a Position, That it is not lawful to persecute any for Conscience rightly informed, hath had a secret whispering from Heaven, that himself never yet left the Tents of Persecutors.*

Surely it must needs be a strange and strong sight, even the sight of such as make themselves equal with God; that can see a man hath not left the Tents of Persecutors, (that is, the Communion with Persecutors) when he openly professeth it, to be utterly unlawful to Persecute any for the Truth's sake. It is true, God may see that in a man's heart which is contrary to the Profession of his mouth and Pen. And so may this *Discusser* see as much, if he be equal with God. But yet herein I dare be bold to say, he exalteth himself, not only equal with God, but above God, to see one contradictory in another, which God himself cannot see. It is contradictory to Persecution, to believe it unlawful to persecute any form the Truth's sake. He then that can see, yea & see apparently, & that out of the Faith and Profession of this truth, that it is unlawful to persecute any for the Truth, he that can see (I say) fellowship with persecution in the faith, or Profession of the unlawfulness of Persecution, verily he can see darkness in light, evil in good, Falsehood in Truth, which God himself (Such is the perfection of his Truth) cannot do.

***Discusser.***

Let me also add a second, so far as the Answerer (by Preaching for Persecution) hath been a guide to others in persecuting any of the Servants of Christ witnessing to his Truth, so far his own mouth and hands shall judge (I hope not his person, but) his actions, that the Lord Jesus hath suffered by him.

***Defender.***

If any Doctrine Preached by me have Guided any to persecute any of the Servants of Christ for witnessing to any Truth of Christ, then I confess I must lay my hand upon my mouth, and acknowledge that the Lord Jesus hath suffered by me. But if the *Discusser* can never be able to produce any such Doctrine broached by me, that hath guided any to persecute any of God's Servants for witnessing to any Truth of his, (as I trust in the grace of Christ, he shall never be able) then the *Discusser* may know (and the Lord

help his spirit to know it) that his own mouth and hands, shall one day judge (if §not his person, yet) his actions, that the Lord Jesus hath suffered in his poor Servants, even better persecutions by his unjust slanders.

---

## CHAPTER 12

*A Reply to his twelfth Chapter Entering upon the Discussion of the unlawfulness to Persecute an Erroneous and blind Conscience.*

### Discusser.

The second Conclusion laid down by the Answerer, is: *It is not lawful to persecute an Erroneous and blind Conscience, Even in Fundamental, and weighty Points, till after Admonition once, or twice Titus 3:10,11. And then such Consciences may be persecuted; because the Word of God is so clear, in Fundamental and weighty Points, that such a person cannot but sin against his Conscience, and so being condemned of himself, that is of his Conscience, he may be persecuted for sinning against his own Conscience.*

### Defender.

They are the words of the *Discusser*, not mine, That such as err in Fundamental and weighty Points, after once or twice Admonition, such Consciences are then to be persecuted.

No, my words will clear themselves if they be truly related, even as himself hath printed them. Thus they stand.

*Secondly, For an erroneous and blind Conscience, even in Fundamental and weighty Points, It is not lawful to persecute any, till after Admonition once or twice. And so the Apostle directeth Titus 3:10, and giveth the reason, That in Fundamental & principal Points of Doctrine and worship, The Word of God in such things is so clear, that he cannot but be convinced in conscience of the dangerous Error of his way, after once or twice Admonition, wisely and faithfully dispensed. And then if any one persist, It is not out of Conscience, but against his Conscience, as the Apostle saith, verse 11. He is subverted and sinneth being condemned of himself, that is, of his own Conscience, so that if such a man after such Admonition, shall still persist in the Error of his ways, and be therefore*

*therefore punished, He is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.*

Where though I say, That it is not lawful to persecute any, though erring in Fundamental and weighty Points, till after once or twice admonition: I do not therefore say, (as the *Discusser* reporteth me) that after once or twice admonition, then such Consciences may be persecuted: *But that if such a man after such Admonition shall still persist in the Error of his way, and be therefore punished, He is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but for sinning against his own Conscience.*

*Objection.* But he that sayeth, It is not lawful to persecute any Heretic till after once or twice admonition, He doth as much as say, that after once or twice admonition, It is then lawful to persecute any Heretic.

*After.* Not so neither, neither every Heretic, nor in every Court. Not in every Court or Judicature. But the same Church that followed an Heretic, with once or twice admonition, was further to pursue him, if he remain obstinate, with excommunication; my words do express two things:

1. That an Heretic till after once or twice admonition, may not be pursued, no not with the Church-censure of Excommunication: but after once or twice admonition, It was then lawful for the Church to proceed to his Excommunication.

2. My words hold forth this also, That if such an Heretic so convinced and admonished, be afterwards punished by any Censure, whether of Church or Court, It cannot be said, he is punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.

But it was no part of my words or meaning, to say, that every Heretic, though erring in some Fundamental and weighty Points; and for the same excommunicated, shall forthwith be punished by the Civil Magistrate: unless it do afterwards appear, that he break forth further, either into Blasphemy, or Idolatry, or seducement of others to his Heretical pernicious ways.

### **Discusser.**

*This third of Titus, which through fearful Profanations hath so many hundred years been the pretended Bulwark of all the bloody wolves, Dens of Lions, Mountains of Leopards hunting and devouring the*

*witnesses of Jesus. He that can but see men as Trees, may easily discern, It shall now be the Refuge and Defence (as I hope) of the Lamb's and little ones of Jesus.*

**Defender.**

It is out of doubt, That this Text is, (as all the Texts in Scripture be) the just Refuge and safe defence of the Lamb's, and little ones of Jesus. But all the wit and skill of the *Discusser*, can never so far wrest it, or darken it, as to make it a Refuge and defence for Heretics, which is the Point in hand.

## CHAPTER 13

*A Reply to his thirteenth Chapter, what is meant by this Heretic in Titus.*

**Discusser.**

*What is this Heretic? I find him commonly defined to be, such an one as is obstinate in Fundamentals. And so the Answerer seemeth to Resent him, saying, the Apostle rendereth this reason, why after once or twice Admonition, he ought to be Persecuted, because, in Fundamental and Principal Points of Doctrine and Worship, the Word of God is so clear, that the Heretic cannot but be convinced in his own Conscience. But of this Reason I find not one Tittle mentioned in this Scripture: for so he saith, such an one is condemned of himself, yet he saith not, nor will it follow, that Fundamentals are so clear, that after first and second Admonition, a Person that submitteth not to them, Is condemned of himself, more than in lesser Points.*

This word then an Heretic is no more, than an obstinate and wilful person in the Church of Crete striving and contending about unprofitable Questions & Genealogies. What is to be done with such an one? Let him be once and Étwise Admonished. What if once and twice Admonition prevail not? The Apostle seemeth to answer, αἵρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον, that is, the man that is wilfully obstinate, after once or twice Admonition, Reject him.

**Defender.**

The *Discusser* is so far from weakening what I said from this Text in *Titus*, that he rather confirmeth it, yea and granteth a  
larger

larger allowance to proceed against erroneous Persons, than I did. For,

1. Whereas I had said, The Apostle directeth the Church to proceed against an Heretic, that is against one obstinately erroneous in Fundamentals, The *Discusser* saith, *yea and against such as err though not in Fundamentals, but in lesser points, and continue obstinate in striving about unprofitable Questions, and Genealogies.*

2. He that granteth (as the *Discusser* doth) that the Word of God is so clear even in lesser Points, that he that persisteth in his error after once or twice Admonition, is wilfully obstinate: he surely will not stick to acknowledge, that the word of God is much more clear in Fundamental and Principal Points, that he that shall persist in Errors against the Foundation, after once or twice Admonition, he cannot but be much more justly accounted wilfully obstinate, and to sin against the light of his own Conscience.

3. Though he saith he findeth no one Tittle in the Text, that in Fundamental and Principal Points of Doctrine and Worship, the Word of God is so clear, that after once or twice Admonition, the Heretic cannot but be convinced in his own Conscience: Yet he might easily find it, and cannot but find it, if he were pleased to ponder the words of the Text: yea and he doth find it, though he be pleased to deny it. For the Heretic (who the Text speaks of) himself expoundeth to be a man wilfully obstinate: An Evidence, that he erreth not through want of light, or weakness of knowledge, but through strength of will. Whence also he is said to be condemned of himself, of his own Conscience: An Evidence that the Points about which he erreth, are so clearly delivered in Scripture, that after once or twice Admonition, the Heretic cannot but be convinced in his own Conscience. And if this hold in sundry lesser Points, how much more doth it hold in Fundamentals and Principals? Unless he think the Holy Ghost be more dark, & obscure in delivering Principals and milk to Babes, than in delivering lesser Points to men of riper growth. If the word be so clear as to make Fundamentals clear, (though not any more clear, as he saith, than lesser Points) yet then it followeth, It maketh them both so clear, that he that submiteth not to them after once, or twice Admonition is condemned of himself.

4. When

4. When the Apostle saith, an Heretic is subverted, ἐξέστραπται, it is as much as if he had said, he is as an house subverted, or turned upside down, or inside outward, as an house turned off from the Foundation: It is too dilute, and loose and Interpretation of the word ἐξέστραπται, (which the *Discusser* maketh, Chapter 14) ὀξοστραπται, he is turned Crooked, a word opposite to straightness, or rightness. For he is not ignorant, that is not the meaning of ἐξέστραπται, but of διέστραπται, which he joineth with the other, mean, turned-crooked: for that is not subverted, but perverted. And if *Paul* say, that the Heretic is subverted, or turned off from the Foundation, and gives that as a reason, why he should be censured, how then can the *Discusser* say, he findeth not one tittle of this reason in this Scripture?

5. Take the *Discusser's* own Interpretation of an Heretic, for an obstinate and wilful striver or contender about unprofitable Questions and Genealogies:

Those Questions and Genealogies, are expressly described by the Apostle, not only to be unprofitable and vain, but also to tend to the subversion of whole houses, *Titus* 1:10,11, which may seem evidently to argue, that their disputings about the Genealogies of Christ, tended to cut off the Line of Christ, or at least to make it doubtful, whether he were the lineal Heir of *David*, according to the flesh, and so whether he were the true *Messiah* or no. And thus, if the *Discusser's* own meaning of an Heretic may stand, still an Heretic is he, who is wilfully obstinate in holding forth such Errors as subvert the Foundation of Christian Religion.

## CHAPTER 14

*A Reply to his fourteenth Chapter, Explaining what it is to be subverted and self condemned.*

### **Discusser.**

*Subverted is not here intended to be spoken of Heretics in Fundamentals only, but of men obstinate in the lesser Questions.*

1. Subverted, ἐξέστραπται, crooked, a word opposite to rightness or straightness.

2. He

2. *He sinneth wandering from the ways of Truth:*

3. *He is αὐτοκατάκριτος, and condemned of himself, that is, by the secret checks and whisperings of his own Conscience, which will take God's part against a man's self, in accusing, smiting, &c.*

**Defender.**

All this so far as Error is found in it, is spoken to, & discharged in the former Chapter.

Only 2. Things more remain in this Chapter which may not pass without some touch.

1. *That he saith God's People in all their awakenings acknowledge how slightly they have listened to the checks of their own Conscience. This the Answerer pleaseth to call sinning against Conscience: for which he may lawfully be persecuted, to wit, for sinning against his own Conscience.*

Wherein there is found a double falsehood: 1. *That he saith, I call the slight listenings of God's People to the checks of their Conscience, their sinning against Conscience.* For I speak not of the sinning of God's People against Conscience, but of an Heretic subverted turned off from the Foundation: much less do I call their slight listenings to Conscience, to be Heretical sinning against Conscience.

2. Least of all do I say, that for such slight listenings to the checks of Conscience, he may lawfully be persecuted, to wit, as for sinning against Conscience. Thus men that have time and leisure at will, will set up Images of clouts, and then shoot at them.

The 2. Thing in this Chapter (which I said might not pass without some touch) is, that having fastened upon me a conclusion, (which is none of mine, but an invention of his own) *He addeth, howsoever it be painted over with vermilion &c. yet he hopeth to manifest it to be the overturning and rooting up of the root of all true Christianity, and absolutely denying the Lord Jesus to be come in the flesh.*

Whereto I Reply no more than this: If he do manifest that which Magnanimously he undertaketh, It may happily be also manifested (by the help of Christ) that it will overturn no conclusion of mine. But howsoever, let him remember it was a proverb in *Israel*, Let not him that girdeth on his Armour, boast himself, as he that putteth it off 2 *Kings* 20:11.

---

## CHAPTER 15

*A Reply to his fifteenth Chapter touching the admonition and rejection of an Heretic.*

**T**He first and second Admonitions in the place of Titus were not Civil or corporal punishments on men's persons, or purses: But they were the reprehensions, convictions, exhortations, and persuasions of the word of the Eternal God, charged home to the Conscience, in the Name and Presence of the Lord Jesus in the midst of his Church. Which being despised, and not harkened unto, in the last place followeth rejection, which is not a cutting off by heading, hanging, burning, nor an expelling out of the Country, and coasts: but the dreadful cutting off from the visible head and body, Christ Jesus, and his Church—Spiritual cutting off by Excommunication.

### *Defender.*

All this, & the proofs of this, in this Chapter, I willingly consent and subscribe unto: nor doth this touch any conclusion of mine at all, much less Discuss, or shake it. For though I said indeed, that for an erroneous and blind Conscience (*even in Fundamental and weighty Points*) *It is not lawful to persecute any, till after Admonition once or twice, according to Titus 3:10,11.*

Yet in alleging that place, to prove that Conclusion, I intended no other persecution, but the Churches prosecution against such an Heretic by excommunication: no syllable in my conclusion looketh at more.

If it be said, but Excommunication or any other Church-prosecution, cannot fitly be called persecution: Yes verily, excommunication is a persecution, and a lawful persecution, if the cause be just offence, (as he Angel of the Lord is said to persecute the wicked *Psalms* 35:6). But the Excommunication is a cruel and bitter persecution, If it be without just cause and due order: yea and the more grievous persecution, by how much the more grievous it is to a Christian man, to be excluded from the Communion of the Saints, than to be banished from a civil Society, sure it is, the Lord Jesus accounteth it a persecution to his Disciples, to be delivered up unto the Synagogues, and to be cast forth out of the Synagogues *Luke* 21:12, with *John* 16:2.

Chap. 16.

---

## CHAPTER 16

*A Reply to his sixteenth Chapter touching Toleration in points of less moment.*

### **Discusser.**

*For a third Position, or Conclusion, the Answerer gave this, that in things of less moment (whether points of Doctrine or Worship) If a man hold them forth in a spirit of Christian meekness and love, (though with zeal and constancy) he is not to be persecuted, but tolerated, till God may be pleased to manifest his truth to him.*

*This conclusion I acknowledge to be the Truth of God; yet 3. things are very observable in the manner of laying it down.*

*1. That such a Person may be tolerated, till God may be pleased to reveal his truth to him: upon the same ground the Apostle calleth for meekness and Gentleness towards all men, and towards such as opposed themselves; 2 Timothy 2, because it may be, God may give them repentance. Hence a soul that is lively and sensible of God's mercy, cannot but be patient, and gentle towards the Jews—towards the Turks—yea to all the several sorts of Anti-Christians, yea to the Pagans, and to the wildest sort of the Sons of men, who have not heard of the Father and of the Son, &c. Yea not only be patient to such, but also to pray for such, yea and to endeavour their participation of the same grace and mercy.*

### **Defender.**

*This nothing shaketh, no nor so much as toucheth our cause, or defence; we think it unlawful for the Church, to censure such, as are out of the Church. And for the Civil State, we know no ground they have to persecute *Jews*, or *Turks*, or other *Pagans* for cause of Religion, though they all err in Fundamentals. No nor would I exempt Anti-Christians neither, from Toleration, notwithstanding their Fundamental Errors, unless after conviction they still continue to seduce simple souls into their damnable, and pernicious Heresies: as into the Worship of false Gods, into confidence of their own merits for Justification, into seditious conspiracies against the lives and States of such Princes, as will not submit their Consciences to the Bishop of Rome. Which if the*

*Discusser*

*Discusser shall in the sequel pluck off as the silken covering of an Image (as he calleth it) we shall further attend him.*

**Discusser.**

*2. I observe from the Scriptures he quoteth for this Toleration (Philippians 3; Romans 14) how closely (yet I hope unadvisedly) he maketh the Churches of Christ at Philippi, and Rome, all one with the Cities of Philippi, and Rome &c.*

**Defender.**

No such matter: I never thought these Scriptures to belong at all to the Cities of *Philippi* or *Rome*, *Paul* writeth to both the Churches not only to tolerate, but to receive their weak brethren, who dissent from them in matters of less moment: but to the Cities, I never read any Epistle of his. Who would ever imagine, the *Discusser* should be so far transported beyond all bounds, either of reason, or truth, or candour, as to surmise the *Answerer* should conceive, *That what those Churches must not tolerate in their holy communion, that the cities of Philippi and Rome must not tolerate within the compass of the City, State, and Jurisdiction.*

**Discusser.**

*3. From this Toleration of persons holding but lesser errors, I observe the unmercifulness of such Doctrines and Hearts, that he, that is slightly and but a little hurt shall be suffered, & means vouchsafed for his cure: but the deep-wounded sin, the Leprous, and Vicious &c. must not be suffered, until peradventure, God may give them Repentance &c.*

**Defender.**

And why doth he as well observe the unmercifulness of such States and Laws, as suffer petty thieves, and liars to live in their Towns & Cities: but will not suffer wilful murderers, and violent robbers to live amongst them? such as are tainted with lesser Errors, and it may be, whet them upon others, they are but as petty thieves, and liars: but such as after conviction do go on to subvert the Foundation of Christian religion and to subvert and destroy the souls of God's People, and stoutly rob them both of the means of Grace here, and of the inheritance of glory hereafter, they are worse than wilful murderers, or violent robbers. The Holy Ghost speaks of false Teachers, as bringing in damnable Heresies, 2 *Peter* 2:1, as overthrowing the faith of some 2 *Timothy* 2:18, as subverting their souls, *Acts* 15:24, making merchandise

dise of God's people, 2 *Peter* 2:3, which being so, methinks, such as do more mischief, are less tolerable, than they that do less. It is true, they that are more deeply wounded-sinners, are more to be pitied, suppose the depth of their wounds reach none but themselves; but if they be infectious, and Leprous, and have Plague sores running upon them, and think it their glory to infect others; It is no want of mercy, and charity, to set such at a distance: It is a merciless mercy, to pity such as are incurably contagious, and mischievous, and not to pity many scores or hundreds of the souls of such, as will be infected and destroyed by the toleration of the other.

---

## CHAPTER 17

*A Reply to his seventeenth Chapter: touching the holding forth of Error with a boisterous and arrogant Spirit.*

### **Discusser.**

*It is said by the Answerer, He that holds forth Error with a boisterous and arrogant spirit to the disturbance of the Civil Peace, he ought to be punished.*

*To this I have spoken too, confessing that if any man commit ought of those things, which Paul was accused of Acts 25:11. He ought not to be spared: yea he ought not in such cases to refuse to die.*

### **Defender.**

I would not say, That every man that holdeth forth Error in a boisterous and arrogant spirit to the disturbance of Civil Peace, ought to be punished with death. This is too Bloody a Tenet, unless the boisterous Arrogancy were such as did disturb the Civil Peace to the destruction of the lives and souls of men.

### **Discusser**

*But if the matter be of a Spiritual and Divine nature, I have written before, in many cases, and might in many more, that the worship which a State professeth, may be contradicted and preached against, and yet no breach of Civil Peace, &c.*

*Defender.*

Their is no Error, that can be a matter of divine nature, though it may be spiritual; no such Points as are of a divine nature, fall within the compass of this dispute of persecution. The many cases, which the *Discusser* before wrote of, are all of them allowed, but none of them concern holding forth Errors, which is the Point in hand.

Yet true it is, that if a man hold forth Truth in some boisterous and arrogant way, not with the Armour of the Spirit, but with the Arm of flesh, He may in so doing disturb the Civil Peace, and for such disturbance be justly punished, according to the quality of the disturbance raised by him.

It is easily granted what the *Discusser* further avoucheth, *that they do break the Cities or Kingdom's Peace, who cry out for Prisons, and Swords, against such who cross their Judgments, or Practice in Religion:* to wit unless their Religion be of God, and the crossing of it be such as destroyeth and subverteth the Religion of God.

But when he saith, *such only break the Cities or Kingdom's Peace, as call for Prisons and Swords against Heretics.* It is too vast an Hyperbole; as if Murderers Seditious Persons, Rebels, Traitors were none of them such, as did break the Cities or Kingdom's Peace at all: but they only who are too sharp against corruption in Religion.

It is also further easily granted, which he allegeth, that many complain most, who are most in fault themselves, as *Joseph's* Mistress of him. The Lord help the *Discusser* to reflect on his own way.

## CHAPTER 18

*A Reply to his Eighteenth Chapter, Examining the first Argument for Toleration from Matthew 13:30,38.*

**Discusser.**

*First, Matthew 13:30,38. Christ Commandeth to let alone the Tares, too grow up together with the wheat, until the Harvest.*

*Unto which he Answereth,*

*That*

*That Tares are not Briers and Thorns, but partly Hypocrites like unto the Godly, but indeed carnal (as the Tares are like to the wheat, but are not wheat) or partly such corrupt Doctrines and Practices, as are indeed unsound, and yet such as come very near the Truth (as Tares do to the wheat) and so near that good men may be taken with them, and so the Persons in whom they grow, cannot be rooted out, but good wheat will be rooted out with them. In such a case, Christ calleth for Peaceable Toleration, not for pœnal Prosecution according to the third Conclusion.*

*But alas here is no evidence or demonstration of the Spirit, nor argument from the place itself, or from the Scriptures of Truth, too prove such an interpretation.*

**Defender.**

*Answer.* The Letter (to which the Answer was given) gave no reason of his exposition: and who ever required more reason of an Answerer, than of a Replier?

2. The Exposition I gave was consistent with that which the Letter gave. [Tares and wheat, saith he, some understand to be those that walk in the Truth, and those that walk in lies] now when I say, the tares are Hypocrites, and some kind of corrupt Doctrines and Practices, and such as walk in them, are not these coincident with such as walk in lies? what need had I to give a reason of the exposition, which he himself (to whom the Answer was written) acknowledgeth?

**Discusser.**

*But those three Persons, Doctrines and Practices, are as a threefold cord, and so a threefold strong snare to catch the feet of some or other.*

**Defender.**

What hurt do they get by being caught? Hypocrites, and corrupt Doctrines, and Practices, if they be sound like unto good Christians, or sound truths, what hurt do they catch, when I say such are to be tolerated to the end of the world? But to prevent his fear of a threefold cord, I shall easily acknowledge that which I meant, that by Tares are meant such kind of evil persons, as are like unto the good, whether they be Hypocrites, men of unsound hearts, or men of unsound Doctrines, and Practices yet such as come near the Truth.

---

## CHAPTER 19

---

### *A Reply to his nineteenth Chapter*

#### **Discusser.**

*That the Lord intendeth not Doctrines, or Practices in this Parable, It is clear: For,*

1. *The Lord Jesus expressly interpreteth the good seed to be Persons, & those the children of the Kingdon: The Tares also to signify men, and those the children of the wicked one verse 38.*

#### **Defender.**

If the *Discusser* had cast his eye a little lower, he might have found, that Christ interpreteth the Tares, not only to be Persons, but things πάντα τὰ Σχάνδαλα, all things that offend, as well as those that do iniquity, verse 41. But I shall not stick upon that at all, let the Tares be Persons, whether Hypocrites, like unto true Christians, or holders forth of scandalous, and corrupt, Doctrines and Practices like unto found.

#### **Discusser.**

2. *Such corrupt Doctrines and Practices are not to be tolerated now (as those Jewish observations were for a while, Romans 14) nor so long till the end of the world. For can we think, that though the Lord tendered the tender conscience of the Jews, in the observation of the difference of meats and drinks (which were sometimes his own Ordinances) that therefore Persons must be now tolerated in the Church (for I speak not of the Civil State) in superstitious forbearing and forbidding of flesh in Popish Lents and superstitious Fridays? &c.*

#### **Defender.**

Who can tell what this *Discusser* would have? The Tares he would have to be Persons; not corrupt Doctrines, and Practices. And yet when he cometh to prove, that corrupt Doctrines and Practices are not to be tolerated, he proveth it from the unlawfulness of tolerating corrupt persons: *for can we think (saith he) that persons must be now tolerated in the Church, in the superstitious forbearing or forbidding of flesh in Popish Lents and Fridays?* Such is the inconstancy of the spirits of men, whose hearts are not stayed, and  
steered

steered by the Spirit of Truth, that sometimes Tares must not be corrupt Doctrines and Practices, but persons, because Tares, and so persons must be tolerated till the Harvest, and so corrupt Doctrines and Practices: And yet all the reason given, why corrupt Doctrines and Practices must not be tolerated, is this, because Persons that hold them forth must not be tolerated.

---

## CHAPTER 20

*A Reply to his twentieth Chapter what is meant by Tares?*

### Discusser

*The original word ζεζάνια, signifying those weeds which spring up with the Corn, as cockle darnell, Tares &c. seemeth to imply such a kind of people, as are commonly and generally known to be manifestly differing from, and opposite to, the true Worshippers of God &c.*

### Defender

1. It is not true, that ζεζάνια signifieth all those weeds that grow up with the Corn. For they be a special weed, growing up chiefly amongst the wheat: but when it comes to the earing, it groweth more like to Barley, yet having a narrower leaf, fatter, and rougher, and a leaner seed in a prickly bark, bearing a purple flower: as *Dioscorides* testifieth. Now this is far from a description of all sorts of weeds, that grow up with Corn.

2. Neither is it true, that Tares are commonly and generally known as soon as they appear. For *Hierom*, who for a time lived in *Jury*, testifieth, that *Inter triticum et zizania, quod nos appellamus lolium, quamdiu herba est, et nondum culmus venit ad spicam, grandis similitudo est, et in discernendo aut nulla aut perdifficilis distantia.* Comment. Mat. Cap. 13.

Yea the text itself (though the *Discusser* deny it) holdeth forth as much. For the servants of the Husbandman (in whose Field the Tares were sown by the enemy) did not discern the tares from the wheat, till the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit: for then it was, and not till then, that the Tares appeared to be Tares, *Matthew* 13:26, what though the Text holdeth forth no such time, wherein

wherein the servants doubted, *or suspected what they were?* It is like enough, they did not suspect them at all by reason of (the *grandis similitudo*) the great likeness that was between them, whilst they were both in the blade. Which still maketh good the Exposition, that Tares are not briers and thorns, but so like to the wheat, that till they come to earing, the one cannot be discerned from the other.

### Discusser

*The one appeared as soon as the other, and when the wheat put forth its blade, and fruit, the Tares were as early, they put forth themselves, and appeared also.*

2. *There is such a dissimilitude and unlikeness between them, that as soon as Tares and wheat sprung up to blade and fruit, every husband-man could tell, which is wheat, and which is Tares.*

### Defender

It's true, the Tares put forth their blade, as soon as did the wheat, and appeared above ground, one as early as the other: but they were so like one to another, that the husbandman could not tell, which was wheat, and which Tares, till the blade was grown up, and they both brought forth their fruit. And though when they both brought forth their fruit, there was no apparent dissimilitude: yet still it is evident, that at first the dissimilitude did not appear. The Tares may therefore still stand for Hypocrites, who are so like at first unto good Christians, that they cannot easily be discerned one from another, till in process of time, the difference of the fruit discover them.

### Discusser

*But when was it that the householder gave charge to let them alone? was it not after they appeared, and were known to be Tares? which should imply by this interpretation of the Answerer, that when men are discovered and known to be Hypocrites, yet still such a generation of Hypocrites in the Church must be let alone, and tolerated until the Harvest, or end of the world: which is contrary to all Piety, order and safety in the Church of the Lord Jesus, as doubtless, the Answerer will grant.*

### Defender

If the Answerer know his own mind as well as the *Discusser* doubtless the Answerer will not grant, that it is contrary to all  
Piety

piety, and order, and safety, that hypocrites (known hypocrites) be tolerated in the Church till the end of the world. For though it be against the safety of the Church, when the Officers, or body of the Church prove hypocrites, (for that threateneth a dis-churching, *Revelation 2:5*) yet till the fruits of hypocrisy grow notoriously scandalous, and ripe for Church-Censure, it is not contrary to all piety, and order, & safety, to suffer them: but rather more safety to suffer them, least some of God's own Saints, (true wheat) who for a time may degenerate and bring forth like fruit with the Tares, be plucked up with them. If foolish Virgins be cast out of the Church, the wise Virgins may be sometime found sleeping, as well as they, *Matthew 25:5*.

---

## CHAPTER 21. *A Reply to his Chapter 21.*

---

*What is meant by the world; and more of the Tares.*

### Discusser.

2. *The Tares cannot signify hypocrites in the Church; for the field wherein they both grow is interpreted by Christ himself to be the world, which lieth in wickedness, and is a wilderness of wild Beasts, Fornicators, Covetous, Idolators, &c. In this world as soon as the Lord Jesus hath sown the good seed, (the Children of the Kingdom, true Christianity, or the true Church) the enemy Satan presently in the night of Security, Ignorance, and Error, soweth the Tares, which are Antichristians, or false Christians. Those the Ministers and Prophets of God would straight run to Heaven for fiery Judgements, from thence to consume them. But the Son of man commandeth a Permission of them, till the end of the world, when Goats and Sheep, Tares and Wheat, shall he eternally separated, &c.*

### Defender.

*Answer 1.* It is true, Christ expoundeth the Field to be the world, *verse 38*. But he meant not the wide world, but (by a usual Trope) the Church scattered throughout the world: as Christ is said to have loved the world, *John 3:16* and to be the Propitiation of the sins of the world, *1 John 2:2*.

*Reason 1.* Else there had been no place for the servants wonder

G

at

at the appearing of the Tares. *Sir, didst not though sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it Tares?* verse 27. Did any of the servants of Christ wonder, or saw any cause to wonder, that the world should be full of Fornicators, Idolaters, Murderers, Robbers, &c? Was it ever otherwise since the world was replenished with Inhabitants?

*Reason 2.* What calling had the Ministers, or Prophets of Christ, to offer to pluck up all such notorious vicious persons out of the world? Did ever any Ministers of Christ demand such a Question of Christ; Wilt thou have us go, and gather up all notorious vicious Persons out of the world? As they do indeed demand the like concerning these Tares in Christ's field, *verse 28.*

*Reason 3.* The Discusser himself reckoneth up Goats and Sheep, as parallel with Wheat, and Tares, as generally Interpreters do. Now evident it is, that Goats were clean Beasts, as well as Sheep; clean for food, yea and clean also for sacrifice; and yet they were tolerated not only to live in the same world, but in the same Church. For after the destruction of Antichrist, when purest times of the Church shall come, the Members of the Church shall all of them be Virgins, (none Idolaters) though some wise, and some foolish; all of them servants, though some thrifty, some unprofitable: all of them clean, though some Goats, some Sheep. And therefore the Kingdom of Heaven (that is, the Church) is at that time resembled to such a mixed state (after the ruin of Antichrist, and conversion of the Jews) until the coming of Christ to Judgment, *Matthew 25:1, &c.*

*Answer 2.* If the Field should be the world, and the Tares Antichristians and false Christians; it is true, Satan sowed them in God's Field, but he sowed them in the Church. The mystery of their Iniquity did secretly work in the very bosom of the Church, till in process of time, it grew so rank and gross, as transformed the Churches that drunk it up, into spiritual Babylon. But if Antichrist be an Apostate, and Antichristianity Apostasy, then it was first sown in the field of the Church, and not of the wide world.

*Answer 3.* It is not the will of Christ, that Antichrist and Antichristians, and Antichristianity should be tolerated in the world, until the end of the world. For God will put it into the hearts of faithful Princes, (as they have given their Kingdoms to the Beast, so)

so) in fulness of time to hate the whore, to leave her desolate and naked, and to burn her flesh with fire, *Revelation* 17:16,17. And after this we read of a visible state of a new *Jerusalem*, which shall flourish many years upon Earth, before the end of the world, *Revelation* Chapter 20, Chapter 21, Chapter 22.

Nevertheless, I willingly grant that the first fruits of Antichristians, and false Christians may be reckoned up amongst the Tares, which Satan sowed in the field of the Church, which afterwards grew to be Briars and Thorns, and so destructive to the wheat, that the wheat could not be suffered (if discerned) to live amongst them.

**Discusser.**

*But Christ (the wisdom of the Father) would never in opening this Parable, so far obscure it, as to call the Church, the world: Nor doth it agree with the nature of the Church, or Garden of Christ, to be styled the world.*

**Defender.**

It is no impeachment to the wisdom of Christ to call his Elect Churches and Saints throughout the world, by the Name of the world; Else *Paul* spake not by the wisdom of Christ, when he said, God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, *2 Corinthians* 5:19.

And though the Church within itself be a Garden, and severed from the world; yet all the Churches being scattered and dispersed throughout the world, it is no more an improper speech, to call the Church the world, then to speak of Christ as dying for the world, when he died for his Church.

---

**CHAPTER 22.**

*A Reply to his 22 Chapter: more of Tares.*

**Discusser.**

*In the former Parable, the Lord Jesus compared the kingdom of Heaven to the sowing of seed. The true Messengers of Christ are sowers, who cast the seed of the word of the Kingdom upon 4 sorts of ground; which 4 sorts of grounds, or hearts of men, cannot be supposed to be of the Church; nor*

*will it ever be proved, that the Church consisteth of any more sorts or natures of ground properly but one, to wit, the honest and good ground. And the proper work of the Church concerneth the prosperity and flourishing of this sort of ground, and not of the other three sorts.*

*In the field of the world then are all those sorts of grounds, High-way-side, stony, thorny Hearers, as well as the honest and good ground. And I suppose it will not be said by the Answerer, that these three sorts of bad grounds were Hypocrites or Tares in the Church.*

***Defender.***

*Answer 1.* But what if the Answerer will say so? It may be contrary to his supposal, but not to the Truth. For I demand, did not Christ himself (who was the chief Sower) did not he Preach, and sow the seed of the word to all those four sorts of Hearers? And yet he was the Minister of Circumcision, (*Romans 15:8*) and Preached seldom to any, but to Church-Members, Members of the Church of *Israel*.

*Answer 2.* It's an error to say, The Church consisteth of no more sorts of Hearers, but one, the honest and good ground: for if the children of Church-members be in the Church, & of the Church, till they give occasion of rejection, then they growing up to years, become some of them like the High-way-side, others like the stony, others like the Thorny, as well as others like the honest and good ground.

*Answer 3.* Though it be not the proper work of the Church to attend the prosperity and flourishing of the three sorts of bad ground, to wit, whilst they remain bad: yet it is their work to seek the changing of the bad into good ground, that so they may come to prosper and flourish. For it is not the proper work of the Church, to bring on their children to become the sincere People of God, as well as to keep themselves in that estate? Is it not a main Branch of their Covenant with God, that as God giveth himself to be a God to them, and to their seed, so they should give up themselves and their seed to be his People? Besides, hath not God given Pastors and Teachers, as well for the gathering together of the Saints, as for the edification of the body of Christ? And hath he not given the Church, and the Gospel Preached in the Church, to lie like Leaven in three Pecks of Meal till all be Leavened? *Matthew 13:33.*

*Answ. 4.*

*Answer 4.* There is not such resemblance between High-way-side ground, and good ground, as is between Tares and Wheat; nor would the servants of the Husbandman ever wonder that weeds should grow in the high-way-side ground, as they do at the growing of Tares in the Field. Nor would they ever ask the Question, whether they should pluck up weeds out of the High-way-side, or stones out of the stony ground, or pluck up Thorns out of the Thorny.

---

## CHAPTER 23.

---

### *A Reply to his Chapter 23. Still touching the Tares.*

---

#### **Discusser.**

*These Tares I shall evidently prove to be Idolaters and in particular, properly Antichristians. For first, these Tares are such sinners, as are opposite, and contrary to the Children of the Kingdom, visibly so declared and manifest, verse 38.*

#### **Defender.**

*Answer 1.* These Tares are not such sinners as are contrary to the children of the Kingdom; for then none should be opposite to them but they. For contraries are such, *quorum unum uni opponitur*. But evident it is, there be more wicked ones opposite to the children of the Kingdom, than Idolaters, and Antichristians, to wit, those notoriously scandalous wicked ones, whom the Discusser nameth in the next Chapter, Drunkards, Thieves, unclean Persons.

*Answer 2.* It is a λήμμα, a begging of the Question, to say that “these Tares are such sinners, as are opposite and contrary to the “children of the Kingdom, visibly so declared and manifested; For the Tares were not discerned at first, (as hath been shewed above) till the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit.

#### **Discusser.**

*These Tares are the Children if the wicked one; which wicked one I take to be, not the Devil; for the Lord Jesus seemeth to make them distinct. The Tares (saith he) are the Children of the wicked one, or wickedness: the Enemy that sowed them is the Devil.*

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

*Answer 1.* The Devil and the wicked one, may well mean one and the same Person. For if the Devil sowed these Tares, then these Tares were the seed (and so the children) of the Devil. Why should they be called the seed of one, and the children of another?

*Answer 2.* Suppose τὰ πονηρά, be translated (the children) of the wicked one, or wickedness; that style will agree to hypocrites, as well as to other Persons. Sure it is, the Lord Jesus often calleth the Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites, (*Matthew 23*) and he calleth them also a wicked and adulterous generation, *Matthew 16*. And therefore still these Tares will not appear to be others than Hypocrites.

## CHAPTER 24.

*A Reply to his 24 Chapter, Still touching the Tares.**Discusser.*

*Though all Drunkards, Thieves, unclean Persons, &c. be opposite to God's Children, yet the opposition of the Tares here against the Children of the Kingdom, is such an opposition as fights against the religious state and Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

*2. It is manifest, the Lord Jesus intendeth no other sort of sinners in this Parable, (then Antichristians) unto whom here he saith, let them alone, in Church or State. For then he should contradict other holy and blessed Ordinances, for the punishment of Offenders, both in Christian and Civil State.*

*For 1. In the Civil State, God hath armed Parents, Masters, Magistrates, to punish evil doers, Murderers, Quarrellers, unclean Persons, stealers, extortioners: such ought not to be let alone, neither in lesser nor greater Families, Towns, Cities, Kingdoms, Romans 13, but seasonably suppressed, &c.*

*2. In the Kingdom of Christ, (whose Officers, Laws, punishments, weapons, are all Spiritual and of a Soul-nature) he will not have Antichristian Idolaters, Extortioners, Covetous, &c. to be let alone, but the unclean Lepers to be thrust forth, &c.*

*Therefore if neither the Offenders against the Civil Laws, State, and Peace, ought to be let alone, nor the Spiritual State, the Church ought to bear with them that are evil, Romans 2.*

*I Conclude that these Tares are sinners of another nature, Idolaters, false Worshippers, Antichristians, who without discouragement to true Christians, must be let alone, and permitted in the world to grow up until the great Harvest.*

***Defender.***

*Answer 1.* As all wicked Persons be opposite to God's children (for the children of the Kingdom of Light; and the children of the Kingdom of darkness, cannot but be opposite;) so the opposition that is in all the wicked against the children of God, doth, "fight against the religious state and Kingdom of the Lord Jesus. For such as stand for the Kingdom of Satan, (as all wicked men do) they stand in opposition to the Kingdom of Christ. No man can serve two Masters; If he cleave to the one, he standeth in enmity to the other, *Matthew 6:24.*

*Answer 2.* It followeth not, that because Christ biddeth his Ministers, Let the wicked alone in Church or State, That therefore he intendeth no other then Antichristian Idolaters: Neither should Christ contradict any Ordinance of his own for the punishment of Offenders, both in Christian and Civil State, though he should command other offenders to be let alone besides Antichristians. For no Ordinance or Law of God, nor just Law of man commandeth the rooting out of hypocrites, either by Civil, or Church-censure, though the Church be bound to endeavour as much (as in them lyeth) to heal their hypocrisy.

*Answer 3.* Neither is it true, that Antichristians are to be let alone by the Ordinance of Christ, till the end of the world. For what if the members of a Christian Church shall some of them Apostate to Antichristian Superstition and Idolatry, (as often falleth out by the seduction of the Emissaries of Babel) doth the Ordinance of Christ bind the hands of the Church (of which they are Members) to let them alone? In chapter 19 The Discussor himself would not have the superstitious observation of Lent-Fasts to be let alone; And surely, Christ ordained by his blessed Apostle *Paul*, that if any Brother proved an Idolater, (whether Pagan, or Antichristian) such an one should be cast out by excommunication, *1 Corinthians 5:11.*

Besides, What if any Antichristian Persons out of zeal to the Catholic Cause, and out of conscience to the command of their  
Superiors,

Superiors, should seek to destroy the King and Parliament, (as hath more than once or twice been attempted;) should such an one by any ordinance of Christ be let alone in the Civil State? Moreover, if Popish Priests and Jesuits be rightly expounded to be the Rivers and Fountains of water which drive the dead Sea of Antichristian pollution up and down all Nations in Europe: and if they by the Ordinance of Christ, be (in some cases) to drink blood, (for they are worthy) then they are not to be let alone, but duly suppressed, and cut off from conveying up and down their Idolatrous, Heretical, and Seditious wickedness, *Revelation 16:4 to 7.*

---

## CHAPTER 25.

---

### *A Reply to his 25. Chapter; Still discussing the meaning of the Tares.*

---

**T**Hirdly, The Tares cannot be hypocrites, is as clear as the Light, because they, when they are discovered, and seen to be Tares, are not to be let alone to the Angels in the end of the world, but are to be purged out by the Governors of the Church, with the whole Church.

#### *Definder.*

This objection hath been answered above, and let it be again denied (till the Discusser prove the contrary, which will never be). That hypocrites when they appear to be hypocrites, (and yet no worse then Tares) are to be purged out by the Government of the Church. It is true, if Hypocrites having a form of Godliness, and yet denying the power thereof, do break forth into such notorious scandalous Fruits of Hypocrisy, as tend to the leavening of the whole lump, they may then justly be proceeded against by the Government of the Church. But otherwise, if the Church proceed against an Hypocrite, as such, merely for his hypocrisy, for want of life and power of Godliness in his duties, they may soon root out, sometime or other, the best wheat in God's Field, and the sweetest Flowers in his Garden, who sometimes loose their fatness and sweetness for a season.

Discussor.

**Discusser.**

*Every Brother that walketh disorderly it is be with-drawn; and separated from.*

**Defender.**

True: But who is a Brother that walketh disorderly? Not every Hypocrite, but only such, who either walk inordinately without a calling (ἄνευ ταξέως,) or idly and negligently in his calling. For so the context carrieth it, in the words alluded to 2 *Thessalonians* 3:6. But that is not the case of every Hypocrite: of whom their are many that follow their callings, and are so far from being burdensome to others by their idleness, that they are even choked with the cares and businesses of this world, and yet are not behind in liberal contributions to pious uses.

**CHAPTER 26. A Reply to his Chapter 26.**

*Touching the danger of letting alone AntiChristians.*

**Discusser.**

*If any imagine, that the Antichristians being let alone may do a world of mischief before the world's end, by the infection of others.*

*I answer, 1. The Civil State keepeth itself with a Civil sword: let Civil offences be punished: and yet let their worship and Consciences be tolerated.*

*2. The Church hath a thousand bucklers and weapons, able to break down the strongest hold (2 Corinthians 10.) and so to defend itself against the gates of earth or hell.*

*3. The Lord knoweth who are his: his chosen cannot finally be deceived.*

*Lastly the Lord Jesus himself in this Parable giveth 2. Reasons able to content and satisfy our hearts.*

*First, least the good wheat be plucked up out of the field of the world. God's People, the good wheat are generally plucked, and persecuted, as well as the vilest Idolaters, whether Jews or Antichristians, which the Lord Jesus seemeth here to foretell.*

*Second reason is, when the world is ripe in sin, in the sins of Anti-christianism, those mighty angels of God will come with their sharp*

H

sickles

*sickles, and down with them, and bundle them up for everlasting burnings, then shall the man of sin be consumed by the breath of the mouth of the Lord Jesus &c.*

***Defender.***

Reply, 1. To his first *Answer*: It is true, the Civil State keepeth itself with a Civil sword, if Civil offences be punished. But when he would have their worship & Consciences tolerated, what if their worship and Consciences incite them to Civil offences? How shall then the Civil State keep itself safe with a Civil Sword.

As suppose a man that worshippeth the Beast, and maketh Conscience of obeying his commandments, shall think himself bound to subvert the Civil Peace, or State, who is excommunicated by the Beast? If such a man must be tolerated in his worship, and Conscience, what sword can provide for the safety of such a Prince or State?

***Reply.***

2. To his second *Answer*, It is true, the Church wanteth no Armories to defend itself, and amongst others, excommunication. But if their numbers be leavened with Antichristian Idolatry and superstition, and yet must be tolerated in their Idolatrous and superstitious worship, will not a little leaven (so tolerated) leaven the whole lump? And how then is the safety of the Church guarded?

***Reply.***

3. To his 3. *Answer*. It is true the Lord knoweth who are his: and none of his Elect shall perish. But nevertheless, Is it not a tempting of God, to presume upon God's Election for our salvation, and to neglect the means of our preservation? In like case, *Paul* knew by revelation; that all his fellow passengers in the ship should be saved: but yet he professed that if the Mariners went out of the ship, they could not be saved Acts, 27:24, with 31. So is it here, The Elect of God shall be saved: but yet if Idolaters, and Seducers be tolerated (all *Jezabel* was in *Thyatira*) to seduce the servants of Christ to pollution and Apostasy, the Church will stand guilty before God of the reduction and corruption of the people of God.

*Reply.*

*Reply.*

4. To his 4. *Answer* (the 2. Reasons alleged by him out of the Text:) To the first: There is no fear of plucking up the wheat, by rooting out Idolaters, and Seducers. If any of God's People should fall into Idolatry, and Apostasy, yea and should prove an instrument to seduce others also into the like wickedness: yet the censures inflicted on them, would be blessed of God to their recovery, & healing: yea and if they were cut off by the Civil sword, yet the example and terror of their punishment, would be blessed of God to preserve their brethren: who would all of them hear and fear, and do no more such wickedness. Neither, is the just punishment of such, any just pretence to punish the innocent lambs of Christ.

*Reply.*

To the Second Reason out of the Parable, It may justly be Replied, that the charge given to the Angels to execute vengeance at the last day upon such Idolaters, if that were sufficient to plead for the toleration of Idolaters, It would as well plead for the toleration of Murtherers, Robbers, Adulterers, Extortioners &c. for all there will the holy and mighty Angels of God gather into bundles at the last day, and cast them into everlasting burnings.

The place in 2 *Thessalonians* 2 doth not say, that the man of sin shall then be consumed with the breath of the mouth of the Lord Jesus: for he shall begin to be consumed long before, by all the seven vials of the wrath of God, *Revelation* 16, which have been, and will be in pouring out, many ages, before the great Harvest, of the end of the world. Yea I believe also, He shall be destroyed many ages before then: as the Apostle *John* foretelleth in Chapter 20.21.22. of the *Revelation*. And though it be translated, (in 2 *Thessalonians* 2:8.) The Lord shall destroy him with the brightness of his coming: yet the word is, ἐν τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς Παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; and Παρουσία doth as well, and more firstly signify Presence, than coming. The Lord will destroy Antichrist with the brightness of his Presence in his sacred and Civil Ordinances, sundry ages before the brightness of his coming to Judgement. Otherwise we should set *John* & *Paul* at variance, who spake by one and the same Spirit or Truth.

---

## CHAPTER 27.

---

### *A Reply to his 27. Chapter.*

*Discussing a doubt, how Ministers may be bidden to let Antichristians alone in the Civil State.*

#### **Discusser.**

*If it be objected, These servants, whom the Householder commandeth to let the Tares alone, seem to be Ministers or Messengers of the Gospel: How shall it belong to them to pluck up the Tares, or to let them alone, if by the Field be meant the world?*

*Answer. The Apostles, and in them all that succeed them, received from the Lord a threefold charge.*

1. *To let them alone, and not to pluck them up by Prayer to God for their present temporal destruction.*

2. *Not to prophecy or denounce a present destruction, or extirpation of all false Professors of the Name of Christ. Tis true many sore and fearful plagues are poured out upon the Roman Emperors, and Roman Popes, yet not to their utter extirpation until the Harvest.*

3. *Not to pluck them up, by stirring up Civil Magistrates and powers, to punish and persecute all such persons out of their dominions, as worship not the true God according to his revealed will in Christ Jesus.*

*Tis true, Elijah thus stirred up Ahab to kill all the Priests and Prophets of Baal: but that was in the figurative state of the Land of Canaan, not to be matched or paralleled by any other State, (but the Spiritual State, or Church of Christ) in all the world, putting the false Prophets Spiritually to death, by the two-edged sword, and power of the Lord Jesus, as that Church of Israel did corporally.*

#### **Defender.**

These 3. Interpretations of, Let them alone, are all of them so many evasions, (slippery evasions) sought out by the subtle wit of man, to wind out from under the Authority of the Truth, and word of Christ,

For 1. Why should not the Ministers of Christ Pray, either to pluck them up out of their Antichristian Idolatries, or else to pluck them up, as the Plantations which our Heavenly Father hath not planted? He that may Pray daily for the coming of  
Christ's

Christ's Kingdom, He may, and doth, and ought to pray for the coming down of all opposite Kingdoms. The Saints under the Altar that prayed against the delay of vengeance on the *Roman* Emperors, (*Revelation* 6:10.) may more justly pray against the delay of vengeance on the *Roman* Antichrists.

What though the State of the *Roman* Antichrists was to continue for sundry ages before their final extirpation? Yet they were to expect vials of God's indignation to root them out by a gradual extirpation in sundry of their cheif branches, and pillars, long before the extirpation of their whole Kingdom.

And what though the Saints in old *Babel* were to pray for the Peace of the City, as wherein themselves—might finde Peace? Yet the Saints that live not in such Antichristian Territories, they may safely pray for the hastening of the redemption of their brethren out of the Antichristian bondage, and there withal pray for the hastening of the ruin, and desolation of the Antichristian Kingdom.

Besides, Certain it is from the Word of Truth, that the Antichristian Kingdom shall be destroyed, and rooted up by Christian Princes and States long before the great Harvest of the end of the world, as hath been shown above. And either such Princes must perform this great work without Prayer (and then it were not sanctified to God 1 *Timothy* 4:4,5.) Or if it be a sacrifice sanctified to God, they must pray for their desolation before they inflict it. And all the seven Angels, who pour out their vials on the Antichristian State, tending to the rooting of it out by degrees, They either pray for the success of the vengeance of their vials, or else they do not pour them out in faith: which were contrary to the spirit of such holy Saints, *who come out of the Temple opened in Heaven, and are clothed with pure and white linen and have their breasts girded with golden girdles*, *Revelation* 15:6.

2. If *John* the Apostle have Prophecied and denounced the destruction and extirpation of Antichristian Idolaters, and their whole State, why may not a Minister and Messenger of Christ (according to the measure of light received) open those Ptophecies, and apply them with severe threatenings, against them and their State?

*Yea, but they may not apply, or denounce them to their present destruction or extirpation.*

Yes

Yes to the present destruction of some or other Antichristian Idolaters in every age, though the State may continue (waiting) till the time appointed. It might as truly be said, the Ministers of Christ are forbidden to denounce present or speedy destruction to any murderers, whoremongers, Tyrants, extortioners, because though some of them, may fall under many sore and fearful plagues: yet there will never want a company of such wicked doers, till the Great Harvest, the end of the world.

Besides what if a messenger of Christ should not denounce present destruction, yet he cannot be said to let them alone, who is hewing at them to bring them to destruction many years before. It is not every stroke with an Axe that felleth an Oak: it may be not an hundred, not a thousand strokes; yet no stroke is lost that maketh way for the felling of it at the last. Neither can he be said to let the Tree alone, that striketh and heweth at it every day. So he that heweth at the Antichristian State every day by Prayer, and Preaching. He doth not let it alone, though it may stand many a year after. It will fall the sooner, and with more—facility for every stroke.

3. Nor can it be the meaning of Christ, in commanding his Ministers to let the Tares alone, to forbid them to stir up Princes and States, to the rooting out of Antichristian Idolaters, and all such false worshippers, as destroy the Truth and Religion of the Lord Jesus. For amongst all the Angels, that poured out their vials upon the Antichristian State, it is not credible, that none of them should be Messengers of the Gospel. And when the ten Kings shall burn the City of *Rome*, and leave it desolate and naked, It is not credible that they will do it without some excitement from the Angels, no more then the Angels poured out their vials, till they were stirred up by a great voice out of the Temple, *Revelations*, 16:1.

It is an evasion as groundless as the former, that *Elijah's stirring up of Ahab to kill all the Priests and Prophets of Baal, was figurative.*

For all Figures in the old Testament have their Accomplishment in the New. Now evident it is, *Ahab* (an Apostate Idolater) was no Type of Christ: nor was *Israel* (after their Apostasy) a Type of the true Church of Christ. A Tabernacle it was, but not a Tabernacle

nacle of Christ: *Aholah* but not *Abolibah*. To make this act in *Israel* a Type of Christ's act in Christian State, or Church, is to make darkness a Type of light. Ceremonial Laws were generally Typical: not so *Moses* his Judicials, especially those which had in them moral equity.

It is Moral equity, That Blasphemers, and Apostate Idolaters, seducing others to Idolatry, should be put to death, *Leviticus* 24:16; *Deuteronomy* 13:5. *Ahab* forfeited his own life because he did not put *Benhadad* to death for his blasphemy. *1 Kings* 20:23,28. and *verse* 42, yet *Benhadad* was no *Israelite*, nor was his blasphemy bleched out in the Land of *Israel*: but the external equity of that Judicial Law of *Moses* was of moral force, and bindeth all Princes to express that zeal, and indignation, both against blasphemy, in such as fall under their just power, which *Ahab* neglected; and against seduction to Idolatry, which *Ahab* executed, or else *Elijah*, or some others, by his consent.

But before I leave this dispute, touching the meaning of those words, Let them alone, let me add another Interpretation, which I see doth rather more satisfy others, and it may well stand. Let them alone, is not a word of precept by way of Ordinance: But a word of permission by way of Providence. God in his Providence will permit some or other Tares ever to be found in his Church to the last Judgement. Which yet he would not have his servants offended at: For them he will pluck up by his Angels at the last Harvest.

---

## CHAPTER 28.

*A Reply to his 28th Chapter: Which is a Recapitulation of what Points the Discusser supposeth, He hath proved in opening this Parable.*

### *Defender.*

The *Discusser* in this Chapter, is only a Rehearser of what he conceiveth himself to have evidently demonstrated to the Conscience, from Chapter eighteen, to this Chapter twenty-eight: Five Points Negatively: and Five Points Affirmatively. But because  
what

what he rehearseth hath been reversed in the Reply to those several Chapters, I will not *Actum Agere*, nor *Dictum dicere*.

---

## CHAPTER 29.

*A Reply to his twenty-ninth Chapter, Discussing the Text in Matthew 15:14.*

### Letter.

*The second Scripture brought against such Persecution for Cause of Conscience, is Matthew 15:14, where the Disciples being troubled at the Pharisees carriage towards the Lord Jesus, and his Doctrine, and relating how they were offended at him, The Lord Jesus commandeth his Disciples to Let them alone, and giveth this Reason, that the blind lead the blind, and both should fall into the ditch.*

### Answer of the Letter.

*Christ speaketh not there to public Officers, whether in Church or Common-wealth, but to his private Disciples concerning the Pharisees, over whom they had no power.*

*And the command he giveth to Let them alone is spoken in regard of troubling themselves, or regarding the offence which they took at the wholesome Doctrine of the Gospel. As who should say, Though they be offended at this wholesome saying of mine, yet do not you fear their fear, nor be troubled at their offence, which they take at my Doctrine, not out of sound Judgement, but out of blindness. But this maketh nothing to the cause in hand.*

### Discusser.

*To pass by this Assertion of the privacy of the Apostles, in that the Lord Jesus, commanded to Let them alone, that is, not only to be offended themselves, but not to meddle with them, It appeareth it was no Ordinance of God, nor of Christ, for his Disciples to have gone further, and have complained to, and excited, the Civil Magistrate to his duty. Which if it had been an Ordinance of God, and Christ, either for the vindicating of Christ's Doctrine, or the recovering of the Pharisees, or the preserving of others from infection, the Lord Jesus would never have commanded them to omit that, which should have tended to these holy ends.*

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

Reply 1. To pass by the Assertion of the Privacy of the Apostles, It is not an Act of courtesy, and loathness to strive, but out of defect of just pretence to make any colourable exception against it. For though the Apostles were called to a public Ministry, *Matthew 10*, yet it seemeth, not as then to a constant office, but to a transient Administration *pro illi vice*, for that time. Their constant calling required to attend continuity upon Christ's Ministry, to prepare and ripen them for the public constant office which they were to be called to, after Christ's Resurrection, *Acts 1:21,22*.

Besides in that transient Administration they were not sent to the Scribes and Pharisees, (who were no bitter then Wolves and Foxes,) *but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, Matthew 10:6*. And therefore the Apostles not being sent to the Scribes and Pharisees, they had no power over them, but stood as private men to them.

Reply 2. And as they had no calling, nor power to correct or censure them themselves: so neither had they a calling to excite the civil Magistrate against them. For first it was no just cause for the civil Magistrate to punish the Pharisees, for that they took unjust offence against Christ's wholesome doctrine.

For neither was the doctrine itself a fundamental truth: nor was their offence against it, a fundamental error, though it was dangerous. Besides the civil Magistrates had no Law established about doctrines, or offences of that nature. And therefore they could take no judicial cognizance of any complaint presented to them about the same.

Moreover our Saviour who sent forth his Apostles to preach to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*, gave them a charge of caution to beware how they meddled with Scribes and Pharisees, *Behold, (saith he) I send you forth as sheep among wolves: Be ye therefore wise as serpents, & innocent as doves, Beware of men, &c. Matthew 10:16,17*.

The Apostles therefore having received this caution could not meddle with the Scribes and Pharisees, but trespass against this rule of serpentine prudence: as much as for a flock of lambs to complain to a kennel of wolves, of the wolves outrage. Yea, Christ himself was sparing to reprove them himself (though called

led to a Public Minstry,) till the last year of his Ministry, when his hour was coming of departure out of the world; as knowing, they would not be able to bear it, and their exasperation might have been some hinderance to the free passage of his Ministry, before his hour was come.

## CHAPTER 30. *A Reply to his Chapter 30.*

### Discusser.

**I**F it be said, neither the Roman Cæsar, nor Herod, nor Pilate, knew ought of the true God, or of Christ: and it had been in vain to have made complaint to them, who were not fit, and competent, but ignorant, and opposite Judges.

Answer 1. *This removeth the stumbling block of Paul's appeal to Cæsar: which since he could not do in common sence, as to a competent Judge in such cases, &c. It must needs follow, his appeal was merely in respect of his civil wrongs, &c.*

Answer 2. *If it had been an Ordinance of God: that all civil Magistrates were bound to judge in causes spiritual, and Christian, (as to suppress Heresies, to defend the Faith of Jesus:) although that Cæsar, Herod, and Pontius Pilate, were ignorant, wicked and opposite Judges: yet Christ and his Disciples should have gone as far as lay in their power for redressing of evil, and left it in the Magistrates hands.*

Answer 3. *If it had been the holy will of God to have established the Doctrine and Kingdom of his Son this way, he would have furnished Kingdoms and Common-wealths with many good and gracious Magistrates, to have fitted them for it.*

### Defender.

Reply 1. to Answer 1. *Paul's appeal to Cæsar, was about the wrongs done unto the Jews, Acts 25:10. The wrongs to them were not only civil, but Church-offences, which Paul denied: Neither against the Law of the Jews (saith he) nor against the Temple, nor against Cæsar, have I offended any thing at all, verse 8. Festus demanded if he would goe up to Jerusalem, there to be judged of these things? verse 9. These things were matters of Religion, as well as civil offences. To offend against the Law of the Jews, and against the Temple, were offences against Religion: to offend against Cæsar was a civil offence. To be judged of these things, Paul*  
declineth

declineth the Court at *Jerusalem*, (as being unjustly prejudiced against him:) But professing his own innocence, and subjection to just judgement, He appealeth to *Cæsar's* judgement seat, *verse* 10, 11, wherein three or four things do evidently appear.

1. That a man may be such an offender in maners of Religion (against the Law of God, against the Church, as well as in civil matters against *Cæsar*) as to be worthy of death.

This *Paul* presupposeth, *verse* 8, 9, 10.

2. That *Paul*, or any other such like servant of Christ, If he should commit any such offence; he would not refuse judgement unto death, *verse* 11.

3. That for the Judgement of his person in these causes, (whether ecclesiastical or civil,) It is lawful in some cases to appeal, to a civil, though a *Pagan* Magistrate. In some cases I say, as where both these concur, to wit. 1. That Church-officers, are maliciously prejudiced against a man, and inferior civil Courts incline to them. 2. That a man be called in question amongst them in capital causes, which concern his life.

But a fourth thing which appeareth from *Paul's* appeal is this, That the civil Magistrate, whether *Christian*, or *Pagan*, may and ought to be so well acquainted, not only with civil causes, but also with causes of Religion, especially such as concern life, as to be able to judge, though not of all questions, yet of capital offences, against Religion, as well as against the civil State.

*Reply* 2 to *Answer* 2. The Marginal Note, seemeth to imply a contradiction to itself, for thus it speaketh, *Civil Magistrates were never appointed by God, Defenders of the Faith of Jesus*. And again, *Everyone is bound to put forth himself to his utmost power in God's Business*: Surely, if every one be bound to put forth himself to his utmost power in God's Business, then civil Magistrates are bound to put forth their civil power, in defending the Faith of Jesus.

Neither, will it henceforth follow, That either Christ, or his Disciples, were bound to complain to *Cæsar*, or to *Herod*, or to *Pontius Pilate*, against the Heresies of the Pharisees. For though all Magistrates, even *Pagans* ought to inform themselves in the matters at Faith and of Christian Religion, (that they may observe and preserve it) and it will be a destructive sin to them and

their States, if they do neglect it, (*Psalm* 2:10,11,12.) Yet it may be safer for a Christian man being oppressed in inferior Courts of heretical malignant Judges to appeal from them unto *Pagan* Princes in his own just defence, than to make complaint to malignant heretical Judges, or to *Pagan* Princes, against heresies, or heretical false Teachers. Christ sent out his Disciples, as sheep amongst wolves: and therefore instructed them, *to be wise as serpents, and innocent as doves*, *Matthew* 10:16. Now it is no part of wisdom for a sheep of Christ to complain to a kennel of Wolves, That amongst the wolves, there be some of their company do make havoc of the sheep, leading them aside into damnable heresies. If a poor sheep should attempt such a thing, would not the whole kennel of wolves arise up against him, as a troubler of their State, that when he enjoyeth peace himself, (they trouble not him,) yet he will needs be so busy as to trouble them?

And therefore we deny, that it had tended to the defence of the Faith of Jesus, or to the suppressing Heresies, for Christ and his Disciples to have complained to *Herod*, *Pilate*, *Cæsar*, of the heresies of the Pharisees. It had rather tended to the disturbance and suppression of the Faith of Jesus, by provoking the malice of the Pharisees. and by disquieting civil Thrones with fears, and jealousies of a new Kingdom springing up amongst them. Besides, it had been altogether preposterous, to make use of the civil power, for the first publishing of the Gospel of peace. It was necessary the Gospel should first be known, and received, and believed, and professed, before any could be complained of, for Apostasy from it into Heresy, or seducement of others into such wickedness.

*Reply 3 to Answer 3.* We do not say, It is the holy Will and Purpose of God, to establish the Doctrine and Kingdom of his Son (our Lord Jesus) only this way, to wit, by the help of civil Authority. For it is his Will also, to magnify his Power, in establishing the same, by a contrary way, even by the sufferings (patient sufferings) of his Saints, and by the bloody swords of persecuting Magistrates, *Revelation* 12:11. So that Christ need not to send good and gracious Magistrates, as if for want of them, the Christian Faith and Religion would fall to the ground: for it  
hath

hath spread and flourished under fiery and cruel persecution. But yet this hindreth not, but that it is the duty of Magistrates to know the Son, and to kiss him, to acknowledge his Kingdom, and submit their Thrones and Crowns to it, to love his truth, and to be *nursing Fathers to his Church*, *Isaiah* 49:23, which how they can do, and yet not be Defenders of the Faith of Jesus, I do not understand.

---

## CHAPTER 31.

*A Reply to his thirteenth Chapter, discussing by the way, the Text in Isaiah 49:23*

### Discusser

**I**. *THat place of Isaiah 49:23. will appear to be far from proving such Kings and Queens Judges of Ecclesiastical causes. And if not Judges, they may not punish.*

*2. In spiritual things, themselves are subject to the Church, shall lick the dust of the Churches feet, as is there expressed. How then shall those Kings and Queens be Supreme Governors of the Church?*

*3. God's Israel of old being earnest for a King, an Arm of flesh, God gave them Saul in his anger, and took him away in his wrath. So God will take away such Princes in his wrath; that so as David succeeded Saul, so Christ Jesus in his spiritual Power may for ever be advanced.*

### Defender.

*Reply* 1. We do not allege that place in *Isaiah*, to prove Kings and Queens to be Judges of Ecclesiastical causes: but to be providers for the Churches well-being, and protectors of it. For so much the very phrase of nursing Fathers, and Mothers, doth necessarily import. But if they be Protectors of the Church, and providers of the well-being one, then are they also Defenders of the faith of it: so far as their defence (in a way of God) is dispensible. So Magistrates are also called Shepherds of the people as well as Ministers) *Ezekiel* 34. Now it is a part of a Shepherds protection of his sheep, to drive away wolves from sheep-folds. And it is the like part of good Magistrates to drive away false Prophets from the Churches, whom our Saviour calleth ravening wolves, *Matthew* 7:15.

*But*

*But (saith he) Magistrates are not Judges of Ecclesiastical causes: and if not Judges, they may not punish.*

*Answer.* There is a three-fold Judgement. 1. A Judgement of private spiritual Discretion: and so *a spiritual man judgeth all things*, 1 *Corinthians* 2:15, and so may a Magistrate judge also, if he be a spiritual man.

2. There is *Judicium Propheticum*, A propheticall Judgement, whereby the Prophets having received a greater gift of spiritual discerning of the things of God, and all office to declare the same, do judge of Doctrines with Authority. *Let the Prophets judge*, 2 *Corinthians* 14:29,32. And this the Ministerial Judgement of the Church: hut here the Magistrates Judgement doth not interpose, as a Magistrate, but as a Brother.

3. There is *Judicium Politicum*, the Judgement of civil power, whereby a Magistrate being called of God to provide, that his people may lead a peaceable life in godliness and honesty, he therefore is called to discern, not only what is honesty or righteousness before men, but what is godliness also before the Lord, & accordingly judgeth of godly & ungodly doctrines & practises, so far as tendeth to the upholding of public Peace. For it is evident in the Scriptures of the New-Testament, that when Magistrates were so blindly devour, and superstitious, as to give their Kingdoms unto the Beast, (as *Revelation* 17:12,13.) and so to tolerate the public worship of Images, and other Idols, they thereby overthrew the civil Peace of their Common-wealth. For to punish their ungodliness, it was, that God opened a way for the *Turks* to break out and destroy the 3<sup>d</sup> part of *Christendom*, *Revelation* 9:14 to 21.

*Reply* 2. Both these may well stand together, that Magistrates may be subject to the Church, and lick the dust of her feet, & yet be supreme Governors of the Church also. In spiritual matters, and in the right administration of them, the Magistrates are subject to the Church. But in civil matters, and in corrupt administration of Church-Affairs, (so, far corrupt, as rendeth to the disturbance of civil Peace, there the Magistrates are supreme Governors even over Churches also, in their own Dominions.

*Reply* 3. It was no sin in *Israel* of old to ask a King, but to ask him before the time appointed, and to ask him in a tumultuous manner, (with rejection of *Samuel*, and to ask him for carnal

carnal and prophane ends, that they might be like to all other Nations, whom God did not approve they should affect to be like unto. Otherwise had they tarried God's time, God had appointed to give them a King out of the Tribe of *Judah*, *Genesis* 49:10. It is true, God took away *Saul* in his wrath, but not for exercising civil Power against spiritual wickedness; for he did justly exercise it against Witches: but for other well-known notorious wickedness. And as for *David*, we do not read, that he did exercise any spiritual Power, as a King, but as a Prophet.

## CHAPTER 32. *A Reply to his Chapter 32.*

### Discusser.

**T***Hough for the present, the punishment of corrupt Teachers (as the Scribes and Pharisees were) be deferred: yet their waiteth for them an higher pitch of punishment, than any Corporal can reach unto.*

*As* 1. *Stark Blindness, &c.*

2. *Incurable Blindness, &c.*

3. *There end is the Ditch, Ac.*

4. *The Leaders of others into the ditch shall find their own ruin horrible, and the ruin of their followers eternally galling & tormenting.*

### Defender.

The Discusser himself knoweth, and accordingly expresseth himself in his next words, *That it is the like case of all sinners, and of all malefactors: their punishment in hell will be more horrible and full of torment, then can be inflicted in this world. And yet the State is often bound to punish them, and in many cases by death itself.*

### Discusser.

*Be it so: But what is this to a blind Pharisee, resisting the Doctrine of Christ? who happily may be as good a Subject, and as peaceable, and profitable to the civil State as any, &c.*

### Defender.

But what is this to the question in hand? we do not hold it lawful for a Christian Magistrate, to compel by civil sword either Pharisee, or any *Jew*, or Pagan, to profess the Religion, or Doctrine of the Lord Jesus, much less do we think it meet, for a private Christian to provoke either *Jewish* or *Pagan* Magistrates

to

to compel Pharisees to submit to the Doctrine or Religion of Christ Jesus. And therefore all these Chapters from 29 to 35 (seven Chapters in all) tending to prove that Christ's Disciples were to let the Pharisees alone in this way, are but so many empty flourishes, beating the air, & playing with a shadow. And yet the rest of the Chapters which remain must not pass without some Adversisement of such passages in them, as do corrupt the truth of Christ. How the Pharisees can be as good subjects, and as peaceable, and profitable to the civil State as any, who yet destroyed the civil State, by destroying Christ; let any but a blind conscience judge.

## CHAPTER 33.

### Discusser.

**I***T is truth, The mischief of a blind Pharisee's blind guidance, is greater than if he acted treasons, murders, &c. And the loss of one soul by his seduction, is a greater mischief, than if he blew up Parliaments, or cut the throats of Kings and Emperors, &c.*

*And therefore a firm justice, that requires an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, life for life, calleth also soul for soul. But that no civil sword can inflict, but the Lord Jesus only.*

### Defender.

*Reply 1.* But he that corrupteth a soul with a corrupt religion, or worship, layeth a spreading leaven, which corrupteth the State. The Idolatry began in the House of *Micah*, corrupted *Laish*, *Judges chapter 17* and *chapter 18*. And that was *the beginning of sin to the Daughter of Zion, Micah 1:13*. And that Apostasy was the captivity of the Land. As in the New-Testament, the worship of Images was the advancement of the *Turk*, and the ruin of Christian States, *Revelation 9:14 to 21*. When therefore the corruption, or destruction of souls, is a destruction also of lives, liberties, estates of men, *lex talionis* calleth for, not only soul for soul, but life for life.

*Reply 2.* False Prophts in the Old Testament did but corrupt the souls of some, and it may be did not corrupt them neither, but attempted it only. And yet amongst God's people, where *lex talionis* was much attended, the Law was, *Thine eye shall not spare him*

him, *Deuteronomy* 13. The reason of which execution is not fetched from any typical holiness of the Land: but from the dangerous wickedness of the attempt, to thrust away a soul from God, which is a greater injury, then to deprive a min of bodily life.

**Discusser.**

*But dead men cannot die, nor be infected. Natural men, the civil State, the world, are dead in sin, &c.*

**Defender.**

*Reply* 1. Dead men may be made worse, by corrupt Teachers, *two-fold more the children of hell than before, Matthew* 23:15. And therefore such as so corrupt them, are worthy in a way of due proceeding, of a two-fold death.

*Reply* 2. Such as profess the truth of the Doctrine and Worship of Christ, they live a kind of spiritual life, though not such as accompanieth salvation. Else how are false Teachers, and such as are led by them, said to be *twice dead, plucked up by the roots? Jude* verse 12. And therefore it is not true, *that such as being in a natural state, are dead in sin, cannot be infected, nor die again.*

**Discuser.**

*As in the common infection of the plague, so in the infection of heresy, none can be struck deadly, but whom God hath thereunto ordained, &c.*

**Defender.**

*Reply* 1. No more can any man be murdered, but whom God hath ordained thereunto. But it is a prophane sacrilege to excuse, or alleviate the punishment of sin by God's eternal predestination. Was the sin of *Herod*, or the *Jews*, or of *Pontius Pilate* any whit the less, because they did nothing against Christ, but what the hand of God and his Counsel had fore-determined to be done? *Acts* 4:29. Sure it is, Christ aggravateth the sin of *Judas*, and of the High Priests, and Elders of the *Jews* by this Argument, that *Pilate* could do nothing against him, but as it was given him from above. *Therefore* (saith he) *he that delivered me to thee, hath the greater sin, John* 19:11.

*Reply* 2. The Discusser himself acknowledgeth, *That though in a common plague or infection, none are smitten, or die, but such as are ordained thereunto:* yet it is not only every man's duty, but the common duty of the Magistrates to prevent infection, and to preserve the common health of the place, by removing infectious persons into solitary tabernacles.

K

Discusser.

**Discusser.**

*True: but the means, God hath appointed for preservation from spiritual infection and perdition, are spiritual, such as God directeth to Revelation 2. Titus 3:10,11. Romans 16:17, But the Lord Jesus never appointed the civil sword for either Antidote, or Remedy, as an addition to these Spirituals. The Remedy which God prescribed to the Angel of the Church of Pergamus, It were a Babylonish confusion to interpret it, as sent to the Governor of the City of Pergamus.*

**Defender.**

*Subordinata, and so Coordinata non pugnant.* It is true, Christ hath appointed spiritual means for the avoiding and preventing the infection of heresies; so hath he also for the preventing and avoiding all offences in Church-members. But that hindreth not the lawful and necessary use of a civil sword for the punishment of some such offences as are subject to Church censure. If indeed the Ordinances of Christ in the Church do prevail to the avoiding and healing of hereties, there is no need of the civil sword for that end. But it often falleth out otherwise: as

1. That when the Church hath cast out an Heretic, yet he still remaineth obstinate, and proceedeth to seduce, and destroy the faith of some, (it may be of many:) as did *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, 2 *Timothy* 2:17,18. If the Magistrate's sword do here rust in the scabbard, such leaven may leaven the whole Mass of a City, or Country; As by this means *Arianism* leavened the world by the indulgence of *Constantius*; *Ingemuit Orbis Christianus, & miratus est factum se esse Arianum.*

2. I may be the Heretic was never any member of the Church, and then though the Church may lay in some *Antidotes*, and *Purges*, to preserve, or recover their Members: yet how shall they succour such as are not subject to their censures? Of how shall they prevent the spreading of this noisome leprosy in private Conventicles?

*But the Lord Jesus never appointed the civil sword for an Antidote, or Remedy in such a case.*

*Answer.* It is evident the civil sword was appointed for a remedy in this case, *Deuteronomy* 13. And appointed it was, by that Angel of God's presence, whom God promised to send with his people, as being unwilling to go along with them himself, *Exodus* 33:2,3.

*And*

*And that Angel was Christ, whom they tempted in the wilderness, 1 Corinthians 10:9, And therefore it cannot truly be said, that the Lord Jesus never appointed the civil sword for a remedy in such a case. For he did expressly appoint it in the Old-Testament: nor did he ever abrogate it in the New. The reason of the Law, (which is the life of the Law) is of eternal force and equity in all Ages. Thou shalt surely kill him, because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, Deuteronomy 13:9,10. This reason is of moral, that is, of universal and perpetual equity to put to death any Apostate seducing Idolater, or Heretic, who seeketh to thrust away the souls of God's people, from the Lord their God. If Magistrates be the Ministers of God in the New-Testament, (as Paul, calleth them, Romans 13:4.) And Ministers of God to execute vengeance on him that doeth evil, surely either this is no evil, (to seek to thrust away God's people from him) or the Magistrate beareth not the sword in vain, to execute vengeance on such an evil doer. Yea but such an evil, is evil only to the inner man, not to the civil State*

*Answer.* But if a man imagine evil against the Lord, it is a destructive evil to a whole City, yea to a *Pagan City*: and God will visit such an evil with such an affliction, as shall be no less than utter destruction to such a City: *It shall not rise up the second time, Nahum 1:9,11.*

#### **Discusser.**

*But the civil Magistrate hath his charge of the bodies and goods of the Subject; as the Spiritual-Officers of Christ's City or Kingdom, have the charge of their souls, and soul-safety.*

#### **Defender.**

*Reply 1.* If it were true, That the Magistrate hath charge only of the bodies and goods of the Subject: yet that might justly excite to watchfulness against such pollutions of Religion as tend to Apostasy. For if the Church and People of God, fall away from God, God will visit the City and Country with public calamity, if not captivity for the Churches sake. The Idolatry and Image-worship of Christians, brought in the *Turkish* captivity upon the Cities, and Countrys of *Asia*, and upon some of *Europe* also, as hath been showed above.

*Reply 2.* It is a carnal and worldly, and indeed, an ungodly

imagination, to confine the Magistrates charge, to the bodies, and goods of the Subject and to exclude them from the care of their souls. Did ever God commit the charge of the body to any Governors, (to whom, he did not commit (in his way) the care of souls also? Hath God committed to Parents the charge of their children's bodies, and not the care of their souls? To Masters the charge of their servants' bodies, and not of their souls? to Captains the charge of their soldiers' bodies, and not of their souls? shall the Captains suffer false worship, yea idolatry, publicly professed and practised in the camp, and yet look to prosper in the Battle? The Magistrates to whom God hath committed the charge of bodies, and outward man of the Subject, are they not also to take care to procure faithful Teachers to be sent amongst them? *Jehoshaphat* took faithful care for the souls of his people in this kind, 2 *Chronicles* 17:7,8,9. Neither did he this as a Type of Christ, but as a Servant of Christ. Those things are said to be done as Types of Christ, which being ceremonial duties, were afterwards done by Christ in his own Person, and so were in him accomplished, and abolished: And it would be sacrilege to perform the same after him. But let the conscience of any sincere Christian judge, whether it would be sacrilege in a godly Magistrate, to procure the sending forth of godly Preachers into all the blind corners of his country? The truth is, Church-Governors, and civil governors do herein stand parallel one to another. The Church-Governors though to them be chiefly committed the charge of souls, as their adequate objects: yet in order to the good of the souls of their people, to dehort from idleness, negligence, from intemperancy in meats and drinks, from oppression, and deceit, and therein provide both for the health of their bodies, and the safety of their estates. So civil-governors though to them be chiefly committed the bodies and goods of the people (as their adequate object:) yet in order to this, they may and ought to procure spiritual helps to their souls, and to prevent such spiritual evils, as that the prosperity of Religion amongst them might advance the prosperity of the civil State.

*Reply 3.* I cannot but with grief observe the sinful guile of the Discussor: who whilst he taketh off all charges of souls from  
the

the civil Magistrates, and layeth it upon Church-Governors, he taketh it off from Church-Governors too, that so the whole charge of precious souls (for whom Christ died) might utterly fall to the ground. For how shall Church-Governors take the charge of soules upon them, if there be no Church-Governors? And how shall there be Church-Governors, where there be no Churches? If Churches be all dissipated and rooted out from the face of the Earth by the Apostasy of Antichrist, and none to be gathered again, till new Apostle or Evangelists be sent abroad for such a work, then there be now neither Churches, nor Church-Governors, nor Church-censures; either to censure Heretics, or to fetch in those stray souls whom they have scattered. And then rejoice ye Heretics, and all ye Idolaters, and Seducers, and go on, and make havoc of the sheep of Christ like ravenous Wolves: you may now do it (*impunè*) without fear or danger; It is neither for Civil Governors, nor Church-Governors to meddle with you; Not for Civil Governors, for they are not to judge nor punish in matters of Religion: Nor for Church-Governors, for there are neither Churches, nor Church-Governors extant now upon the face of the Earth. But woe be to you poor sheep and Lambs of Christ Jesus: you are now indeed truly become the *sheep of the slaughter*, *your Possessors may slay you*, and *plead themselves not guilty*, (*Zechariah 11:4,5.*) not guilty before the Civil Bar: for their crime is exempted from civil cognizance: not guilty before the Churches Tribunal: for there be no Churches to call them to account.

---

### CHAPTER 35. *A Reply to his 35. Chapter.*

**Discusser.**

**I***F it were the Magistrates duty or office, to punish Heretics, then is he both a Temporal and Ecclesiastical Officer.*

**Defender.**

It followeth not: unless the Magistrate were to punish them with Ecclesiastical censures, which he neither doth, nor may do. The punishments which he inflicteth on them, are merely Civil, whether imprisonment, banishment, or death.

Discusser.

**Discusser.**

*That Doctrine and distinction, that a Magistrate may punish an Heretic civilly, will not here avail. For what is Babel, if this be not? confusedly to punish Corporal, or Civil offences, with spiritual, or Church-censures (the offender not being a member of it:) or to punish soul or spiritual offences, with Corporal or Temporal weapons proper to Delinquents against the Civil State.*

**Defender.**

It is no *Babel*, or Babylonish confusion to punish corporal, or civil offences, with Spiritual or Church-censures. What if a Brother be a striker, an oppressor, a murderer, a fornicator, or Adulterer? all these are corporal, and civil offences. But shall not therefore the Church punish these with spiritual, and Church-censures? Then the Apostle was mistaken, who directeth so to do, 1 *Corinthians* 5:11, why the Discusser putteth in that parenthesis (the offender not being a member of it:) I cannot tell: sure I am, it is nothing to the purpose. For as the Church cannot punish any offender, unless he be a member of the Church, so neither may the Civil Magistrate punish an Heretic or other spiritual offender, unless he be a member of his Common-wealth.

And if it be no confusion to punish civil offences with Church-censures, it is no confusion to punish spiritual offences with civil censures. And the reason of both these is the same, there be sundry civil offences, which are also transgressions of the Rule of the word, and so offences to the Consciences of the Church, and so justly subject to Church-censure. There be also offences to the Order and peace of the Church, which tend likewise to provoke wrath against a Civil State. As the King of *Persia* said, *Whatsoever is commanded by the God of Heaven for the House of God, let it be diligently done: for why should there be wrath against the King and his Sons?* *Ezra* 7:3. If offences to the Church do provoke wrath against the Civil State, it is no confusion in the Civil State to punish such.

**Discusser.**

*Woe were it with the Civil Magistrate, if together with the common care and charge of the Common-wealth, the blood of every soul that perisheth, should cry against him, unless he should sat with Paul, Acts* 20. I am clear from the blood of all men, &c.

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

It is not the blood of every soul that perisheth, that can cry against a Magistrate, unless the soul perish by some such neglect of duty in the Magistrate, which God requireth of him for the good of the souls of his people. Of which Duties there be two sorts.

1. To seek out and procure means of Grace for them so far as they are capable in God's way.

2. To remove means of their corruption and pollution, such as Idols openly erected, and idolatrous false Teachers perverting the people. If in both these, the Magistrate be faithful, though thousands of souls may perish under his Government, yet he is innocent from the blood of them all, and may so profess with *Paul*.

**Discusser.**

*I acknowledge the Magistrate ought to cherish (as a Foster Father) the Lord Jesus in his Truth, in his Saints, to cleave unto them himself, to countenance them unto the Death, yea also to break the Teeth of the Lions, who offer civil violence and injury unto them. But to see all his Subjects, Christians, to keep such a Church, or Christians in the purity of worship, and see them do their duty, this belongeth to the head of the body the Lord Jesus, and such spiritual Officers, as he hath to this purpose deputed.*

*Reply 1.* What is said of Spiritual Officers deputed by Christ to see the Church to do her Duty, is but a pretence, when he acknowledgeth no Church, nor spiritual Officers in the Church deputed by Christ, extant upon the face of the Earth.

*Reply 2.* What Reason can the *Discusser* give why the Magistrate should break the teeth of the Lions, who offer evil violence to the Church and Saints, and not break the teeth of the ravenous wolves (false Prophets) who offer violence to their souls (Doubtless those ravenous wolves, that make havoc of their souls, are far more mischievous than the Lions be, that offer violence to their bodies. The Roman pagan Emperors (who like Lions persecuted the Church, 2 *Timothy* 4:17.) they by persecution increased it, though against their will. But the Roman Popish Bishops, that like ravenous wolves devoured their souls, left the Church of Christ scarce visible, (though visible) and them, a very small remnant, though a remnant. It may be  
matter

matter of just wonderment, why Antichrist should find more favours in the *Discussers* eyes, then all ignorant Pagan, when the one hateth Christ more bitterly, and maketh far more waste of the Church, and Saints of Christ, then doth the other. Is it because his own Spirit doth more symbolize with Antichrist than with *Cæsar*? Rather in secret supplanting, then in open persecuting the Churches and Ordinances of Christ?

*Reply 3.* We do not say that it is a part of the Magistrates duty, to see all his Subjects to become Christians, if they were Pagans before: though we say, it is his Duty to neglect no good means to help them onward to the knowledge and faith of Christ Jesus. But why doth the *Discusser* shake this duty out of the *Magistrates*, to see that the Church, and the Christians under his Government, should walk in purity of worship, at least not to far to degenerate and apostate as to provoke Christ to depart from them? Can he hope that such Christians will be faithfull and loyal to their Prince, whom he seeth to grow false and disloyal to their God? Surely the Land of *Israel* though it had some peculiar and typical Holiness belonging to it, yet no other then what did prefigure the Holiness of the Church, which is as holy to Christ, and ought to be as holy to us, as the Land of *Israel* was to them. If therefore it was the duty of *Jehoshaphat*, *Hezekiah*, and *Isaiah*, to reduce the people of *Israel* from their backslidings, because they were an holy people, (2 *Chronicles* 19:4.) Surely the like Duty lieth upon all Godly Christian Princes, to reduce their backsliding Churches to their Primitive Purity.

Let no man say, that as the Holy Land of *Israel*, was a Type of Holy Church: so there Princes were *Types of the Lord Jesus*, to whom alone it belongeth to see Churches and Christians to do their duty in Purity of worship.

For though *David* and *Solomon* were Types of Christ, (and so the Scripture holdeth them forth:) ver the Scripture giveth no hint, that the other Kings either of *Israel*, or *Judah* were Types. Nor of *Israel*, for they were all Apostates: nor of *Judah*, for if the Kings of *Judah* (as Kings of *Judah*, to wit, in respect of their Regal Estate over the Church) if they were all of them Types of Christ, then Apostates from Christ, were Types of Christ. For many of the Kings of *Judah* were Apostates from Christ as well as the Kings of *Israel*.

Yea,

Yea, if they were all Types of Christ, then Christ is the Anti-type, and by accomplishing such types, hath abolished them all: so that now it were sacriligious and Antichristian usurpation for any Kings to be set over Christians, or the people of God. For the Body being come, Types and shadows vanish.

But what if they were all types of Christ in respect of their Kingly office over the Church alone? were they therefore types of Christ in all the Kingly Offices which they performed? Then it was typical in *Solomon* to put *Joab* a Murderer to death, and *Adonijah* a Traitor. And then it will be unlawful for Christian Princes to put Murderers or Traitors to death.

Or if you say these were civil crimes: But Idolatry and Heresy, which *Asa*, *Joash*) and *Josiah* punished with death, were spiritual crimes, and therefore the Kings of *Judah* in punishing these latter, were types of Christ, not so in the former: this is spoken *gratis*. For whatsoever the Kings of *Judah* did, as types of Christ, Christ being the Antitype, might more full, and lively perform it in his own person. But certain it is, he put no man to death in his own person, all the days of his flesh. Why therefore may it not rather be said, that whatsoever the Kings of *Judah* lawfully did, whether against the Transgressors of the first or second Table, they did it nor as types of Christ, but as servants of Christ, be-trusted with the care of the welfare both of Church and Common-wealth, and therefore as patterns and examples to Christian Magistrates?

And indeed many of the Kings of *Israel*, as they were Kings over a Common-wealth, which was also a Church, so they were Kings also over sundry Pagan Nations round about them, as were *David* and *Solomon*, *Asa* and *Jehosaphat*, *Joash* and *Josiah*. And though none of them compelled the Pagan Nations, to become Proselytes to the Church of *Israel* (no more than Christian Kings may compel Pagans to become Christians, or men without to become Church-members) yet *Ahab*, though King over an Apostate Church, having gotten Pagan *Benhadad* by conquest under his Dominion, because he put him not to death for his blasphemy, forfeited his own life, for his, 1 *Kings* 20:23 with 42.

---

## CHAPTER 36.

*A Reply to his Chapter 36. Discussing the Text in Luke 9:54,55.*

### **Discusser.**

**T**He next Scripture brought by the Letter against such Persecution, is Luke, 9:54,55 where the Lord Jesus reproved his Disciples, who would have fire come down from Heaven, to have devoured those Samaritans, that would not receive him, in these words, You know not of what spirit you are, the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives but to save, them.

*With this Scripture Mr. Cotton joineth the next, and answereth both in one, which is this, 2 Timothy 2:24. The servant of the Lord must not strive, but must be gentle towards all men, proving if at any time, God will give them Repentance, &c. unto both these Scriptures, he giveth this Answer.*

*Both these are directions to Ministers of the Gospel, how to deal, (not with obstinate offenders in the Church, but) either with men without, as the Samaritans were, and many unconverted Christians in Crete, whom Titus (as an Evangelist) was to seek to convert.*

*Or at best, with some Jews or Gentiles in the Church, who though carnal, yet were not convinced of the Errors of their way. And it is true, it became not the Spirit of the Gospel, to convert Aliens to the Faith, (Such as the Samaritans were) by Fire and Brimstone, nor to deal harshly in public Ministry, or private conference, with all such several-minded men, as either had not yet entred into Church-fellowship, or if they had, did hitherto sin of Ignorance, not against Conscience. But neither of both these Texts, do hinder a Minister of the Gospel to proceed in a Church way against Church-members, when they become scandalous, either in life, or Doctrine: much less do they speak at all to the Civil Magistrate.*

### **Defender.**

The matter of this Answer, it is likely enough was given by me: for it suiteth with mine own apprehensions, both then and now. But some expressions in laying it down, I do not own, nor can I find any Copy under my own hand-writing, that  
might

might testify, how I did express myself, especially in a word or two, wherein the *Discusser* observeth (in *chapter 38*) some haste, and light, and sleepy attention. But if the *Discusser* can show the same under mine own hand, (as it is not impossible) I shall be willing (by God's help) both to acknowledge it, and my haste in it.

---

## CHAPTER 37. *A Reply to his Chapter 37.*

### **Discusser.**

**T***His perplexed and ravelled Answer, wherein so many things, and so doubtful are wrapped up and entangled together, I shall take in pieces.*

1. *That the Lord Jesus in rebuking his Disciples rash and bloody zeal against the Samaritans, did not hereby hinder the Ministers of the Gospel, to proceed in a Church-way against scandalous offenders, is not here questioned.*

### **Defender.**

Well then, this Point is none of those many doubtful things here wrapped: much less is it perplexed, or ravelled, but a plain, and confessed Truth. But whether the Author of that Letter sent to me, did take it for a certain and unquestioned Truth, I did not know: nor do I yet know, unless the *Discusser* speak his mind herein, as well as his own. Sure I am, Prosecution in a Church-way, (if the cause be not just) is as odious and dreadful as Persecution, as Prosecution in a Court of civil Justice, as hath been proved above.

### **Discusser.**

*Secondly, when the Answerer saith, much less doth this Text speak at all to the civil Magistrate: here I observe, that he implieth, that beside the censure of the Lord Jesus in the hands of his spiritual Governors, for any spiritual evil, in Life or Doctrine, the civil Magistrate is also to inflict corporal punishment.*

### **Defender.**

This observation I may truly say is ravelled out of my Answer, and that so perplexedly, that it cannot be wound up out of my Answer without breaking the thread, both of my words, and meaning. It is plain and certain Truth, that as the Disciples were not civil Magistrates, so neither doth Christ speak to them in

this Reproof as to such. But it is far from me to say, that it is lawful for civil Magistrates to inflict corporal punishment upon men contrary minded, standing in the same state the Samaritans did. No such thought arose in my heart, nor fell from my pen, either in my Answer to the Letter, or in any writing of mine, that it is lawful for a Civil Magistrate (though he had dominion over Pagans, much less if he have none) to inflict corporal punishments upon such as are contrary minded in matters of Religion. No, these are ravellings of a loose and ungirt disputer, not the Inferences of a serious and solid *Discussor*. And therefore the Reasons which he bringeth in the Sequel of this chapter, that the Magistrates should not lay violent hands upon any (such as the Samaritans) for not receiving of the Lord Jesus, might well have been spared: for they fight not against me, but against a shadow of his own fancy.

But when he maketh the Fire that fell down from Heaven, *Revelation 13:13, to be the fiery Judgements and persecutions, which the second Beast persuaded the civil Powers, to destroy the Saints withal, as if they were God's just Judgements from Heaven upon Heretics.*

This in such an Interpretation, as ravelleth the Text, and will not stand with the Context. For the Text speaketh of it, as a great wonder, that the Beast should *make Fire to come down from Heaven upon Earth in the sight of men*, verse 13. But this was no wonder to cause civil Powers to inflict fiery Judgements of Imprisonment, Banishment, Death upon Heretics; for *Constantine* had done as much before.

And the *Arian* Bishops had caused *Constantius* to do as much against the Orthodox Saints. Besides in the Context, *verse 15*. It is expressly there declared as a distinct matter from the former, that he had *Power to cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast, should be killed*. This is a different effect (and recorded as different) from the former of causing fire to come down from Heaven, and that, not upon the Saints, but upon Earth.

Chap. 38.

---

## CHAPTER 38.

*A Reply to his Chapter 38. Discussing the place in Timothy. 2 Timothy 2:25,26.*

**Discusser.**

**I** Acknowledge, this Instruction, to be meek and patient to all men, &c. is properly an Instruction to the Ministers of the Gospel.

**Defender.**

Then hitherto the Answer is not perplexed and ravelled.

**Discusser.**

*Yet divers Arguments will from hence be truly and fairly collected, to manifest and evince, how far he civil Magistrate ought to be, from dealing with the civil Sword in spiritual cases.*

*But first by the way, I desire to ask, what the Answerer meaneth by his unconverted Christian in Crete? An unconverted Christian, is as much as an unconverted Convert, untamed tamed, unholy holy, Christians Antichristians.*

*How sad an evidence is this, that the soul of the Answerer, hath never yet heard the call of the Lord Jesus to come out from those unconverted Churches, from that unconverted Antichristian-Christian world? &c.*

**Defender.**

*Reply 1.* When we come to those Arguments truly, and fairly collected out of this place of *Timothy* (which is not till the next chapter) we shall, (God willing) consider what Truth and fairness they hold forth: which if it be found, we shall consider, whether they be of force against the Truth witnessed by me.

In the mean time, for Answer to his demand, *what I should mean, by the unconverted Christian in Crete?*

*Answer.* I must take it upon his credit, that I spake at all of any unconverted Christian in *Crete*. Mine own copy is not extant with me. And the Transcript, which with much seeking, I found, hath it, instead of unconverted Christians in *Crete*, unconverted persons in *Ephesus*. As indeed *Timothy* was left at *Ephesus* when *Paul* wrote to him his first Epistle, as is evident, 1 *Timothy* 1:3. and *Titus* it was, who was left at *Crete*, *Titus* 1:5.). But whether *Timothy*

*thy*

was then at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote his second Epistle to him, is not so certain. But wheresoever he was (as being an Evangelist, he was not limited to a certain place) doubtless there wanted not unconverted persons, amongst whom the Members of the Church lived.

*Yea, but they were not unconverted Christians, for it is as much, as unconverted Converts, &c.*

*Answer.* It must lie upon the Discussers credit, whether I used at all such a phrase or no: sure I am, I cannot hitherto (after much seeking) find mine own hand-written copy, which might clear the mistake, both of *Crete* for *Ephesus*, and unconverted Christians for unconverted Persons.

But let it not seem strange to him, to hear tell of unconverted Christians, or unconverted Converts. There is no contradiction at all in the words. When the Lord saith, that *Judah turned unto him, not with all her heart, but fainedly*, (*Jeremiah 3:10.*) Was she not then an unconverted Convert? converted in show and profession, but unconverted in heart and Truth? Let him then consider his own phrase here misapplied, whether this be the Language of *Canaan*, or the Language of *Ashdod*. *Jeremiah's* Language is the Language of *Anathoth*, not of *Ashdod*.

*Reply. 2.* If the Discusser look at it as a true, *but sad experience of my unconverted estate, from unconverted Churches, and that the Lord Jesus never yet called me to come out of them, because I speak* (if I do so speak) of unconverted Christians living amongst them.

I must be contented still to lie under that imputation from him. I never knew that Church yet, nor ever read of it, in which there was not, (or at least, might not) be found, some unconverted Christians, unconverted Converts. *Judas* was found in Christ's Family: *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, in the Apostolic Primitive Church: *Balaam* and the *Nicholaitans* were found in *Pergamus*, and *Jezebel* in *Thyatira*.

Besides I have nor yet learned, (nor do I think, I ever shall) that the children of believing Parents born in the Church, are all of them Pagans, and no Members at the Church: or that believing Members of the Church, (& so holy) that they are all of them truly converted. And if they be nor always truly converted, then let him not wonder, nor stumble at the phrase of unconverted Christians.

But

But if the *Discusser* do sadly observe it, that my *soul hath not yet heard the call of the Lord Jesus to come out of unconverted Churches*: truly I have just cause (not without sadness and mourning) to consider, and to pray, that he might consider, what call of the Lord Jesus his soul hath heard to come out, not only out of unconverted Churches, but converted too, yea out of all Churches?

**Discusser.**

*Again, I observe the haste and light attention of the Answerer, to these Scriptures (as commonly the Spirits of God's children in matters of God's Kingdom, are very sleepy:) for these persons here spoken of were not unconverted Christians in Crete, whom Titus as an Evangelist was to convert, but they were such Opposites, as Timothy (to whom Paul writeth this Letter at Ephesus) should not meet with all.*

**Defender.**

Whether such words be found in the copy of my Answer to the Letter, I leave it to the *Discusser's* credit. All I said even now, mine own copy I cannot (after much diligent search) find: the Transcript which I have found hath it otherwise, the unconverted Persons in *Ephesus*, whom *Timothy* as an Evangelist was to seek, to convert. But if my copy do speak as he reporteth:

Then, 1. I do not deny, but have just cause to acknowledge mine own haste, and light attention, and sleepiness in the matters of Christ's Kingdom, not only in this passage: but frequently else in the race of my Christian course of life. The Disciples themselves Christ found sleepy, *Matthew 26:40*. how much more may he find me sleepy?

2. The *Discusser* might have imputed it as well, to my haste to gratify his earnest desire to Answer his friends Letter, and to my confidence in his love, that for haste to satisfie him, mistook one place and person for another, and was not so attentive to peruse and examine the copy sent by me to him, as I would have been, had I sent it to an Adversary.

3. The case is all one in the matters of Christ's Kingdom, whether I had named *Timothy*, or *Titus*, *Ephesus*; or *Crete*: For the persons were both of them Evangelists, and the places of them both such, all had unconverted persons in them, and (like enough) unconverted Christians too: *Ephesus* had evil persons amongst them,

them, whom they could not bear, (*Revelation 2:2.*) as well as *Crete* had amongst them such as were *always liars, evil Beasts, slow bellies, Titus 1:12.*

4. The *Discusser*, that observeth haste, and light attention, and sleepiness in another, one would think, would be more vigilant, and attentive himself. He that saith (as the *Discusser* doth in his parenthesis) that *Paul* wrote this Letter, (to wit, his second Epistle) to *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, taketh it for granted, that which without some hasty lightness, even the same, which he blameth in myself, he cannot believe, that *Paul* wrote his second to *Timothy* at *Ephesus*. There is no word in the Epistle, that speaketh of *Timothy's* being at *Ephesus*, when *Paul* wrote that second Epistle. His calling of an Evangelist did not permit him to tarry long in a place: and the first Epistle to *Timothy*, is thought by the Learned to have been written one of the first of all *Paul's* Epistles, next after those of the *Thessalonians*. But the second Epistle to *Timothy* was written last of all the Epistles, when *Paul's* time of departure was at hand, 2 *Timothy* 4:6. And when *Paul* writeth 2 *Timothy* 4:12, that he had sent *Tychicus* to *Ephesus*, It is not likely, he would have written so to *Timothy*, if *Timothy* then had been at *Ephesus*: For *Timothy* would have known, that *Tychicus* had been at *Ephesus*: Or if *Tychicus* had been then but on his way to *Ephesus* (which is a narrow point of time) it is more than propable, if *Timothy* had been then at *Ephesus*, he would have said, *Tychicus have I sent to thee to Ephesus.*

## CHAPTER 39. *A Reply to his 39. Chapter.*

### Discusser.

**B**Ut, from this place in *Timothy* (2 *Timothy* 2.25.) in particular, I argue thus

1. If the Civil Magistrates be Christians or Members of the Church, able to prophesy to the Church of Christ; then they are bound by this command of Christ, to suffer oppositiin to their Doctrine, with meekness and gentleness, waiting if God peradventure will give them Repentance.

So also it pleaseth the Answerer to acknowledge in these words: It becometh

*cometh not the spirit of the Gospel to convert Aliens to the Faith (such as the Samaritans and unconverted persons, whether in Ephesus, or Crete) with Fire and Sword.*

**Defender.**

The Answerer is still of the same mind, though he might strike in upon the advantage, that if the Magistrate be also a Prophet, he may do some things as a Magistrate, which he may not do as a Prophet: yet he willingly acknowledgeth, that if a Magistrate be also a Prophet (yea, whether he be a Prophet, or no) he ought not to seek to subdue, and convert Aliens to the Faith, by Fire and Sword.

**Discusser.**

*Secondly, if the Oppositions be within, and the Church-members become scandalous in Doctrine (I speak not of scandals in the Civil State, which the civil Magistrate ought to punish.) It is the Lord only (as the Scripture in Timothy implieth) who is able to give them Repentance, and to recover them out of Satan's snare, &c. It is true, he civil Sword may make a whole Nation of of Hypocrites, as the Lord complaineth, Isaiah 10, and as befell our Native Country in a few scores of years, in the fever all Reigns of Henry 7, Henry 8. King Edward, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth; under whom our Nation was as ready to change the fashion of their Religions, as of their Suits of Apparel, which hath been their sinful shame.*

**Defender.**

If Opposition rise from within, from the Members of the Church, I do not believe it to be lawful for the Magistrate to seek to subdue, and convert them to be of his mind by the civil Sword: But rather to use all spiritual means for their conviction, and conversion. But if the Opposition still continue in Doctrine and Worship, and that against the vitals, and Fundamentals of Religion (whether by Heresy of Doctrine, or Idolatry in Worship) and shall proceed to seek the Seduction of others, I do believe the Magistrate is not to tolerate such opposition against the Truth in Church-members, or in any Professors of the Truth after due conviction from the word of Truth. Nor is it an *Objection of any weight, that neither the Magistrate, nor his Sword can give Repentance unto such.*

For neither can he give Repentance unto such persons as are

M

scandalous

scandalous to the civil State, whom yet notwithstanding the *Discusser* himself acknowledgeth the civil Magistrate ought to punish. Though the civil Sword should not make the opposers Hypocrites, yet better tolerate Hypocrites and Tares, then Briars and Thorns. In such cases the civil Sword doth not so much attend the conversion of wicked Seducers, as the prevention of the seduction of honest minds by their means.

What the Kings and Queens of *England* have done in former, or later times, either by violent Persecution of the Truth, or in preposterous maintenance of the Truth, we have cause rather to bewail it: (and so hath the *Discusser* too, if he be an *English-man*) then to justify it: as also bewail the like vanity justly complained of in sundry of our *English* Nation, to be as ready to change the fashion of their Religion, as of their Raiment. And yet he cannot be ignorant, that the Lord hath chosen to himself sundry faithful witnesses out of that Nation, who have continued steadfast unto the death in the Profession of the Truth, and have not been carried away, either with the fear of civil Sword, or with the deceitful insinuations of unstable but seducing Teachers, to depart from the simplicity and Truth of the Gospel. But howsoever woeful, and wonderful changes have been made of Religion in *England*, in the Reign of four or five Princes, yet it is no more then befell the Church of *Judah*, in the days of *Ahaz* and *Hezekiah*, *Manasseh*, and *Josiah*; yet the Prophets never upbraided them with the civil Magistrates Power in causes of Religion, as the cause of it. Better some vicissitudes in Religion, then a constant continuance in Idolatry, and Popery, by Princes referring all causes of Religion to Church-men. The Prophecy of *Englands* Revolt again to Popery, wanteth Scripture Light.

---

## CHAPTER 40. *A Reply to his Chapter 40.*

### **Discusser.**

**B**Ut it hath been thought and said, shall Oppositions against the Truth escape unpunished? will they not prove mischievous? I answer as before, concerning the blind Guides, their case being incurable is rather to be lamented, since none but the right hand of the Lord, in  
the

*the meek and gentle Dispensing of the word of Truth, can release them, &c.*

***Defender.***

So it is with all scandalous offenders against the civil State: none can give them healing Repentance, but the right hand of the Lord Jesus, in the dispensing of the word of Truth: yet that doth not restrain Magistrates from executing just Judgement upon them. So neither doth it restrain them from executing the like just Judgement against these, though not to procure the Repentance of incurable obstinate Heretics, and Idolaters: yet to prevent the seduction and subversion of others. What though a dead soul, though changed from one Worship to another, (*like a dead man shifted into several suits of Apparel*) cannot please God? Hebrews 11:6. *And what though Faith be that gift, which proceedeth alone from that Father of Lights?* Philippians 1:29.

Yet better a dead soul be dead in body, as well as in Spirit, than to live, and be lively in the flesh, to murder many precious souls by the Magistrates Indulgence. And better he die without Faith, than to live to seduce many honest minds to depart from the Faith.

***Discusser.***

*I add, a civil Sword hardneth the followers of false Teachers, by the sufferings of their false and Antichristian Seducers.*

*And secondly, it begetteth in them an Impression of the falsehood of that Religion, which cannot uphold itself, but with such Instruments of violence, and wanteth the soft, and gentle commiseration of the blindness of others.*

***Defender.***

A civil Magistrate ought not to draw out his civil Sword against any Seducers (Whether Heretics, or Idolaters) till he have used all good means for their conviction, and thereby clearly manifested the bowels of tender commiseration and compassion towards them.

But if after their continuance in obstinate Rebellion against the Light, he shall still walk towards them in soft and gentle commiseration, his softness and gentleness is excessive large to Foxes, and wolves: But his bowels are miserably straitened and hardened against the poor sheep and Lambs of Christ. If any be hardened

by the just and faithful severity of Magistrates in this case, it is merely accidental, from the extreme perversness of the deceitful and corrupt heart of man, not from any corruption found in such dealings of Magistrates. Yea, Experience speaketh the contrary, not only in the instance of the *Donatists*, who were many of them reclaimed, by the just severity of the civil Magistrate in *Augustines* time: But also in our own memory. Let the *Discusser* speak his conscience, whether Popery or Papists did more swarm and abound in Queen *Elizabeth's* days, than in the days of King *James*?

**Discusser.**

*Antonius Pius, the Emperor of Rome, upon this occasion, wrote to all the Governors of his Provinces, to forbear the Persecution of Christians, because such dealing was so far from converting Christians from their way, that it rather begat in their minds an opinion of their Cruelty.*

**Defender.**

No marvel: for first the Pagan Religion was not of God, but palpable and gross Idolatry: But the Religion of Christians came down from Heaven, in the Gospel of Trmh. It is cruelty in a Magistrate: and it will beget in the minds of indifferent men, an opinion of his cruelty, to murder Innocents (and that *indictâ Causa*;) when it will never be found guilty, nor beget in equal minds an opinion of the cruelty of such, as shall put to Death Murderers, and obstinate destroyers of the life of Souls.

Secondly, It is evident, the persecuting Emperors, and their Governors of Provinces under them, attended not at all, to the conviction of Christians, nor did they endeavour to make it appear, that the Christians sinned against the Light of their own consciences: And therefore we marvel, if it bred in the people, a just opinion of the cruelty of Persecutors, and of the Innocency of Christians.

3. It is an untrue Intimation of the *Discusser*, that *Antonius* forebad the persecution of Christians upon any such grounds, as if he affected rather their conversion (which harsh dealing might alienate them from: or as if by reason of hard dealing with them, it bred in the Christians an opinion of the cruelty of their Persecutors: which he was desirous to avoid. Read both the Re-

scripts

of *Antonius Pius*, both to the man of *Acts*, and to the Senate of *Rome*: and he giveth other just Reasons of forbidding the persecution of them: as in respect of their confidence on God in times of danger, above Pagans: and in respect of his Father's favourable grant to them: and chiefly in that by their Prayers they had saved his Army in great distress in *Germany*, and destroyed their Enemies. But he was so far from seeking their conversion to his Paganism by lenity towards them, that he straitly chargeth his Officers, μή μετὰ γένιν τὸν τοιαύτων εἰς μετάνοιαν, καὶ ἀνελευθερίαν not to draw any such to Repentance, and bondage. Both his Rescripts are extant in the end of *Justin Martyr*, second Apology for Christians.

---

## CHAPTER 41.

*A Reply to his Chapter 41. Discussing the Texts, Isaiah 2:4. with Micah 4:3.*

### Discusser.

*The next Scripture against Persecution, if that of the Prophet Isaiah 2:4. together with Micah 4:3. They shall break their Swords into Plowshares, and their Spears into pruning hooks: And Isaiah 11:9. There shall none hurt or destroy, in all the Mountain of my Holiness.*

*Unto which Mr. Cotton answereth, 1. That these Predictions do only show with what weapons Christ will subdue the Nations to the Faith of the Gospel.*

*2. They show also what the meek and peaceable temper will be of all true Converts to Christianity: not Lions, nor Lerpards, nor cruel Oppressors, nor Malignant opposers, and biters one of another; but doth not forbid them to drive ravenous wolves from the sheepfold, nor to restrain them from devouring the sheep of Christ.*

*This first Answer is truly Christian: but me thinks the Answerer might hear a voice from Heaven, out of thine own mouth will I judge thee: for that which he addeth is as evil and bitter, as the former words were good and sweet; But this doth not forbid them to drive ravenous wolves from the sheepfold, and to restrain them from devouring the sheep of Christ.*

*But*

*But this fighteth against the former Truth, to wit, that Christ by spiritual weapons will subdue the Nations of the Earth to the obedience of the Gospel. For by driving away these Wolves, he intendeth not only the Resistance or violence, which the Shepherds of Christ ought spiritually to make: but the civil Resistance of the material Swords, staves, Guns, &c. whence I argue, that some power forceth the evil (the Wolves) out, forceth the good (the sheep) in: for of the same things, is the like and same reason, &c.*

***Defender.***

He should say, for of contrary things, is a contrary Reason: for sheep and wolves are not the same things: nor are force in, and force out the same things. But howsoever, his Argument is of the like force, as if he should reason, a man may with a staff or a Sword drive away dogs, that might by the way bite, or worry his children in going to School: therefore a man may with a staff, or a Sword drive his children to go to school: for there is the same Reason of both. But doth he speak in good earnest, that there is the same Reason of both? Are Wolves to be driven away, and sheep brought into the fold by the same Instruments? *Yes, saith he, the same arm that with a staff beateth off the Wolf, with a rod and book bringeth in the sheep: the same Dog that assaulteth and teareth a Wolf, frighteth and forceth in the fledgling sheep.* But the Dog that is taught to assault and tear the Wolf, if he assault and tear the sheep also, will find a halter for his labour. And though the same Arm may with a staff beat a Wolf, yet it will not with the same staff beat a sheep. The same Shepherds staff, that knocketh down a Wolf on the head, hooketh in the sheep gently by the leg. The same voice from Heaven, that calleth the sheep by Name into the sheep-fold, and leadeth them by still waters, the same voice hath said, that Antichristian Wolves and Seducers shall drink of blood, for they are worthy, *Revelation 16:6.*

---

**CHAPTER 42. *A Reply to his Chapter 42.***

***Defender.***

**I**N this Chapter the *Discusser* maketh himself work to discourse upon the Wolves, which *Paul* foretold to the Elders of *Ephesus*)

*Ephesus*) should come in amongst them, not sparing the flock, *Acts* 20:29. A place which I quoted not, nor did apply to the cause in hand. (But he as a full vessel) abounding and running over in wit, and words, (and it seemth in leisure) he propoundeth, and discusseth three Questions about these Wolves in this Chapter: and two more in the next.

**Discusser.**

*As 1. What Wolves were those Paul warneth of? not literally meant: nor Persecutors of the Flock, such as the Roman Emperors: But such as brought in other Religions and Worshipps, such as amongst themselves should speak perverse things, as many Antichrists did. And I ask whether or no such as may hold forth other Worshipps, or Religions, (Jews, Turks, Antichristians) may not be peaceable and quiet Subjects, loving and helpful neighbours, fair and just dealers? &c. It is clear, they may, in all experience, and yet in spiritual and Mystical Account, they are ravenous, and greedy Wolves.*

**Defender.**

It hath been declared above, that we do not hold it lawful, to constrain by Civil Sword, Jews, or Turkes, or Antichristians to be of our Religion, whether they be good Subjects) loving Neighbours, fair dealers, yea or no. Nor doth the Apostle in that Text, (which the *Discusser* hath in hand) speak of men out of the Church, Jews, Turks, or Antichristian, but of such as enter into the Church, and are of themselves.

Now if Church-members should Apostate from Christ, and of Christians become Jews, and Turkes, and Antichristians, and draw away Disciples after them, I would demand of any man (whose Conscience is not past feeling of the danger of damnable Heresies) whether such *Members may go for peaceable and quiet Subjects, for loving and helpful Neighbours, for fair and just dealers, for true and Loyal to the civil Government?* If those be peaceable, and quiet Subjects, that withdraw Subjects from Subjection to Christ: if they be loving and helpful Neighbours, that help men on to perdition: If they be fair and just dealers, that wound the souls of the best, and kill and destroy the souls of many, if such be true and loyal to Civil Government, that subject it to the Tyranny of a foreign Prelate, then it will be no advantage to civil States, when the Kingdoms of the Earth shall become the Kingdom

Kingdoms of our Lord: and they may do as good service to the civil State, who bring the wrath, of God upon them by their Apostasy, as they that bring down blessings from Heaven by the Profession and Practise of the true Religion in Purity.

**Discusser.**

*I query secondly, to whom Paul gave this charge, to watch against them? verse 31.*

*They were not the Magistrates of the City of Ephesus, but the Elders of the Church of Ephesus.*

**Defender.**

Who doubteth of it?

**Discusser.**

*Many of these charges and Exhortations given by Christ to the Shepherds and Ministers of the Churches, be commonly attributed and directed (by the Answerer in this Discourse) to the Civil Magistrate.*

**Defender.**

*Cujus contrarium verum est.* For look the Answer through, and you shall find, not one of these charges or Exhortations, given to Ministers, were ever directed by the Answerer, to civil Magistrates: the falsehood of the *Discusser* in this charge upon the Answerer, is palpable and notorious. And this exhortation in this place, the Answerer doth not so much as mention at all either as directed to Magistrates, or to Elders.

**Discusser.**

*I desire it may be enquired into, whether in all the will, or Testament of Christ, there be any such word of Christ by way of Command, Promise, or Example, countmanding the Governors of the Civil State to meddle with these wolves, if in civil things peaceable and obedient.*

**Defender.**

This Condition if (in civil things peaceable and obedient) implyeth a contradiction to the nature and practice of wolves. How can Wolves be peaceable, and obedient, unless they be restrained? and how can they be restrained, and not meddled with? *What Peace* (said *Jehu*) *so long as the whoredoms of Jezabel, and her witchcrafts are so many,* 2 Kings 9:22.

Yes: may not spiritual whoredoms and witch-crafts stand with Civil Peace?

No verily: the whoredoms and witch-crafts of the *Jezebel* of Rome,

*Rome*, took away civil peace from the earth, and brought in the *Turks* to oppress the peace: both of Christian Churches and Common-wealths, as hath been showed above, *Revelation* 9:15,21. That dreadful example of God's vengeance upon Civil States for tolerating and practising Image-worship, is a serious and loud warning to all Christian States to beware of such seducing spirits, as bear them in hand, they shall have peace, though they tolerate Idolatrous and false worships in their Territories.

Besides for another example, and that approved, you find in the Lord's Testament, *Revelation* 16:4,5,6,7 of which before. And for a word of command from Christ, to meddle with wolves, that grand charter, whereby Magstrates are established in the new Testament, may abundantly suffice, The Magistrate is the Minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil *Romans* 14:4 [13:4?].

If the wolf be an evil doer, let him look at the Magistrate as appointed of God to be an avenger, and executioner of wrath upon him. Say not, yea, if the wolf be an evil doer against the second Table, but not so, if against the first Table: or if an evil doer against the bodies and estates of men, not so, if against their souls.

For who gave any man commission so to limit the word of God, or the power of the Magistrate? Besides it hath been often said, that he that goeth about to subvert Religion, and to destroy souls, is an evil doer against the peace of the Civil State.

#### **Discusser.**

*If God had given charge to Magistrates to punish evil doers in matters of Religion, he would have given to Magistrates in the world, ability to discern, and determine, who are sheep, and who are wolvisish oppressors, whom he is bound to punish and suppress. Yea they must be able to discern this, not with other men's eyes, but with their own, &c.*

#### **Defender.**

It hath been declared above, that Magistrates ought to be so well acquainted with matters of Religion, as to discern the Fundamental Principles thereof, and the evil of those heresies and Blasphemies, as do subvert the same. Their ignorance thereof, is no discharge of their duty before the Lord. Such wolvisish

oppressors, and Doctrines, and practices as they cannot discern with their own eyes, It will be their sin, either to suppress them, because they cannot do it of faith: or to tolerate them, because they are destructive of the souls of the people, and enemies to the common salvation. *Gallio* is justly censured as a prophane man, not because he refused to be a Judge in matters concerning the *Jewish* worship, and Religion: (for he had no Law of *Cæsar*. whose Deputy he was, to judge of it:) but because he rejecteth the cognizance of such causes of Religion, as a Question of words and Names. Which made him so far regardless of causes of Religion, that though the Civil peace was broken by the *Jews* (in pursuit of *Paul*) the *Jews* laying violent hands upon *Sosthenes*, and that before the judgement Seat, yet *Gallio* cared for none of those things, *Acts* 18:15,16,17.

**Discusser.**

*In the third place, I Quere, Whether the Father who gave the sheep, and the Son who keepeth them, be not greater then all? And who can pluck the Elect out of his hand? which Answereth the common objection of the danger of devouring souls.*

**Defender.**

It doth nor Answer that Objection. For the Father, and Son were greater then all in the old Testament, as well as in the New: And none could then pluck his Elect out of their hands, no more than now: yet the attempt to pluck them out of God's hand was a Capital crime then, *Deuteronomy* 13:5,10. for speaking to turn away a soul from God. *verse* 5, and seeking to thrust away a soul from God are but attempts. Besides God putteth no difference of Elect and Reprobate in matter of murder either of soul, or Body: But the respect which God hath in this case, is to his Covenant, which God made with the visible members of his Church.

Now if a man shall so far violate his Covenant as to Apostate from God. and so draw others away to Apostate from him, the Lord avengeth this quarrel of his Covenant upon the lives of such. And therefore the heinousness of this crime is expressed, in that he spake, or sought to turn away any of the people of God from the Lord their God, *Deuteronomy* 13:5,10.

---

## CHAPTER 43. *A Reply to his Chapter 43.*

**Discusser.**

**F**ourthly, *I ask; were not those Elders and Ministers of the Church of Ephesus sufficiently furnished from the Lord Jesus, to drive away these spiritual, and mystical wolves?*

**Defender.**

They were furnished with sufficient power to cast out of the Church, but being cast out, they had not sufficient power to drive them away from conferring with, and corrupting the members of the Church, or other Godly ones out of the Church. It is no dishonour to Christ, nor impeachment to the sufficiency of the Ordinances left by Christ, thatt in such a case, his Ministers of Justice in the Civil State, should assist his Ministers of the Gospel in the Church-State

**Discusser.**

*Fifthly, lastly, I Ask, whether (as men deal with wolves) these wolves at Ephesus were intended by Paul to be killed, their brains dashed out with stones, staves, Halberts, Guns &c. in the hands of the Elders of Ephesus?*

**Defender.**

No: nor was it alleged by me for any such end, nor indeed alleged by me at all: but only the *Discusser* pleased to set up a mark, to shoot at for his own recreation. Elders must keep within the bounds of their calling: But killing, and dashing out of Brains (which is all one with stoning) was expressly commanded, in such a case, to the People of God (by order from the Judges:) *Deuteronomy 13:10.*

**Discusser.**

*But comparing spiritual things with spiritual things, spiritual & mystical wolves, should be spiritually and mystically slain.*

**Defender.**

So they should be by the spiritual Officers, and members of the Church. But in destroying Religion they are also disturbers of the Civil State, and accordingly are to be dealt withal by

Civil Justice. *Achan* disturbed the Common-wealth, as well as the Church of *Israel*, by bringing a Babylonish garment into the Tents of *Israel*: and was therefore troubled himself, for troubling the People of the Lord, *Joshua* 7:25.

**Discusser.**

*It is a most bloody Doctrine, The wolves (Heretics) are to be driven away, their brains knocked out, and killed, the poor sheep to be persecuted for whom Christ died.*

**Defender.**

Belike it is a milky, and peaceable, and Gospel like Doctrine, The wolves (Heretics) are to be tolerated, not an hair to be struck off from their heads, but for the poor sheep, for whom Christ died, let them perish, unless Christ mean to preserve them himself alone, with his own immediate hand: no care of preserving them belongeth to the Civil Magistrate.

**Discusser.**

*Is not this to take Christ, and to make him a temporal King by force? John 6:15. Is not this to make his Kingdom of this world? to set up a Civil and Temporal Israel? to bound out new earthly holy lands of Canaan? yea and to set up a Spanish Inquisition in all parts of the world, to the speedy destruction of millions of souls, and to the frustrating of the sweet end of the coming of the Lord Jesus, which was to save men's souls (and to that end, not to destroy their bodies) by his own blood?*

**Defender.**

Now of all these when the Kingdoms of the earth become the Kingdoms of the Lord (*Revelation* 11:15.) It is not, by making Christ a temporal King, but by making temporal Kingdoms nursing Fathers, to his Church. In the days of Christ's flesh it was Incompatible to his Ministry to make him a King (as they went about to do *John* 6:15.) Christ hath enjoyed (even as Mediator) an everlasting Kingdom, not only in the Church, but in the Government of all the Kingdoms of the earth, by his glorious power, and righteousness. But the Kingdoms of the earth are then said to be the Kingdoms of our Lord, when they submit their laws to the laws of his word. But that neither maketh him a temporal King; nor his Kingdom in the Church to be a Kingdom of this world. The Church and Common-wealth are still distinct Kingdoms, the one of this world, the other of Heaven

Heaven: and yet both of them from Christ; unto whom the Father hath committed all Judgement, *John 5:22*.

Neither will this setup a Civil and temporal *Israel*, an holy *Canaan*, unless all the members of the Common-wealth were called to be members of the Church, and subject to all the ceremonial, and all the judicial Laws of *Moses* (not only those of Moral, and perpetual equity,) but peculiar to that State, as the Brother to marry his deceased Brothers wife.

Nor is it a Spanish Inquisition, to preserve the sheep of Christ from the raven of wolves: but this rather, (such is the practice of the *Discusser*) to promote the principal end of the Spanish Inquisition, to advance the Romish tyranny, Idolatry, and Apostasy, by proclaiming immunity to all their whorish and wolvisch Emissaries.

Nor is it a frustrating of the sweet end of Christ's coming, which was to save souls, but rather a direct advancing of it, to destroy (if need be) the bodies of those wolves, who seek to destroy the souls of those, for whom Christ died, and whom he bought with his own blood.

---

## CHAPTER 44. *A Reply to his Chapter 44.*

---

### *Discussing 2 Corinthians 10:4.*

#### **Discusser.**

*The next Scripture produced against such persecution was 2 Corinthians 10:4. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God &c.*

*To which it is Answered, Paul speaketh of the weapons of Apostles, and Church-Officers, which are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God. But this denieth not, Civil weapons of Justice to Civil Magistrates. But I here observe, that the Scripture holdeth forth a two-fold State, a Civil State, and a Spiritual: Civil Officers, and spiritual: Civil weapons, and spiritual: Civil-vengeance, and spiritual: though the Spirit speaketh not here expressly of Civil Magistrates, and their Civil weapons: yet these States being of different natures and considerations (as far differing as flesh and spirit) therefore Civil weapons are most improper and unfitting in matters of the spiritual*

*spiritual Kingdom and State, though in the Civil State most proper and suitable.*

***Defender.***

The Discusser, as often throughout his Discourse, so here he looseth himself, and the truth, in ambiguities. Civil weapons are indeed improper, and unfitting in spiritual matters, to wit, in the dispensing, and pressing of spiritual matters for the immediate producing of spiritual ends, as for a Magistrate to draw his sword to compel all his Subjects to the obedience of the faith of Christ, and to the profession of it. But this is not unfitting nor improper, That a Magistrate should draw his sword, though not in matters spiritual, yet about matters spiritual to protect them in peace, and to stave off the disturbers, and destroyers of them. It were improper and unfitting, for carpenters to bring their Axes and Hammers to build up the spiritual Kingdom and Church of Christ: But yet their tools are fitting to build up scaffolds, that the people may draw near to hear the Word, & by hearing, be brought on to faith and salvation.

---

**CHAPTER 45. *A Reply to his* 45. Chapter.**

**Discussor.**

*To Batter and take a strong Hold, or Fort, men bring not a first and second Admonition, and after obstinacy, Excommunication: But they bring Canons, Culverings, Sakers, Bullets, Powder, Musquets, Swords, Pikes, weapons suitable and proportionable. On the other side, to batter down Idolatry, false worship, Heresy out of the soul and spirit, It is vain, Improper, unsuitable to bring the usual weapons of persecutors, Stocks, Whips, Prisons, Swords, Gibbets, Stakes: But against these spiritual strongholds in the souls of men, spiritual Artillery, and weapons are proper, and mighty through God to subdue every thought to obedience.*

***Defender.***

Let this stand (as it shall for me:) It nothing toucheth the Question in hand. It is far from me to allow the Civil Magistrate to make use of his Civil weapons to batter down Idolatry

try, and Heresy in the souls of men: but for this end, he is to use spiritual weapons, and all Lenity and wisdom in the improvement thereof: But if the Idolater or Heretic grow obstinate & as the Apostle saith, wax worse and worse deceiving himself and others, to the destroymg or corruputing and disturbing of others, now the Magistrate maketh use, not of Stocks, and Whips (for there do not remove, but exasperate the malady:) but of Death, or Banishment, that may cut him off from opportunity of spreading the leaven, and Gangrene of his pernicious ways, whether in Doctrine, or practice. It is one thing to speak so Heresy and Idolatry in the Absract: another in the Concrete. Heresy, Idolatry and all spiritual wickedness, cannot be rooted out of the hearts of the sons of men, but by spiritual weapons. But Heretics, and Idolaters may be restrained from the open practice, and profession of their wickedness by the Sword of Justice, and such weapons of Righteousness.

**Discusser.**

*But though these weapons were proper: yet they are unnecessary. For if spiritual weapons in the hand of Church Officers, be able, & mighty, and sufficient, and ready for the Lords work, either to save, or to kill the soul &c. How doth the Magistrate come in to help, but as if the Lord had no power?*

**Defender.**

This is a mere prerence in the mouth & pen of the Discusser: For he having cut off all the Churches of Christ, and all Church Ordinances, and Church-weapons from off the face of the earth for there many ages past, and I know not for how many years yet to come: If Civil weapons be debarred from defending Religion, upon pretence, that Church-weapons are sufficient, and then no Churches nor Church-weapons to be found upon the face of the earth, then let all Seducers to Apostasy, Idolaters, & Hererics, let them all rejoyce in an open door of liberty, & safety, which the Discusser hath set wide open before them. If Civil States must not, and Churches cannot, come in to help the Lord, shall the curse of *Meroz* be so avoided, because the Lord wanteth not power to help himself? But I might reply further, that though spiritual weapons are mighty through God, and sufficient to those ends, for which the Lord appointed them:  
which

which are to purge out leaven from their holy communion, and to mortify the flesh of offenders: yet that is not supercede as to Civil Magistrates, to neglect to punish holiness, which the Church hath censured, if the persons, censured do proceed to subvert the truth of the Gospel, or the peace of the Church, or the salvation of the people. The rest of the Discussers discourse in this chapter are (as *Jude* speaketh) clouds without water, words without matter.

---

## CHAPTER 46. *A Reply to his Chapter 46.*

*Discussing Romans 13.*

### **Discussor.**

**T***his Scripture Romans 13. which it pleaseth the Answerer to quote, how hath both himself, and many excellent servants of God, wrested (not as Peter writeth of the wicked to their eternal, yet) to their own and others temporal destruction by civil wars, and combustions in the world?*

### **Defender.**

This charge is a greivous crime, if it be truly proved: a greivous slander. if it be not proved.

The rest of the Chapter proveth it not, but that only which I willingly grant, that this 13th Chapter to the *Romans* exhorteth unto subjection to Magistrates, & unto love to all men: which are duties pertaining to the second Table. Howbeit though subjection to Magistrates, and love to all men be duties which concern the second Table (a point which needed no proof:) yet this inference will not here follow, That therefore Magistrates have nothing to do to punish any violation no not of the weightiest duties of the first Table It is a clear case, amongst the duties of the second Table, people may be exhorted to honour their Ministers, and children may be exhorted to honour their Parents. But will it hence follow, that therefore Ministers have nothing to do with matters of Religion in the Church, or Parents in the Family?

Chap. 47.

---

## CHAPTER 47. *A Reply to his Chapter 47.*

**Discusser.**

**T**Here be excellent and precious servants of God in their time, who have absolutely denyed the 13. of the Romans to concern any matter of the first Table.

**Defender.**

I will not stand upon the last use in that Chapter, put you on the Lord Jesus Christ: which I hope the *Discusser* himself will not deny, much less say, that any, Excellent and precious servants of God; do absolutely deny, that such a Duty concerneth the first Table. But what is it that the servants of God say?

**Discusser.**

*Calvin saith, this whole Discourse concerneth Civil Magistrates: and therefore in vain do they who exercise Power over Consciences, go about from this place to establish their sacrilegious Tyranny.*

**Defender.**

*Calvin's* Judgement herein (as generally in other points) is sound and agreeable to the Text: but not at all favouring the *Discusser's* Imagination. This whole Disputation (saith he) is of Civil Governments: whereupon this inference, is (according to his own true meaning and scope) therefore it doth not concern Church-Government. Therefore such Church-Governors as upon pretence of this Text do make Laws, without the word, and besides the word, to bind Conscience, and to usurp power over Consciences, they in vain go about to establish their sacrilegious Tyranny from this place. But what is this to the point in hand? Church-Governors do in vain go about from this place to establish their Sacrilegious Tyranny by giving Laws without the word, and beside the word to bind Conscience: Therefore Civil magistrates, (of whom this whole Discourse is) shall exercise a sacrilegious Tyranny over the Conscience, and in vain go about to establish it from this place, when from the word of God they establish true Religion, and go about to punish the Fundamental subverters of the same. But how far off *Calvin's* Judgement was to restrain Civil Magistrates from meddling in matters of Religion, let him interpret himself in his own

words (in his *opuscula*) in his Answer to *Servetus*, who was put to Death for his *Heresies* at Geneva by his procurement. *Hoc uno* (saith he) *contentus sum, Christi adventû; nec mutatum esse Ordinem Politicum, nec de Magistratuum officio quicquam Detractum.*

*A gedum quod Paulus docet, Romans 13:4. Non frustrâ ah ipsis Gladium gestari, an ad speciem unam restringi debet? Fatentur isti, quibuscum nunc Discepto ad alia crimina plectenda Judices diviniûs esse amatos, mode â Religione abstineant, ut libera, ipsis tacentibus, Impietas lasciviat: veriam reclamationis locis Spiritus Sanctus, &c. This one thing (saith he) suffereth me, that by the coming of Christ, neither was the State of Civil Government changed: nor anything taken away from the Magistrate's Office. Go to then, that which Paul teacheth, (Romans 13:4.) that he beareth not the Sword in vain, ought it to be restrained unto one kind only? they themselves confess with whom I have to deal, the Magistrates are armed of God to punish other crimes, so that they abstain from matter of Religion, that so ungodliness may run riot by their connivance. But the Holy Ghost crieth out against this in many places, &c.*

#### Discusser.

*Again, Calvin speaking of fulfilling the Law by Love, writeth thus on the same place, Paul hath not respect unto the whole Law, he speaketh onely of those duties, which the Law commandeth us towards our neighbours. And after Paul only mentioneth the second Table, &c. And that he repeateth, Love is the fulfilling of the Law, understand it as before, of that part of the Law which concerneth, human Society: for the former Table of the Law, which is of the worship of God, is not here touched.*

*So Beza upon the word ἀνακεφαλιοῦται, (if there be any other Commandment, it is summed up in this, thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thyself) the whole Law, (saith he) commandeth nothing, but the love of God, and our Neighbour: but since the Apostle in this place discourseth of the mutual Duties of men one to another, I think this Term, Law, ought to be restrained to the second Table.*

#### Defender.

*And so think I too, yet without the least prejudice to the cause in hand. For if the Question be of the duties which Subject owe to Magistrates, they pertain to the second Table: or if the Question be of the vertue of love one to another, That it is the fulfilling,*  
of

of the whole Law, It is meant chiefly of the second Table: though withal it be true, the second Table cannot be fulfilled without fulfilling of the first Table also. These things are out of controversy. But what is all this to the point in hand? The Apostle in calling love the fulfilling of the Law, speaketh of the Law of the second Table. *Ergo*, the Magistrate. (who is spoken of in the same chapter) hath no power to punish the crimes against the first Table? Or thus further, in the 13. of the *Romans*, the Apostle speaketh of the Duties of Subjects to Magistrates (which is a Duty of the second Table:) therefore Magistrates have no power to punish their Subjects for crimes against the first Table?

The *Discussor* might as well argue, that the duties of Subjects to Magistrates, are duties of the second Table: therefore it is not the Duty of Subjects to pray for their Magistrates, which is a Duty of the first Table? The Truth is, though Prayer be a Duty of the first Table; yet to pray for Magistrates, is a Duty of the second Table. In like sort, though Idolatry, and Blasphemy, and Heresy be sins against the first Table: yet to punish these with civil penalties is a Duty of the second Table. For let it be considered in the fear of God, are not all Duties of Righteousness to man commanded in the second Table, as well as all Duties of Holiness to God, commanded in the first Table? If so, I demand again, whether it be not a Duty of righteousness belonging to the people of God, to enjoy the free passage of Religion, Truth of Doctrine, Holiness of worship, Purity of Church-Government? I demand yet further, if it be not an injurious dealing to the people of God, to disturb the Truth of Doctrine with Heresy? the holiness of worship with Idolatry? the Purity of Government with Tyranny? If all these be granted, then it unavoidably followeth, that all there ways of unrighteousness are justly punishable by the second Table. Let not therefore the *Discussor* please himself in deluding himself, and the world, that *Beza*, and *Calvin* did absolutely deny the 13. of the *Romans* to concern any matter of the first Table. For though the Duties of Loyalty to Magistrates, and of love to all, concern the second Table, yet it was neither the word nor Judgement of *Calvin*, or *Beza*, so to interpret *Romans* 13. As to exempt Magistrates from Power of punishing Heresy, and Idolatry. *Calvin's* Inter-

pretation of *Romans 13:4*, and his Argument from thence against *Servetus*, is declared above in this chapter. Hear now how *Beza* interpreteth the same Text in his Book entitled *De Hæreticos, à Magistratu puniendis. Testatur Paulus Magistratum esse Dei Ministrum qui Gladium great ad eas ulciscendas, qui malè agunt, Romans 13:4. Quambrem alterutrum necesse est, si in Hæreticos Magistratus jus nullum habet, velipsos malè non agere (quod Refutatione indigere non puto) vel, quod in genere Paulus ait, ad certum maleficiorum genus revocandum, eorum videlicet, quæ corporalia peccata vocant, de quo malificiorum discrimine, copiosius, ut spero, postea, sua loco Disseram.* That is, *Paul* witnesseth saith he, that the Magistrate is God's Minister, who beareth the Sword to take vengeance on them that do evil, *Romans 13:4*, wherefore one of these two must needs be, If Magistrates should have no just power over Heretics, either that Heretics are not evil doers (which is so gross, that I think, it needs no Refutation) or else that *Paul's* speech is to be restrained to a certain sort of evil deeds, to wit, such as they call corporal sins: of which distinction of evil deeds, I shall dispute more largely, I hope in his due place hereafter. So *Beza*.

---

## CHAPTER 48. A Reply to his Chapter 48.

### Discusser.

**T**He higher powers in this *Romans 13* were (amongst others) the Roman Emperors, and subordinate Magistrates under them. But they all were strangers from the life of God, yea most averse and opposite, yea cruel, and bloody Persecutors of the Name and followers of Jesus: and yet unto these is subjection commanded.

Now then I argue, If *Paul* had commanded this subjection to Roman Magistrates in spiritual causes to defend the Truth, to punish Heretics, (neither of which they could discern nor judge of, but by Trust from others, as *Pilate* condemned Jesus (he must in the Judgement of all men, have put out the eye of Faith, and Reason, and sense at once.

### Defender.

Not in the Judgement of all men, for besides *Calvin* and *Beza* (whose Judgement you have heard) all those Interpreters, who expound

expound this place in the *Romans*, of the Magistrates power in punishing spiritual evil doers, as well as corporal, they, none of them do so judge, that *Paul* in commanding the Churches to yield subjection unto civil Magistrates in matters of Religion, did put out the Eye of Faith, and Reason, and sense at once.

For first, it is one thing to yield subjection to the unrighteous Decrees of Ignorant, and Pagan Magistrates: another thing to obey their Ordinances in Matters of Faith, and worship, and Government of the Church. The former of these, Christians did yield unto the Roman Magistrates, even subjection unto the Death: the other, they neither did, nor ought to yield: as knowing God was to be obeyed rather than men.

Secondly, though it be true, whilst the Roman Emperors and Magistrates were Pagans and Persecutors, they were incompetent Judges, to discern and give Sentence in the spiritual matters of Christian Religion: yet the word of Christ, who commandeth a Duty, commandeth all the necessary means, which tend to that Duty. And therefore in giving them a Power and charge to execute vengeance on evil doers, (and that in matters of spiritual unrighteousness against the Church, as in matters of Civil unrighteousness against the Common-wealth) It behoved them to enquire and listen after true religion, to hear and try all, and upon serious, deliberate, and just scruting to hold fast that which is good, and so prevent the disturbance thereof by the contrary. It was no vain charge of the Holy Ghost, *Psalms* 2, 10, 11, 12. If Christ have an Iron Sceptre in his hand (to crush all States, and Kingdoms, Emperors, and Princes, as well as private persons) *Be wise now therefore ô ye Kings: be instructed ye that are Judges of the Earth, serve the Lord with fear, rejoice unto him with trembling. Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way.*

Thirdly, the cases of Religion, wherein we allow Civil Magistrates to be Judges, are so fundamental, and palpable, that no Magistrate studious of Religion in the fear of God, but, if he have any spiritual discerning (as all truly Christian Magistrates have, and even Pagans have discerned between innocent Christians, and turbulent Seducers) he cannot but judge of such gross corrupti-

ons

as are unsufferable in Religion, as hath been opened above. Though we reserve to the Prophets and Churches *Judicium Propheticum*, as hath been said above: yet we allow *Judicium Politicum*, to Civil Magistrates studious of Truth (as all ought to be) and the Judgement of Discretion unto all Christians. But as for such Magistrates as are merely natural and Pagan, though Christians be bound to subject themselves unto them with patience: yet such Magistrates ought to forbear the exercise of their Power, either in protecting, or punishing matters of Religion, till they have learned so much knowledge of the Truth, as may enable them to discern of things that differ.

But this forbearance of theirs is not for want of Authority in their callings, nor for want of Duty in their Consciences, but for want of evidence to them in the cause. In which Case, Magistrates are wont to forbear their exercise of their Power, and to respite Judgement even in Civil causes, not for want of Authority, or Duty, to do Justice: But for want of ripe and full cognizance of the Cause.

---

## CHAPTER 49. *A Reply to his Chapter 49.*

### Discusser.

**W**Hy then did Paul himself appeal to Cæsar (Acts 25) unless that Cæsar (though he was not yet, yet he) ought to have been a fit Judge in such matters?

Answer. Paul appealed to Cæsar, not to judge the cause of his Religion: but to defend him from civil violence, and slanderous accusations about sedition, mutiny, civil Disobedience, &c. From which Cæsar (as a supreme civil Magistrate) ought to defend him.

### Defender.

This appeal of *Paul* to *Cæsar* doth evidently hold forth three things.

1. That there is a lawful and needful use of civil Magistracy unto Christians.

2. That Church Officers (even of highest rank) the Apostles themselves, and other Ministers are subject to civil Authority, as well as private Christians.

3. That

3. That *Paul* did submit to *Cæsar's* Judgement-seat: the trial of his innocency, as well in matters of Religion, as in civil conversation. For he pleadeth his innocency, that he was guilty in *none of those things whereof they did accuse him*, and for trial whereof he appealeth to *Cæsar*, *verse 11*. Now the things whereof they did accuse him, were offences against the Law of the *Jews*, and against the Temple, as well as against *Cæsar*, *verse 8*. And offences against the Law of the *Jews*, and against the Temple, were matters of Religion. And yet even in these *Paul* appealeth to *Cæsar's* Judgement-seat for trial of his innocency.

**Discusser.**

*But if Paul in this Appeal to Cæsar had submitted his Religion (which was the cause of Christ) his Ministry, and Ministration, to the Roman Emperor's Tribunal, he had sinned. First, against the light of Reason. Secondly, against the cause of Religion. Thirdly, against the holy Calling of a Christian. Fourthly, against his own calling of Apostleship. Fifthly, against the holy name of God, &c.*

**Defender.**

All these sins might with some colour have been charged upon *Paul*, if he had appealed to *Cæsar*, to Judge, whether his Religion, or Ministry, or Ministration were of God, or no. But that was no point of his Appeal: But whether his Religion, or Ministry, or Ministration were guilty of any capital crime against the Law of the *Jews*, or against the Temple, or against *Cæsar*. Now in this case *Paul* might safely appeal to *Cæsar*, and that to the Honour of God, of his Apostolic and Christian Calling, and to the glory of his Religion. The Reasons against *Paul's* Appeal in this case are but bulrushes.

---

## CHAPTER 50. *A Reply to his Chapter 50.*

**Discusser.**

HAVING dispatched two Arguments (against the founding of the civil Magistrates power in spiritual causes, in *Romans 13*. First, from the Testimony of *Calvin* and *Beza*: the second from *Cæsar's* incompetency and insufficiency to Judge of spiritual matters.)

*I come now to the third Argument, taken from the nature of the Magistrates weapons: he hath a Sword, and that Sword is a civil Sword, a Sword of civil Justice which being of a material and civil nature, serveth for the defence of Persons, Estates, Families; Liberties of a Civil or civil State, and for the suppressing of uncivil and injurious Persons, or Actions by civil punishment. And therefore this Sword cannot extend now (as it did in Israel of old) to spiritual and soul causes, to spiritual and soul punishments.*

***Defender.***

I easily hold with the *Discusser*, that the civil Sword doth not extend to spiritual and soul punishments. But if the civil Sword ought to extend to the defence of civil men, in civil Liberties, then why not also to the like defence of Churches, and spiritual persons in their spiritual Liberties? It is the Office of the civil Magistrate to govern his people in righteousness. And if spiritual Liberties be in righteousness due to spiritual persons, as well as civil Liberties to civil persons, doubtless the Magistrate is defective in Rules of righteousness, if he only attend the defence of the civil people, in their civil Rights, and neglect to defend his spiritual people in their spiritual Rights.

What though the Sword be of a material and civil nature? so it was in the Old Testament; as well as in the new. It can therefore reach no further, either then or now; then unto the punishment of men, in bodily life, or civil Liberties: But it can reach to punish in these things not only the offenders in bodily Life, and civil liberties; but also the offenders against spiritual Life and soul-Liberties.

What though it be called a civil Sword in common speech? It is not a Scripture-phrase, so to call it: It may as fitly be called the Sword of God, as well as the Sword of war is so called (*Judges 7:20*) which the *Discusser* (guilefully, or else unskilfully) distinguisheth in this chapter from the civil Sword. Now if the Sword of the Judge, or Magistrate, be the Sword of the Lord, why may it not be drawn forth, as well to defend his Subjects in true Religion, as in civil Peace?

And as Magistrates are called (in common speech) civil Magistrates: so are they called also in the Language of the Sanctuary) Gods, *Psalm. 82:16*. If civil Magistrates are to attend to  
civil

civil matters: are not God's to attend to God's matters? It was wont to go for a good Argument *â conjugatis, homo sum, humani nihil â me. alienum puto*. But now (by the Discussers Doctrine) the Magistrate may say, *Ego (dignatione Divinâ) Deus sum* (Psalm 82.) *quatenus autem Deus sum; Divina omnia â me aliena puto*. Now far be all such reasonless, and Paganish, yea worse than Paganish, Atheology from us. Worse than Paganish I say, for Pagan Princes accounted their Religion their chief care; *prima cura sacerorum*. And can a Christian forbid the care of Religion to Magistrates, I say not, without blushing, but without trembling?

*Objection.* But Magistrates, were called Gods in the Old Testament, *not so in the New. Now under Christ all Nations are merely Civil, without any such Typical holy respect upon them as was upon Israel a National Church.*

*Answer.* It is written in the New Testament; the Kingdoms of the world are become the Kingdom's of the Lord, and of Christ, *Revelation 17:15*. And if the Kingdoms be God's Kingdoms, and the Kingdoms of Christ, then the Kings of those Kingdoms, are God's Kings, and Christian Kings. And what Title is there in all the New Testament that either derogateth from the Titles, or, Office of Kings?

Though the Nations now have, not that Typical holiness, which the Nation of *Israel* had: yet all the Churches of the Saints, have as much Truth and reality of holiness, as *Israel* had. And therefore what holy care of Religion lay upon the Kings of *Israel* in the Old Testament, the same lieth now upon Christian Kings in the New Testament, to protect the same in their Churches.

---

## CHAPTER 51. *A Reply to his Chapter 51.*

### Discussers.

**A** *Fourth Argument from the Scripture (Romans 13) I take (in verse 6.) which if a merely civil reward for the Magistrates work. Now as the wages be, such is the work, but the wages are merely Civil, Custom, Tribute, not the contributions of the Saints or Churches of Christ, &c.*

P

defender.

*Defender.*

The Contributions or the Saints and Churches, are truly called by the Apostle carnal things, *Romans* 15:27, and again, *2 Corinthians* 9:11. But shall a man therefore thus reason, as the wages be, such is the work: But the wages are carnal things: therefore such is the work of the Ministers of the Gospel, to whom such wages are paid? It is true the contributions of the Saints, may be called Holy, because they are given to God, and (by his appointment) to the maintenance of such as minister in his house about his holy things: But these are mental relations, no real differences in the things given to Magistrates, and Ministers: The wages given to them both, are carnal things. And consider them both in their proper ends: as the rewards given to Ministers, are given for their service about holy things: so the rewards given to Magistrates are given for their service about righteous things. Now if the Purity of Doctrine, Worship, and Government be righteous privileges of all the Churches in the Common-wealth, surely Magistrates do not well deserve all their wages, that suffer the Churches to be bereaved, and despoiled of their spiritual privileges, which is the greatest and best part of their Birth-right.

Besides, the Apostle commandeth the Churches, and Saints not only to pay to Magistrates, Tribute, and Custom, (which are civil things:). but also to pour out all manner of Prayers, and Supplications, Intercessions, and given of thanks for them, *1 Timothy* 1:1,2: Add surely these are spiritual dues, and not Earthly. And therefore Magistrates owe to the Churches, and Saints some Spiritual recompences, which the Apostle also there nameth, that we may live a quiet and peaceable Life in all godliness and honesty, *verse* 2. If therefore the Churches and Saints be not suffered to live a quiet and peaceable Life in Godliness, and honesty: or if they be suffered to live a quiet and peaceable life in ungodliness and dishonesty, the Magistrates fall short of returning spiritual recompence for the spiritual Duties and services performed for them.

**Discusser.**

*Lastly, that the Spirit of God never intended to direct or warrant the Magistrate, to use his power in spiritual affairs and Religions, I argue*

*argue from the Term, or Title given by God, to such Civil Officers, to wit, God's Ministers, verse 6.*

***Defender.***

One would think the Argument would rather evince the contrary. For what is a Minister, but a Servant? and what is a servant, but he that is at his Master's command (for his efficient cause:) and for his Master's ends, as his final cause? How shall then a Magistrate carry himself, as a Minister of God, and yet fall short (and intended so to do) both of God's Commandments in his Laws? and of God's worship, and glory in the execution of them?

**Discusser.**

*But at the very first blush, any man will acknowledge a double Ministry: the one appointed by Christ in his Church, to order the affairs thereof, Ephesians 4, 1 Corinthians 12. The other a Civil Ministry or office, merely human and Civil, which men agree to constitute, (therefore called an human Creation, 1 Peter.) and is as true and lawful in those Countries, that never heard of the true God, and his holy Son Jesus, as in any part of the world, where the Name of Christ is not taken up.*

***Defender.***

If Magistrates be the Ministers of God (as *Paul* calleth them) then their Ministry or office is not merely human, but as the Apostle saith, it is of God, and ordained of God, *Romans 13:1*. And if it be of God, it must also be for God: or else he is a Minister and servant not of God, but of the world. It is true, men agree to constitute it, to wit, this or that form of it (in respect of which influence of men, it is called an human Creation:) but the Truth is, Government itself is of God, and ordained by God, and every lawful form of Government (whether Monarchy, Aristarchy, or democracy; or some mixed of these, according to the State of the People) they are all of God, and so acknowledged, and authorized by God in his word, and though they be as true and lawful in those Nations that never heard of the true God, or of his holy Son Jesus: yet it was from the guidance and appointment of God in the very light of Nature, that such Nations did erect such and such Government, and Governments for the good of human society; and that not only in worldly matters, But in matters also of Religion.

Whence it is, that in all civil Nations, whose *Acts* are recorded, either in sacred or prophane Authors, their Magistrates have had not only a due care of Justice and honesty, but a reverend care of Religion also: *Joseph* in *Egypt* provided for the preservation of the Lands of the Priests without Impeachment, and that not out of respect to their superstition (which he could not but dislike:) but out of regard to the *Ægyptian* Laws, & Customs, to preserve their Religion, and the maintenance thereof, inviolate, *Genesis* 47:22. In *Babel*, *Nebuchadnezzar* being convinced of the sovereign Divinity of the God of *Israel*, made a capital Law against the blasphemers of his Name, *Daniel* 3:29. *Darius* of the Medes and *Persians* enacted a Royal Law to like purpose, *Daniel* 6:26. The like did *Artaxerxes*, *Ezra* 7:26, and *Darius* before him, *Ezra* 6:11. In *Athens* they had a Law against Ἀδσέβεια, Irreligion, upon which suffered three famous Philosophers, *Socrates*, *Theodorus*, and *Protagoras*. *Socrates*, as *Laertius* reporteth in his Life) was accused by *Melitus* τῆς Ἀσεβείας, who commenced his Action against him in these words Ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης, οὗς ἡ Πόλις νομίζει Θεούς, οὐ νομίζων, ἔτερα δὲ Δαιμόνια καὶ ἀείσθησιν οὐκ ἔχοντα.

*Theodorus* was surnamed Ἄθεος, and as *Socrates* was condemned to death by poison, so was this man also, as *Laertius* reporteth out of *Amphicrates* in the life of *Aristippus*. *Protagorus*, (as *Tully* reporteth of him, *de Natura Deorum Lib. 1.*) having thus expressed himself in the beginning of his Book; concerning the Gods (I have not to say, whether they be, or whether they be not) his Books were publicly burnt, and himself banished out of City and Country. How the *Ephesians* stood affected to the destroyers of their Religion, appeareth by the excuse which the Town-Clerk made for *Paul* and his Companions, you have brought these men hither saith he, which are neither robbers of Churches, nor yet blasphemers of your Goddess, *Acts* 19:37. The *Romans* how zealous they were in defence of their Religion, the slaughter of many thousand Christians will be a perpetual Monument to all Ages. All which things I recite not to justify the misapplying of their zeal to the maintenance of false Gods, but to make it appear, that as the Pagan Nations who never heard of the true God, and of his Son *Jesus*, did erect by instinct of Nature, Governments, and Magistrates: so by the same instinct,  
their

their Laws and Magistrates' took care of the maintenance of that Religion, which they took to be of God. What a shame were it, that Pagan Magistrates should be more careful and zealous of the honour of their Idols, then Christians of the Honour of the known true God, the Lord our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier?

---

## CHAPTER 52. *A Reply to his Chapter 52.*

### Discusser.

*MAny object out of verse 4 of Romans 13, that the Magistrate is to avenge evil: and therefore Heresies, false Christs, &c. But I answer, First, that the word is generally opposed to civil goodness, or virtue in a Common-wealth, and not to spiritual good.*

*Secondly, I have proved, here as not intended evil against the spiritual or Christian State (handled in chapter 12.) But evil against the Civil State, handled in this 13 chapter.*

### Defender.

What is meant by τὸ κακὸν, evil, no man (that I meet with). Interpreteth more fully then Pareus. There is, saith he, a four-fold evil, of which the Magistrate is the Avenger: contrary to the four-fold good, whereof the Magistrate is the Preserver. A natural good, a Moral good, a Civil good, a spiritual good. A natural good, as Life, and safety of our bodies: A moral good, as Temperance, Chastity: a Civil good, as our goods and Lands, and civil Liberties. A spiritual good, as the free passage of the Ordinances of God, and pure Religion. In opposition to these there is a four-fold Evil: Natural, as the killing, and wounding, and beating of our bodies: moral as Drunkenness, and whoredom; Civil, as stealth, and robbery, and oppression: Spiritual, as Heresy, Idolatry, and disturbance of the free passage of God's Ordinances. As the Magistrate is bound by his office to preserve the good of the Subject in all these kinds: so is he to avenge the evil done against the Subject in any of these.

What the *Discusser* hath proved to the contrary (as he saith) hath been Answered already in his place.

### Discusser.

*The Elders of New England grant, the Magistrate may not  
punish*

*punish some evil, as the secret sins of the Soul: nor sins handled in the Church in a private way: nor such sins as are private in Families. As the complaints of Children against Parents, Servants against Masters, Wives against Husbands: nor such sins as are between the Members, and Churches themselves. From whence I observe,*

1. *That the Magistrate is not to punish all evil.*

2. *I observe, how they take away from the Magistrates that which is proper to his cognizance, as the complaints of Children, servants, Wives, against their Parents, Masters, Husbands, &c.*

**Defender.**

When we say, the Magistrate is an Avenger of evil: we mean of all sorts, or kinds of evil: not every particular of each kind: secret evils, in thought, or affection, yea in action too: but neither confessed, nor proved by due witnesses: the Magistrate cannot punish.

**Discusser.**

*The distinction of secret, or private, and public evil, will not here avail: because such as urge the Term evil (viz. that the Magistrate is to punish evil) they urge it strictly, eo nomine, because Heresy, Blasphemy, &c. is evil, &c.*

**Defender.**

But not simply because it is evil, unless it be also notorious, and evident, and convicted by sufficient witnesses, and held forth with public offence, and disturbance. *Neither do the Elders take away from the Magistrates, the cognizance of the complaints of Children, Servants, wives, against Parents, Masters, Husbands.*

Unless they be merely private, and easily healed in a private way, by Domestical Government, what need household Government, if every Family-offence should be brought to the cognizance of the public Magistrate? one Ordinance of God doth not swallow up another.

---

## CHAPTER 53.

*A Reply to his Chapter 53, 54, and 55.*

### **Discusser.**

*THE Author of the Letter proceeded to a last Reason from Scripture, to prove that the Disciples of Christ should be so far from persecuting, that they ought to bless them that curse them, and pray for them that persecute them: and that because of the freeness of God's grace, and deepness of his Counsels, calling home them that be Enemies, persecutors, no people, yea some at the last hour.*

*Unto this Reason the Answerer is pleased thus to Reply.*

*First, in general, we must not do evil that good may come thereof.*

*Secondly, in particular, he affirmeth that it is evil to tolerate seditious evil doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous livers; and for proof of this, quoteth Christ's Reproof of the Angels of Pergamus, and Thyatira, for tolerating Balaam, and Jezebel, to teach, and seduce, Revelation 2:14,20.*

### **Defender.**

The *Discusser* forgetteth himself, through Incogitancy, (if not through guile) when he maketh this to have been my first Reply, that we must not do evil that good may come thereof. For he is not ignorant, that I gave two Answers, (or Replies as he calleth them) before, in the same place.

*First, when Christ commandeth his Disciples to bless them that curse, them, and persecute them, he giveth not therein a Rule to public Officers, whether in Church, or Common-wealth, to suffer notorious sinners, either in Life or Doctrine, to pass away with a Blessing: but to private Christians, to suffer persecution patiently, yea and to pray for their Persecutors.*

*Again, it is true, Christ would have his Disciples to be far from persecuting, (for persecution is a wicked oppression of men for Righteousness sake:) but that hindereth not, but that he would have them execute upon all Disobedience, the Judgement and vengeance required in the Word, 2 Corinthians 10:6. Romans 13:4.*

Both these Answers the *Discusser* passeth over in silence. For look, as Children where they cannot read, think it best to skip  
over:

over: so men of riper years, when they are loath to stoop to the Authority of the Truth, they think it best to pass it over in silence. But what is it, the *Discusser* is pleased to answer to?

**Discusser.**

*In this Proposition, [that it is evil to tolerate notorious evil doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous livers:] I observe two evils.*

*First, that this Proposition is too large and general, because the Rule admitteth of exception, and that according to the will of God.*

**Defender.**

And to prove that this general Proposition admitteth some exception, the *Discusser* spendeth the rest of this 53 chapter: as also the 54th. chapter, and 55th.

But because I would not spend time, nor weary the Reader with following the *Discusser* in impertinent, and copious digressions, I return briefly this Reply.

First, it is wholly impertinent, whatsoever the *Discusser* is pleased to discourse of God's permission, or toleration of any evil.

For first, God is his own Rule, and what he doth is good, because he doth it: Not his Act, but his word, is a Rule to us. He may tolerate *Cain*, a Murderer to live; but that is no precedent to a Civil Magistrate.

Secondly, I willingly grant, it may be lawful for a Civil Magistrate, to tolerate notorious evil doers in two cases, under which, all the Examples will fall, which the *Discusser* allegeth in any word of Truth.

As first, in regard of the efficient cause of punishing; when the Magistrates hand is too weak and feeble, and the offenders Adherents so great and strong, that Justice cannot be done upon him, without manifest peril to the whole State, there the Magistrate may tolerate a notorious evil, even murder it (else, as *David* upon this ground did tolerate in *Joab* and *Abishai*, the murder of *Abner*. 2 *Samuel* 3:39.

And secondly, in regard of the final cause, an evil may be tolerated to prevent other greater evils: As *Moses* tolerated divorce of displeasing Wives, to prevent the murder, or other hard and cruel usage of them.

In either of these cases, I would not deny but a murderer may be tolerated: if either the Magistrate want sufficient Power, with safety

safety of the State, to cut him off: or if a foreign State be so affected and addicted to the Murderer, that in case the Magistrate here cut off him, they will cut off sundry of our innocent and necessary members, whom they have gotten into their custody in revenge of him.

And if either of these be the case, I easily grant that it is not evil to tolerate a notorious seducing false Teacher, or other scandalous liver: But such an extraordinary doth not hinder the due largeness, and generality of the Proposition, that it is evil to tolerate seditious evil doers, seducing Teachers, scandalous Livers. As in a paralell case, this Proposition is not too large, nor too general, it is evil to tolerate a bloody murderer: notwithstanding in some cases (such as have been named, but those are extraordinary) it may be lawful to tolerate him.

Now that in ordinary cases, it is not lawful to tolerate a seducing false Teacher, the Commandment of God is clear, and strong, Deuteronomy 13:8,9. *Thine eye shall not pity him, neither shalt thou spare him, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him.*

If the *Discusser* shall except, that first Commandment was in force in *Israel*, because their Land was typically holy, or their Magistrates were Types of Christ.

The Reply is plain and just, God himself allegeth no such reason of his Law: But another quite different, but common with them to all Nations, professing the worship of the true God, *Thou shalt put him to death, because he sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God*, verse 10.

Neither can any instance be given of any Capital Law of *Moses*, but is of Moral, (that is of general, and perpetual) Equity, in all Nations, in all Ages, *Capitalia Mosis Politica sunt æterna*.

## CHAPTER 54. A Reply to his Chapter 56.

### Discusser.

*I Come now to the second Evil, which I observe in the Answerers former Position, that it would be evil to tolerate seducing Teachers, scandalous Livers.*

*In two things, I shall discover the great evil of this joining and coupling*

Q

*seducing Teachers, and scandalous Livers, as the proper and adæquate object of the Magistrates care and work to suppress and punish.*

**Defender.**

I no where make it the proper and adæquate object of the Magistrates care and work, to suppress, and punish seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers. For I have expressly said it, and proved it before, that it is, and ought to be the case and work of the Church also to suppress and punish seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers, in a Church-way, as well as the Magistrate, in a civil way.

**Discusser.**

*First, this joining of things of such different kinds, is not an homogeneous, but heterogenous comixture of things most different in kinds.*

**Defender.**

But these different kinds, they agree in one common kind: they are both of them evils, and evils destructive in their several ways to the common good of God's people, which ought to be preserved both in Church and Common-wealth. The *Termes of Homogeneous* and *Heterogeneous*, are in this case only words of noise, and of an empty sound, fit to take with simple people, that know not the meaning, nor use of them.

**Discusser.**

*Who knoweth not, that many seducing Teachers of the Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or Antichristian Religion, may be clear and free from scandalous offences in their lives, and from disobedience to the civil Laws of the State?*

**Defender.**

Now you may see the *Discusser* was willing to make use of sounding words, which himself (it seemeth) knew not well the use of. For what if there were many seducing Teachers of all Religions, that may be clear from scandalous offences? the distinguishing therefore of evils into these two sorts, into seditious Teachers, and scandalous offenders, is so much the more allowable, and accurate. If a man shall say the work of the Creation on the sixth day, was either of man, or of Beast: shall a man go about here to observe a great evil, that here is not an homogeneous, but an heterogeneous comixture of things most different in kind? For who knoweth not that there are many Beasts, Lions, Leopards, Wolves, Bears, that never were men, but are clear and free from all human nature?

Such a like reasoning is that of the *Discusser* here; What if many  
seducing

seducing Teachers, whether *Jewish, Paganish, Turkish, Antichristian*, were never scandalous livers, but obedient to the civil State? yet are they not all of them evil? and accordingly to be restrained by lawful Authority? And is the joining of them together the great evil of an *heterogeneous* comixture?

Again, let the *Discusser* be pleased to observe (that which hath been often touched afore) that we look at it, as more tolerable, for seducing Teachers to seduce those who are already in the same gall of bitterness with themselves, as *Pagans* to seduce *Pagans*, *Jews* to seduce *Jews*, Turks to seduce Turks, and *Antichristians* to seduce Antichristians. Though this also ought to be prevented by wise and

wholesome means; by a Christian Magistrate in all those that are under his dominion, so far as there is power in his hand, without the hazard of the public State.

Lastly, let me add this *Reply* to the rest, that it will be hard for the *Discusser* to find *Antichristian* seducers clear and free from Disobedience to the Civil Laws of a State, in case that *Antichrist* (to whom they are sworn) shall excommunicate the civil Magistrate, and prescribe the civil State to the invasion of Foreigners.

**Discusser.**

*Again, who knoweth, not that a seducing Teacher properly sinneth against the Church, & against the Spiritual State and Laws of it? and therefore ought most properly and only to be dealt withal in such a way.*

**Defender.**

These twice-sod Coleworts, the *Discusser* hath often set them before us heretofore: but with as little favour now, as before. For what if a seducing Teacher having sinned against the Church, be cast out by the Church, and still continue seducing? yea what a weak and guileful evasion, would this prove for the *Discusser*, to refer a seducing Teacher to a Church-way, when himself doth not acknowledge any Church of Christ extant upon the face of the Earth?

**Discusser.**

*A second evil, which I observe in coupling seducing Teachers with scandalous livers, is a silent and implicit Justification of all unrighteous and cruel proceedings of Jews, and Gentiles against all the Prophets of God, the Lord Jesus himself, and all his messengers and witnesses, whom their Accusers, have ever so coupled and mixed with notorious evil doers, and scandalous livers, &c.*

Q 2

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

Is this a silent and implicit Justification or all the injurious and cruel handlings by wicked men of the Lord Jesus, and his witnesses, to say, that seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers are to be punished by Authority, because the Lord Jesus himself, and his witnesses have suffered under those names? What if the wicked *Jews*, and *Gentiles* did injuriously and blasphemously put those names upon the Lord Jesus, and his faithful witnesses, and upon presence of such evils put them to death? doth it therefore justify such proceedings, to say, that seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers are to be punished by Authority? If those who are indeed seducing Teachers, and scandalous livers ought to be punished, will it therefore justify the like proceedings against them who are no such persons, but falsely so called? if a man should say, a murderer is to be punished with death, will it therefore justify the *Islanders of Melita*, to put *Paul* to death, because amongst them he was so reputed, doubtless a murderer? *Acts* 8:4, yea let the *Discusser*, seriously consider, whether this kind of reasoning of his, do not more then silently and implicitly testify, that the Lord Jesus and his witnesses, were seducing Teachers and scandalous livers.

---

## CHAPTER 55. *A Reply to his Chapter 57.*

**Discusser.**

**T**He Scripture alleged by the Answerer, to prove that it would be an evil, to tolerate notorious evil doers, whether seducing Teachers, or scandalous livers, is written, Revelation 2:14,20. Where Christ hath something against the Church of Pergamus, for toletating them that hold the Doctrine of Balaam: and against the Church of Thyatira, for tolerating Jezabel, to teach and seduce.

Unto which I may answer with some admiration and astonishment, how it pleased the Father of Lights, and most Jealous God, to darken and veil the eyes of such a man, as not to seek out, and propose some Scriptures (in the proof of so weighty an assertion) as at least might have some colour for the influence of the civil Magistrate in such cases. For these Texts concern neither the City, nor the civil Magistrates of Pergamus, and Thyatira, but the Churches, and Elders, &c.

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

It was no part of my meaning, to allege those Scriptures, to prove it unlawful for Magistrates to tolerate seducing Teachers, but unlawful for Churches.

If the *Discusser* say there needed no proof of that, that was but of Question.

I may truly tell him, that was more than I knew. For the Letter which he entreated me to Answer, so stated the Question, as in general to argue against persecution for cause of Conscience. And if the Question be put in such general Terms, I knew the Church might all well be complained of for persecution for cause of Conscience, as the civil Magistrate. For if persecution be taken properly for affliction or oppression for righteousness sake I knew it was out of Question, all persecution was unlawful, whether by the Church, or the Magistrate: an unjust excommunication is as true persecution, as an unjust Banishment. But if persecution be taken more largely, and loosely, (as it is by the Author of the Letter, and by the *Discusser*, for any affliction, or persecution for cause of Conscience whether good Conscience, or evil, whether rightly informed, or erroneous) If that be the Intent of the Letter (as it seemed to me) to bear witness against that, then any testimony of Scripture, that justifieth a lawful censure of false and erroneous Teachers, doth evince the scope of the Letter to be erroneous, which is against all persecution for cause of Conscience. Let therefore the *Discusser* admire at his own admiration, and be astonished at his own astonishment, that wondereth to see an universal negative argued against by a particular affirmative.

The Letter denyeth the lawfulness of all persecution in cause of Conscience, that is, in matter of Religion: I seek to evince the falsehood of it, by an influence of lawful Church prosecution in case of false Teachers.

**Discusser.**

*But if the Churches and Angels thereof had sufficient power to suppress Balaam, and Jezabel, then all power of the Magistrates and Governors in Pergamus and Thyatira (though they had been Christian) must needs fall to the ground, as none of Christ's appointment.*

*Defender.*

The power of the Churches and Angels, of *Pergamos*, and *Thyatira*, were sufficient for those ends, for which Christ ordained Church-

Church-power: to wit, for the healing of the souls of such seducers, (if *they* belonged to Christ) as also for keeping those Churches pure from, the fellowship of the guile of their Act (in teaching false Doctrines) whom they had duly censured. But the power of those Churches and Angels was not sufficient to prevent the further spreading of the Leaven of their false Doctrines, both in such as were out of the Church, and in private, amongst the members of the Church, who might adhere to them. Much less was the putting forth of the Church-power against them sufficient to clear the Magistrates of a Christian State from the guilt of Apostasy, in suffering such Apostates amongst them, who would be ready to solicit many simple souls, either to with-hold and with-draw themselves from the Fellowship of the Churches, or in the Churches to withdraw from the Lord Jesus.

**Discusser.**

*Lastly, from this perverse wresting of whst is writ to the Church, and the Officers thereof, as if it were writ to the Civil Officers, and State thereof, all may see how since the Apostasy of Antichrist the Christian world (so called) hath swallowed up Christianity, how the Church, and Civil State, that is, the Church and the world are now become one flock of Jesus Christ, &c.*

**Defender.**

Here is no wresting, much less perverse wresting of any Scripture at all, from the Church, to the Civil State. I intended to apply the Scripture written to the Churches, and to the Officers thereof, no further than to other Churches, and their Officers. The Scriptures upon which we call in the Magistrate to the punishment of Seducers, are such as are directed to civil States, and Magistrates, of which divers have been mentioned, and applied before.

---

**CHAPTER 56.**

*A Reply to his Chapters 58, and 59. Discussing the Testimony of some princes.*

**Discusser.**

**I** *Proceed to the second Head of Reasons (against persecution for cause of Conscience) taken from the profession of famous Princes, King James, Stephen of Poland, King of Bohemia.*

*Unto*

*Unto whom the Answerer returneth a treble Answer.*

1. *We willingly acknowledge, (saith he) that none is to be persecuted at all; no more than any may be oppressed for righteousness sake.*

*Again, we acknowledge, that none is to be punished for his Conscience, though misinformed, unless his error be fundamental, or seditiously and turbulently promoted, and that after due conviction of his Conscience, that it may appear, he is not punished for his Conscience, but for sinning against his Conscience.*

*Furthermore, we acknowledge, none is to be constrained, to believe or profess the true Religion, till he be convinced in Judgement of the truth of it: but yet restrained he may be from blaspheming the Truth, and from seducing any into pernicious errors.*

*This first Answer, I believe, I have sufficiently cleared the weakness of the Foundations thereof in the former discourse.*

**Defender.**

*And I doubt not, but by the help of Christ, I have formerly declared and convinced the feebleness of the opposition made against them, and what firm foundations those Answers are built upon, from the Scriptures of Truth.*

**Discusser.**

*His second Answer is this, what Princes profess and practice is not a Rule of Conscience. They many times tolerate that in State Policy, which cannot justly be tolerated in point of true Christianity.*

*Againe, Princes many times tolerate Offenders out of very necessity, when the Offenders are too many, or too mighty for them to punish. In which respect David tolerated Joab and his murder, but against his will.*

*It may be here observed, how the Answerer dealeth with Princes, one while, they are nursing Fathers of the Church, not only to feed, but also to correct; and therefore consequently, bound to judge, what is true feeding and correcting: and cosequently all men are bound to submit to their feeding and correcting.*

**Defender.**

*The Discusser doth partly falsely, and partly fraudulently fasten upon. me this dealing with Princes. That I make them  
nursing*

nursing fathers of the Church, I therein follow the footsteps of the Holy Ghost before me, teaching what Princes should be, and foretelling what they shall be in the latter dayes, *Isaiah* 49: 23. In which place, It was not the intent of the Holy Ghost, (nor mine) to threaten the Church with a rod of Correction: But to comfort the Church with a double blessing: First of the Fatherly provision and protection of princes for the Church: Secondly, of their subjection to the Church, in respect of their spiritual Estate. What Princes may do, in case the Church should Apostate, and become no Church: or in case they should break forth into Sedition, and Rebellion against the Civil State, It is another Question which I have not meddled with, in all this Discourse. Neither have I spoken of Princes, as bound to Judge, what is true feeding, or correcting: least of all have I said, that all men are bound (especially in Conscience) to their feeding, and correcting. These are calumnies devised by the Discusser.

All I have said (to my remembrance) this way, is, that Princes are bound to be wise, and Learned with holy knowledge that they may kiss the Son, and be subject to him, *Psalme* 2:10,11. And therefore able to discern of such corrupt feeding, as destroyeth the Foundation of Religion, and the souls of God's people, that they may be able to restrain such, and to preserve the Church from such ravenous Wolves: and I deny not that their Subjects are to submit to them herein; when they judge according to the Word; or howsoever patientl to suffer for well-doing, without resistance, in a way of Hostility, notwithstanding any Church-power. If ought be unfound in this dealing with Princes, I am willing to hear of it.

#### **Discussor.**

*Another while, when Princes cross Mr. Cotton's Judgement, and Practice, then it matters not, what the Profession and Practice of Princes is for, (saith. he) their Profession and Practice is no Rule to Conscience.*

#### **Defender.**

If Princes swerve from the rule of the word, either in profession, or  
practice,  
 [in the original apges 119 and 120 are repeated]

practise, their own profession, or practice is no rule either to themselves, or others. Princes ought not to rule the word, but are to be ruled by it. But see the notorious calumny, of the Discuffer, so representing Mr *Cotton's* dealing with Princes, as if he made his own judgement and practice the rule of the proceeding of Princes. Men whose tongues are their own, may speak any thing: But yet such as fear the Lord, would tremble at such speeches, as neither express Truth, nor Love.

**Discusser.**

*I ask then, unto what Princes or Magistrates, will themselves, or any so persuaded, submit to, as unto keepers of both Tables, and nursing Fathers, and Mothers, to the Church?*

*First will it not evidently follow by these Tenents, That they ought not to submit to any, Magistrates in the world, in these cases, but to Magistrates just of their own Conscience?*

**Defender.**

We subject ourselves to all sorts of Magistrates of the Countries where we live, or whether we come, whether Christian, or Pagan, Orthodox, or erroneous, just of our Consciences, or unjust against them. Subject ourselves, I say, either in active submission, and obedience, when they command according to God: or in passive submission, of our bodies, and goods, lives, and liberties, when they command against God. Since the Discusser concludeth, it will evidently follow, that we will submit to no Magistrates, but just of our own Consciences let him make that evident, which he saith, is evident, or else, let him say, he is evidently mistaken, *né quid dicam gravius*.

**Discusser.**

*Secondly, will it not also follow, that all other Consciences in the world, (except their own) must be persecuted by such their Magistrates?*

**Defender.**

This will no ways follow, unless all mens Consciences in the world did err Fundamentally, and obstinately after just conviction, against the very Principles of Christian Religion, or at least, unless they maintained, and held forth other errors (though not Fundamentally subverting Religion, yet Fundamentally subverting Church-Order, and civil order) and that in a turbulent,

R

and

and factious manner. For in these cases only we follow Magistrates to punish matters of Religion.

**Discusser.**

*And Lastly, Is not this to make Magistrates, but steps, and stirrups for themselves, to ascend and mount into their rich, and honourable Seats, and Saddles? I mean, great and settled maintenances, which neither the Lord Jesus, nor any of his first Messengers, the true Patterns did ever know.*

**Defender.**

How this power ascribed to Magistrates, not by me, but by the body almost, of all Faithful Ministers, yea by the Prophets and Apostles themselves, should make Magistrates stairs, and stirrups, for ourselves to mount up on high, let him that can discern it, make it appear. To allow them power over ourselves in case of Heretical Delinquency, is not to make them stairs, or stirrups of our advancement, but Swords and staves (if need be) for our punishment.

Besides, I wonder what fancy came into the Discusser's mind, to dream of rich and honourable Seats, and Saddles of our Magistrates? When as he need not be ignorant, how far short they themselves, fall, of rich and honourable Seats and Saddles, which himself, interpreteth, great and settled maintenances.

Lastly, I suppose, he is not ignorant, that myself against whom he is pleased by Name to write this invective, liveth not upon great and settled maintenance, but according to that which he calleth, the true pattern of the first Messengers of the Lord Jesus.

## **CHAPTER 57. A Reply to his Chapter 60.**

**Discusser.**

**I***N the second place, the Answerer saith, that Princes out of State-Policy, do sometimes tolerate, what suiteth not with Christianity: and out of State-necessity, Tolerate (as David did Joab) against their wills.*

*But then the Answerer must acknowledge with me, That there*  
is

*is a necessity sometime of State-Toleration, as in the case of Joab. And so his former affirmation, generally laid down, [viz., That it is evil to Tolerate seducing Teachers, and Scandalous Livers.] Was not duly weighed in the balance of the Sanctuary, and is too light.*

**Defender.**

I easily acknowledge sometime a necessity of State Toleration; As I have formerly expressed (in Chapter 53.) especially in two cases, whereof that of *Joab* is one.

But that will nothing impeach the Truth of my former affirmation delivered in general terms, especially, if it be weighed in the Balance of the Sanctuary. For the holy writings of the Sanctuary do expressly deliver the like position, in like general terms. As *Moses* saith, who so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. This Law is delivered in general terms: and yet though *Joab* was a murderer, he was tolerated to live all the Reign of *David*: yet I hope the Discusser will not say, that general Law of *Moses* was not duly weighed in the Balance of the Sanctuary, and is too light.

**Discussur.**

*I affirm Secondly, That that State-Policy and State-necessity which permitteth Consciences of men, will be found to agree most punctually with the Rules of the best Politician, that ever the world saw, the Lord Jesus himself, who commanded the permitting of the Tares, to wit, Antichristians, or false Christians with true Christians, as I have discoursed above.*

**Defender.**

That discourse hath been examined above, and found too light, so far as it crosseth the Truth returned in Answer to the Letter. To permit some Antichristians, or false Christians, The Answer to the Letter did allow: unless they maintained Fundamental Heresies against the Foundation of Religion, and that obstinately, after conviction, and did withal seduce others, into the same Apostasy.

But as for such Heretics, and seducing Teachers, I hope, it hath been cleared, they are none of those Tares, of which Christ saith, Let them alone.

Besides, it is an Interpretation of Christ's words formerly given, and not to be reversed, That if by Tares were meant, such

gross offenders, then the speech of Christ. Let them alone, is not a word of command in way of an Ordinance, but a word of Permission, and prediction, what will be, in way of Providence. Like that in *Luke 22:36*. He that hath no sword, let him sell his Garment and buy a sword, It is not a word of command, or direction, what the Disciples should do; But a word of prediction, what times of trial they should meet withal.

## CHAPTER 58. *A Reply to his Chapter 61.*

### Discusser.

*His third Answer is this.*

**F**OR those three Princes named by you, who Tolerated false Religion, we can name more and greater, who have not Tolerated Heretics and Schismatics, notwithstanding their pretence of Conscience, and Arrogating the crown of Martyrdom to their sufferings.

Constantine the great at the Request of the general Council of Nice, Banished Arius, with some of his fellows, *Ecclesiast. Histor. l. 1. Cap. 19, 20.*

The same Constantine made a severe Law against the Donatists: & the like proceedings against them were used by Valentinian, Gratian, & Theodosius, as Augustine reporteth in *Epist. 166*. only Julian the Apostate granted liberty to Heretics as well as to Pagans, that he might by Tolerating all weeds to grow, choke the vitals of Christianity: Which was also the practice and sin of Ualens the Arian.

Queen Elizabeth, as famous for her government, as most of the former, It is well known what Laws she made, and executed against Papists: Yea and King James (one of your own Witnesses) though he was slow in proceeding against Papists (as you say) for Conscience sake; yet you are not ignorant, how sharply and severely he punished those, whom the Malignant world calleth Puritans, men of more Conscience & better Faith, then the Papists, whom he Tolerated.

### Discusser.

First, for mine own part, I would not use an Argument from the number of Princes, witnessing in profession, or practice, against persecution

*tion for cause of Conscience, &c. Truth, and Faith, must not be received with respect of persons: precious pearls are found in muddy shells. The most High chooseth the poor of this world, to be witnesses to his Truth: and Buchanan dying was going thither, whether few Kings were coming.*

***Defender.***

This Chapter then might have been spared: for it neither maintaineth his cause, nor refuteth my answer to his friends Argument: but yeildeth up the invalidity of the Argument from such a Topic place, As from the number and votes of Princes. But by his leave, the answer which I gave to his argument is not taken from the like number of Princes, but from the greater piety, and presence of God with those Princes, who have professed and practised against Toleration. It is truly said, *Suffragia non sunt numeranda, sed ponderanda*. Heroical wisdom, magnanimity and zeal, is not the less to be esteemed, because it is found in the spirit, and counsel, and practice of Princes.

---

**CHAPTER 59. A Reply to his Chapter 62.**

**Discusser.**

**S***econdly, I observe, how inconsiderately (I hope not willingly) the Answerer passeth by the reasons and grounds, urged by these three Princes.*

*In King James his speech, he passeth by that golden Maxim, that God never loved to plant his Church by blood.*

***Defender.***

The Discusser is mistaken, when he saith I passed over their reasons and grounds inconsiderately, though he hopeth, not willingly? for indeed I passed them over willingly, but not inconsiderately. For I well considered, either the reasons wanted weight, or else did not impugne the cause in hand. For instance, this speech of King *James* (That God never loved to plant his Church by blood) though it be a Truth of weight: yet it doth not touch this cause. It is far from us to defend the planting of Churches

Churches by blood: that is, to compel men to yield themselves to the fellowship of the Church by bloody Laws, or pœnalties: the Church of Christ admitteth no members, but a willing people, *Psalm 110:3* Nevertheless that hindereth not, but as the Church was purchased and planted by the blood of Christ: so he that shall go about to supplant, and destroy the Church of Christ, his blood may justly fall upon his own head.

**Discusser.**

*Secondly, That civil obdience may be performed by Papists: this was another reason of King James passed over by the Answerer.*

**Defender.**

No marvel, that I passed it over: for I did not find it in the Letter. For though the King say (as the Letter reporteth him, I only declared, to be secured for civil obedience: which for Conscience cause, they were bound to performe:) yet the King doth not say, That civil obedience may be performed, by Papists, standing steadfast to the rules of their own Religion. For if the Bishop of *Rome*, upon pretence of heretical pravity, shall excommunicate a Protestant Prince, dissolve the Subject's Oath of Allegiance to him, depose him, dispose of his Kingdom; In this case (whish often falleth out) how can civil obedience be performed by the Papists?

**Discusser.**

*Thirdly, the Kings third ground is his observation in Revelation 20. That persecution is a true & certain note of false Church: The wicked are Beseigers, the faithful Beseiged.*

**Defender.**

I subscribe to the King that persecution (properly so called, that is, the oppression of any for righteousness sake) is a note of a false Church: but nor a certain note. For again, I say, that persecution properly so called, may be some time found, in the true Church. For which of all the Prophets did not the Church of the old Testament persecute? *Acts 7:52*.

And yet that persecution was not the true and certain note of a false Church: For then God had left no true Church upon the face of the earth. But this I grant, That such persecution, where ever it is found, It is a degree of falsehood and Apostasy in that Church. But what a vast distance is there between the just censure  
of

of Apostastical, and Heretical seducers, and disturbers of the Churches peace and truth, and between persecution?

As for the other speech [The wicked are beseigers, the faithful are beseiged] It may well be said of the seige spoken of in that 20 of the *Revelation*: But if it should be put for a universal Maxim, Royal Authority cannot make it good Divinity. When the ten Christian Kings shall hare the Whore of *Rome*, and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. (*Revelation* 17:16.) I suppose the Discusser will not say, the wicked are Beseigers, the faithful are beseiged.

**Discussor.**

*In King Stephens speech of Poland, he passeth by the true difference, between a civil, and spiritual Government. I am (said Stephen) a civil Magistrate over the bodies of men, not a spiritual over their souls.*

**Defender.**

King *Stephen's* speech may well stand, and the cause still untouched. The Magistrate is a Ruler over the Bodies of men, not over their souls: He cannot command their souls, nor bind their Consciences, nor punish their spirits. It is the Lord alone can reach them. That which the King or Magistrate can do, or doeth in this case, is to punish the bodies of men for destroying, or disturbing Religion.

**Discussor.**

*To confound these, is Babel: and Jewish to seek for Moses and bring him from his Grave, &c.*

**Defender.**

It is Babel indeed, for civil Magistrates, to make Laws to bind Conscience, and to excommunicate transgressors of those Laws: But to punish false Prophets, and Seducers of God's people to Idolatry, was never the practice of Babel: but it was, and is their practice, not only to Tolerate them, but to advance, and encourage them.

If it were a *Jewish* seeking of *Moses*, and a bringing him from his Grave, to punish Seducers for Idolatry, then after *Moses* was buried, that Law (*Deuteronomy* 13.) was abrogated. But his burial, and God's hiding of the place thereof, was rather a confirmation, and establishment of it, than any Abrogation, or Impeachment  
of

of it. for may it not justly be conceived, That the Lord therefore hid the place of his burial, least the Children of *Israel* knowing it, might go a whoring after his Sepulchre, and it may be offer sweet incence upon it: and so such false worship against the law of *Moses* might come to be Tolerated, for honour to the body of *Moses*?

*But Christ hath abolished a National State, or Church, which Moses set up in Canaan*

Though Christ abolished a National Church-State, and instead thereof set up a Congregational Church: yet Christ never abolished, a National Civil State, nor the Judicial Laws of *Moses*, which were of Moral equity, but established them rather, in their place and order. He that shed his own blood to plant his Church, did never abolish that Law, which enacted, that his blood should be upon him, who should supplant his Church. If Christ's blood go to plant it, let the false Christ's blood go for supplanting it.

**Discusser.**

*In the King of Bohemia's speech, the Answerer passeth by that Foundation in grace and Nature, that Conscience ought not to be violated, and forced, it is a spiritual Rape.*

**Defender.**

This was not passed by, but prevented in stating the Question, where it was said, it is not lawful to censure any, no not for error in Fundamental points of Doctrine or Worship, *till the Conscience of the offender, be first convinced (out of the word of God) of the dangerous error of his ways and then if he still persist, It is not out of Conscience, but against his Conscience (as the Apostle saith Titus 3:11.) & so he is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but punished for sinning against his Conscience..*

**Discusser.**

*The King observeth that most lamentably true experience of all ages, That persecution for cause of Conscience, hath ever proved pernicious, &c.*

**Defender.**

No experience in any age did ever prove it pernicious, to punish seducing Apostates, after due conviction of the error of their way. Wherein did the burning of *Servetus* prove pernicious

[pages 127 and 128 do not exist in the original, jumping to 129].

ous to *Geneva*? or the just execution of many popish Priests to Queen *Elizabeth*, or to the english State?

But the King's speech may pass, if it be meant of persecution properly so called, to wit, Oppression of the faithful, for the Truth's sake: yea if it be the punishment of any for error, If not Fundamentally pernicious either to Religion, or Church-order, and that after conviction of Conscience, persisted in with obstinacy.

**Discusser.**

*Lastly, the King's observation of his own time, that Persecution for cause of Conscience; was practised most in England, and such places, where Popery reigned: Implying (as I conceive) such practices commonly proceed from the great Whore, whose Daughter, are like their Mother, all of a bloody nature, as commonly all wolves be.*

**Defender.**

It is no marvel, if I passed by this observation in the King's speech: For there is no such observation there to be found. If the Discusser had well observed it himself, he would have found, it was not the speech of the King, but of the Prisoner.

And the persecution, he speaketh of, was not of Antichristians, or Heretics, or Idolaters, but only of such as the world nicknamed Puritans, or the like, and of them too, without conviction of the error of their way.

But in that the Discusser maketh England a Daughter, of the great Whore; *and of a bloody nature, like her Mother: he speaketh as some other of the rigid Separation have done before him. But I could never yet see a warrant* (from the rule either of Truth, or Love) for such a speech. Did ever the holy Scripture, call any Church an whore, that worshipped the true God, only in the Name of Jesus, and depended on him alone for righteousness and salvation? Is it not the part of a base child, or at least, a base part of a child, to call his Mother whore, who bred him, and bred him to know no other Father but her lawful Husband, the Lord Jesus Christ?

---

## CHAPTER 60. *A Reply to his Chapter 63.*

### Discusser.

NOW Thirdly, In that the Answerer observeth, that amongst the Roman Emperors, they that did not persecute were Julian the Apostate, and Valens, the Arian: Whereas the good Emperors, Constantine, Gratian, Valentian, and Theodosius, they did persecute the Arians, and Donatists.

*Let it be for an Answer, It is no new thing for godly, and eminently godly men to perform ungodly actions: nor for ungodly persons, for wicked ends, to act what in itself is good and righteous, &c.*

### Defender.

This may go for a truth, but not for an Answer. The Letter would Justify Toleration of Religion from the judgement and speeches of three Kings. I Answered that was no Argument, for I could bring him Kings more in number, and greater in the sight of God and man, who judged it meet not to tolerate Heretics, nor turbulent Schismatics,

To this the Discusser Answereth, sometimes the Godly do that which is evil, and the wicked, that which is good. This I say is a Truth, but doth not take away my Answer, but by a *Petite Principij*, a begging of the Question, That Kings alleged by him did that which was good, but the Kings alleged by me, though better persons, did that which was evil.

---

## CHAPTER 61. *A Reply to his Chapter 64.*

### Discusser.

THE unknowing zeal of Constantine and other Emperors did more hurt to Christ Jesus, his Church and Kingdom, then the raging fury of the most bloody Neros. In the persecution of those wicked Emperors, Christians were sweet and flagrant, like spice pounded in Mortars: But those good Emperors persecuting some erroneous persons, and Advancing the Professors of some truths, and maintaining their Religion

*Religion by the material Sword, by this means Christianity was eclipsed, The Professors of it fall asleep (Canticles 5.) Babel was usherd in, and by degrees the Churches of the Saints were turned into the Wilderness of whole Nations, Revelation 12:13) until the whole world, became Christian, or Christendom. These good Emperors intending to exalt Christ, but not attending to the command of Christ Jesus, to permit the Tares to grow in the Field of the world, they made the Garden of the Church, and Field of the world, all one &c.*

*Defender.*

If the unknowing zeal of *Constantine*, & other Christian Emperors did more hurt to the Church, then the raging fury of bloody *Neros*: It was not because the raging fury of those Persecutors was more accepted of God, then this unknowing zeal of the good Emperors. For though the unknowing zeal of the one was sinful, yet it was the fruit of human frailty, *Error Amoris*: But the rage of the others was devilish fury, *Amor Erroris*. Besides the unknowing zeal of the good Emperors, lay not in punishing notorious Heretical Seducers: nor will the Discusser be ever able to show, that the Church of Christ suffered any hurt at all by that means. The contrary is evident, *Constantius*, and *Valens* by Tolerating and favoring the *Arians*, the whole world became *Arian*; *Ingemuit orbis Christianus, et miratus est factum se esse Arianum*. Now whether be the greater mischief the whole world to become *Arian*, or to become Christian, Let Christians judge. The Discusser indeed speaketh of it, is a soliscism in Religion, that the whole world should become Christian, and quoteth for it, *Revelation* 12 and 13. But *Revelation* 12 speaketh nothing to the purpose: and *Revelation* 13 speaketh of it, as a marvellous evil, that the whole world should wonder after the Beast, verse 3. But their wondering after the Beast, not a becoming Christian (for they were that before) nor did it spring only from the unknowing rule of Christian Emperors in persecuting Apostate Heretics: But rather from their sinful Indulgence: in the Toleration of Heretics in Doctrine, and Idolaters in Worship. For had they been zealous, and watchful against such, how is it possible, that ever Antichrist should have been hatched up, to carry the world after him into such a notorious Apostasy? It was not persecution, that made the world, Christian: but Toleration, that

made the world, Antichristian. Furthermore, the hurt of the unknowing zeal of good Emperors did to the Church, came in also another way, by advancing Church-Officers to Mountains of high preferments, and settled endowments, *Revelation* 8:8,9. The Church never took hurt by the punishment of Heretics. Moreover, when God advanced *Constantine* and other good Emperors to sit on the Throne, It is true, the Church soon became a wilderness: but that came not to pass because those Emperors forced Pagans into Church-Fellowship by the material Sword as the Discusser intimateth, but untruly) But because the common sort are willing to follow the example of great ones, *Regis ad exemplum totus componitur Orbis*: as also because of the sleepiness of the watchmen (the Elders of the Churches) who should not have suffered such store of Tares to come into the communion of the Church. Had the world renounced their Paganism, and professed Christ to be the Son of God, but yet had been kept out of the Fellowship of the Church, till they had approved their profession by a sincere Christian conversation. It had been no soliscism at all (howsoever the Discusser judge of it) though the whole world had been come—Christian, and styled Christendom. But it is too gross and palpable a mistake, to make this the cause why the Garden of the Church, *and the Field of the world became all one, because the zeal of Christian Emperors intending to exalt Christ, did not attend to the command of Christ, to permit the Tares to grow in the Field of the world.*

For they did permit them to live in the Field of the world, they seldom or never put any to death for Heretical pravity (though it had been better they had so done with some of them:). But only exiled them from such Cities and Countries as were most Populous, where if they had continued, they might have had too great an opportunity of spreading their leaven, which (as the Apostle speaketh fretteth like a Gangrene; 1 Timothy 2:17.

Chap. 62.

---

## CHAPTER 62. *A Reply to his Chapter 65.*

### Discusser.

**I** Desire you to glance your eye on this not unworthy observation, how fully this Answerer hath learned the Language of Lion like Persecution &c. for thus he writeth, more and greater Princes, then these you mention, have not Tolerated Heretics, and Schismatics, notwithstanding their pretence of Conscience, and their Arrogating the Crown of Martyrdom to their sufferings.

Tis true, these terms Heretics (or wilfully obstinate) and Schismatics, are used in holy writ: tis true also, that such pretend Conscience, and Arrogate the Crown of Martyrdom to their suffering. But this is the common clamour of Persecutors against the witnesses of Jesus in all ages, you are Heretics, Schismatics, factions, Seditious, rebellious.

### Defender.

If it be true, that there be Scripture terms, and by his own acknowledgement truly applicable to Heretics and Schismatics, then, it seemeth, the Discusser hath learned this language of *Ashdod*, that the Scripture itself, and Truth itself speaketh the roaring Language of Lion like Persecution. For he acknowledgeth, the Scripture useth the same terms, and Truth verifieth the same things. In Sum, It is as much to say, as *Paul* had learned the roaring and railing Language of Lion-like *Pharoah*: *Pharoah* told the Children of *Israel*, ye are idle, ye are idle, *Exodus* 5:17. And *Paul* had learned to say as much to the *Cretans* by his Letter to *Titus*, *The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies*. *Titus* 1:12. But is it so indeed? may not the same reproof unjustly cast upon God's servants, be justly applyed to God's enemies, when (by the Discussers own confession) it may be applyed truly! If Persecutors misapply Scripture Terms, & rebukes to Christ's Witnesses falsely, may not a servant of God apply the same truly, as the Scripture applyeth them, but he shall be thought to learn to speak not the Language of Scripture, but the Language of persecutors?

### Discusser.

*Oh it is hard for God's Children to fall to Opinion and practice of Persecution,*

*Persecution, without ready learning the Language thereof. And doubtless that soul, that can so readily learn Babel's Language hath cause to fear that he hath not yet in Point of Worship left the gates or suburbs of it.*

**Defender.**

If this Language used by me be the Terms of Scripture, and by the acknowledgement of Truth rightly applied, than it is the Language of *Canaan* and not of *Babel*. What Language they have learned, who in point of Worship, have left Zion, but not the gates and Suburbs of *Babel*, (for they set up Bulwarks of Impunity, to secure them) Let themselves (in the fear of God) consider.

But what Language is it to speak of me, as having learned the opinion & practice of persecution, I desire the God of Truth to teach him to know, It is the Language of him that stood not in the Truth, and of such also, as call evil good, and good evil.

**Discusser.**

*Again in blaming Julian the Apostate, and Valens the Arian for Tolerating all weeds to grow, he noteth their sinful end, that thereby they might choke the vitals of Christianity: and seemeth herein to consent (on a speech of Jerome) That the weeds of false Religions tolerating, have a Power to kill true Christianity in the Church.*

*But when Christianity began to be choked, It was not when Christians lodged in cold Prisons, but Down-Beds of ease, and Persecuted others.*

**Defender.**

I noted indeed the sinful end of *Julian* the Apostate in tolerating all Religions and Heresies, to aim at the choking of the vitals of Christianity. Of *Valens* I noted the like sinful practice of Tolerating all Religions: but did not express his end. But what I spake of the end, concerned *Julian*: and I spake of it not of mine own imagination, (though he that shall read the stories of his Apostasy, and malignity against the Name of Christ, and Christians, might easily believe and speak it without rashness:) but I speak it out of a grave and judicious Author, who lived near those times, I mean *Augustine*, who in his 166 *Epistle*, thus expresseth *Julians* both practice, and end. *Julianus desertor,*  
*Christi*

*Christi, et Inimicus, Hæreticis liberatem perditionis permisit, et tum Basilicas Hæreticis reddidit, quando Templæ Dæmonijs; Eo modo putâns, Christianum Momen posse perire, de Terris, siunitati Ecclesiæ, de qua lapsus suer at, invideret, et sacrileges Dissensiones liberas esse permetteret, that is, Julian, the forsaker, and the enemy of Christ, Permitted to Heretics liberty of perdition: and at the same time restored Palaces (or royal-meeting-houses) to Heretics when the Temples to Divels; thinking by this means, the Christian Name might perish from the earth, if he should envy that unity to the Church from which himself fell, and permit Sacrilegious Dissensions to enjoy their liberty.*

What the Discusser subjoined, as weakning this end, *that Christianity began to be choked, not when Christians lay in cold Prisons, but Beds of ease, and persecuted others:* This doth not at all weaken the right apprehension of *Julions* end, For 1. *Julian* might aim at that end, though he might not have attained it.

Secondly, evident it is that Toleration of briars and thorns, (and such are Heretics and Blasphemies) do choke the life of Christianity. For beside experience the Text in *Revelation* 8:10, 11. Declareth, that by the fall of a Star, (called wormewood) into the waters, the third part of the waters were embittered by it, and many men died that drunk of those waters. And what was that Star, but *Arius* and *Constantius*?

Thirdly, Though Beds of ease have been one means of choking Christianity, yet that hindereth not, but the Toleration of all weeds to grow with the good seed, is another.

Fourthly, when he saith, *Their persecuting of others was a means of choking Christianity:* It is a plain contrdiction of his former speech that *Constantine did more hurt to Christ's Church and Kingdom, than the raging fury of the most bloody Neroes.*

## CHAPTER 63. *A Reply to his Chapter 66.*

### Discussor.

**H**E ends this passage with approbation of Queen Elizabeth for *Persecuting the Papists, and a reproof to King James for Persecuting the Puritans.*

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

I neither did in terms approve the persecution of the one, nor reprove the persecution of the other. The words I spake of them are recited above. Chapter 58, which contain an Historical Narration of the *Res gestas* in this case of both the Princes, but neither approvment, nor reprovment of them. It was enough to answer the Prisoners Argument, that as great Princes as the three named by him for Toleration, might be named against Toleration: As Queen *Elizabeth* for one, and King *James* for another, who persecuted Puritans, though he Tolerated Papists.

**Discusser.**

*But if Queen Elizabeth did well to persecute the Papists according to her Conscience: King James did not ill in persecuting others according to his.*

*Defender.*

It followeth not. For Queen *Elizabeth* might do well in punishing seditious, or seducing Papists according to Conscience rightly informed, and King *James* do ill according to Conscience misinformed. Besides, it may be the worse, when a man persecuteth those whom he knoweth to be innocent, against his own Conscience. Or suppose Conscience by often sinning against the light & checks of it, be (by the just Judgement of God) blinded and feared, In such a case to do a wicked act according to Conscience, doth not extenuate, but aggravate a sin: in that such a man sinneth not only in doing a corrupt act, but (which is worse) with a corrupt Conscience. But with what Conscience King *James* did persecute Puritans, I judge not: the judgement of such things is with the Lord.

**Discusser.**

*But then Mr. Cotton must grant, that if King James did ill in persecuting Puritans according to his Conscience, then either King James was not fit to be King; and had not the essential qualifications of a King (in not being able rightly to judge, who are to be persecuted, who not:) or else, He must confess that King James, and all Magistrates must persecute such, whom in their Conscience they judge worthy to be persecuted,*

*Defender.*

None of these things will follow. For though King *James* did evil to persecute godly Ministers, and other good Christians,

ans, studious of Reformation; yet he was fit to have been a King, and wanted not the essential Qualifications of a King. For he was by lawful Succession the next heir of the Crown, and was besides endued with many royal gifts of wisdom, and Knowledge, both of Scripture and Policy, which if he did not always attend to, in his Administrations, the defect was not for want of Essential Qualifications, but for want of employing his Qualifications according to the right Rule of the word of God. For by the Rule of the word, those (whom they called) Puritans ought not to have been persecuted, no though they had been erroneous in their way, which they were not. For though they consented not to the State-Government of the Church; yet neither did they tumultuously and seditiously resist it. But suppose Princes and Magistrates do want some Qualifications meet for their calling (as this for one, Knowledge and Judgement rightly to discern, who may be punished for matters of Religion, who not:) yet such Qualifications are not of the Essence of the calling of a King, or Magistrate, but belong only to the Integrity of it. Yea such Kings or Magistrates as want such clear discerning of this point, they have a just Call to forbear all execution of civil Censures in matters of Religion, till they be better informed. Or else (as the *Discusser* saith truly) they may persecute the Son of God instead of the son of Perdition.

---

## CHAPTER 64. *A Reply to his Chapter 67.*

### **Discusser.**

**I**N the second place, I ask, what glory to God, what good to the souls and bodies of their Subjects, did these Princes bring, in persecuting?

### **Defender.**

Persecution of Innocents never brought good to Princes, or Subjects, but accidentally: all the *Discusser* said above, that *Nero* in persecuting, made the hearts of *Christians*, more sweet, and fragrant like pounded Spices. But such evil ought not to have been done, that such good in such a way might come of it.

But the good that is brought to Princes and Subjects by the

T

due

due punishment of Apostate Seducers, and Idolaters, and Blasphemers, is manifold.

First, it putteth away evil from the people, and cutteth off a Gangrene, which would spread to further ungodliness, *Deuteronomy* 13: 5. 2 *Timothy* 2:16,17,18.

Secondly, it driveth away Wolves from worrying, and scattering the Sheep of Christ. For false Teachers be Wolves, (*Matthew* 6:15; *Acts* 20:29.) And the very name of Wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them, or driving them away.

Thirdly, such Executions upon such evil doers causeth all the Country to hear and fear, and do no more such wickedness, *Deuteronomy* 13:11.

Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickedness in some: so are they wholesome Medicines, to heal such as are curable of these evils, *Zechariah* 13:4,5,6.

Fourthly, the punishments executed upon false Prophets, and seducing Teachers, do bring down showers of God's blessings upon the civil State, 1 *Kings* 18. 40,41.

Fifthly, it is an honour to God's Justice, that such Judgements are executed, *Revelation* 16:5,6,7

#### **Discusser.**

*But such Executions in Queen Elizabeth's days had raised almost all Europe in combustion; the wars of 88. the Spanish Invasion had special respect to this. And had not the Lord born witness to his own Law, and to his people herein, (by defeating the Intendments of their Enemies) it might have been the ruin, both of England and the Netherlands, which are the words of Mr. Cotton himself on the third Vial.*

#### **Defender.**

The words Answer for themselves. The Devil and his Instruments raged against such Laws, and such Executions, but God bare witness to both, by mightily defeating the Invasions and Conspiracies of Enemies.

#### **Discusser.**

*It is no Argument that God bare witness to his people in such Deliverances and Victories: For,*

1. *Events and Successes come alike to all, and are no Arguments of Love or Hatred.*

*Defender.*

**Defender.**

Events and successes are indeed no Arguments of a man's spiritual Estate, of the Love or hatred of God, to a man's person, in which sense *Solomon* speaketh, *Ecclesiastes* 9:1,2. But otherwise they are ordinary witnesss, good Events of a good Cause if it be well handled: ill events of an ill cause, or at least of the ill handling of a good cause, *Psalms* 1:3,4; *Jeremiah* 22:15,16,17.

**Discusser.**

*Secondly, Papists in their wars have ever yet had both in Peace and war, victory and Dominion. And therefore (if success be the measure) God hath borne witness to them; as in the Wars between Charles the first: and some German Princes, where the success was various, between Philip of Spain, and the Low-Countries; the King of France, and his Protestant Subjects, sometimes winning, sometimes loosing.*

*But most memorable the History of the Waldenses, who fought many Battles against three succeeding Popes, with various success: But the small success and Victory fell to the Popedom, and Romish Church, in the utter extirpation of those Waldensian witnesses.*

**Defender.**

*Reply 1. I will not inquire of the meaning of the words, how the Papists in their wars have had both in Peace and War Victory and Dominion. But this I cannot excuse from contradiction, that the Papists in their Wars ever had the Victory: and yet have often fought with various success, sometime winning, sometime loosing.*

Nor can I tell, how it standeth with Truth, that Papists in their Wars ever had the Victory: since *Queen Elizabeth* ever had the Victory over them.

*Reply 2. Though Papists have sought with various Success, it is God's manner to nurture his people with some crosses, that they might at length learn to fight not in their own strength, but in the Lord's.*

*Reply 3. The story is evident, that the Waldenses never lost Battell, but when they complied with the Papists, and trusted more in their false pretences, than in the Lord. Neither is it true, that the final success of the Victory fell to the Romish Church to the utter extirpation of those Waldensian witnesses.*

For it never came to an utter Extirpation of them, but only to a dispersion into sundry Countries of *Europe*, as Bishop *Usher* sheweth in the last words of his Book *De successione Christianarum Ecclesiarum*. But dispersion is one thing; utter exterpatation is another. Seed is dispersed, and the more multiplied: but exterpatation sendeth to withering, and destruction. Certain it is, the *Waldenses* long after those wars, and that dispersion, wrote Letters to *Luther*, and *Calvin*, which are extant to this day.

**Discusser.**

*It is most true, what Daniel in his 8:11, and 12 Chapters, and John Revelation 11, 12, and 13, Chapters, write of the great success of Antichrist against Christ Jesus for a time appointed.*

**Defender.**

Not against Christ Jesus: for who ever ward against him, and prevailed? *Job* 9:4. But true it is, against his servants *Antichrist* prevailed for a time appointed: but it was when either the Saints suffered for the Truth: (and then the Saints were the true Conquerors:) or else when they complied with the corruptions of the times, and then though their cause was good, yet they handled it ill.

**Discusser.**

*God's servants are all Conquerors, when they war with God's weapons in God's cause and worship: as in Revelation 2 and 3 Chapters, and in Revelation 12, they overcome the Dragon in the Roman Emperors by three weapons, the blood of the Lamb, the word of their Testimony, and not loving their lives unto the death.*

**Defender.**

It is true, those are the weapons of the Ministers of the Gospel, and those are also the weapons of private Christians: but if the Magistrate be the Minister of God in bearing his sword, then the Sword also is a weapon of God, which when it is drawn out in God's cause and worship, according to God, with confidence, not in the arm of flesh, but in the Lord of Hosts, it goeth forth Conquering to conquer, *Revelation* 17:14 with *Revelation* 19:14, 19, 20. *Gideon's* Sword was the Sword of the Lord, *Judges* 7:20.

Chap. 65.

---

## CHAPTER 65.

*A Reply to his Chapter 68. Discussing the Testimonies alleged from Ancient and later writers: and first, that of Hilary.*

**Discusser.**

**T**He last Head of Arguments produced by the Author against persecution, was from the Judgement of Ancient and later Writers: to some of which, the Answerer pleaseth to answer.

**Defender.**

Some of which? as if any of them were omitted? or as if all of them were not answered? compare the Prisoner's Letter, and my Answer together, and see if I have baulked anyone of them.

**Discusser.**

*If it be a mark of the Christian Church to be persecuted, and of the Antichristian or false Church, to persecute, then the Churches cannot be truly Christian (according to the first Institution) which either actually themselves, or by the civil Power of Kings and Princes given to them (or procured by them to fight for them) do persecute such as dissent from them, or be opposite against them.*

**Defender.**

I say again, if persecution be properly taken for the punishment of the Innocent for Truth, or Righteousness sake, it ought not to be found in a Christian Church, but is usually found in a false and Antichristian Church, but I cannot (as the *Discusser* doth) make it a mark of the Christian Church, to be persecuted, and a make of a false Church to persecute. For a Mark is such a sign as belongeth, *omni, soli, & simper*, as a mark of the Church must agree to every Church, and at all times to the Church, and only to the Church. But to be persecuted, is not found in every true Church, at least not at all times: For after the conversion of *Paul* unto the Faith of Christ, the Churches had rest throughout all *Judæa*, and *Galilee*, and *Samaria*, *Acts* 9:31. shall we say they were then no true Christian Churches, because they wanted this mark of the Church, to be persecuted? Again, we read, that after the destruction of Antichrist, the Churches of the Saints shall

shall have rest and rule a thousand years, *Revelation* 20:4. Shall their freedom from persecution, be a dissolution of the Church-Estate? The like may be said of the *New Jerusalem* (the Churches of the *Jews*, after the destruction of *Gog*, and *Magog*) when God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and take away Death (violent Death) sorrow, crying, and pain, (*Revelation* 21:4.) shall they shall cease to be Churches, when persecution ceaseth?

Beside, to persecute is not always a mark of a false Church: for then it would be a mark of a false Member of a Church, or a mark of a Member of a false Church: but the contrary appeareth in the example of *Asa*, who persecuted the Prophet of God for his holy Message sake, 2 *Chronicles* 16:10. And it hath been showed above, that *Stephen* complaineth of the persecution of all the Prophets, *Acts* 7:51. And if they were persecuted, it was by the Church of the Old Testament: and if therefore the Church of the Old Testament was false, God had then no Church extant upon the face of the Earth.

It is therefore a begging of the Question, to affirm, that those Churches cannot be true Christian, who by themselves, or by the Civil power of Kings, do punish such as dissent from them or are opposite against them.

And indeed a double begging of the Question, it is: For,

1. It beggeth that for the Question, which is not the Question: for it is no Question, but out of Question, that it is not lawful for a Christian Church, to punish men for, dissenting from them, or being opposite to them. But the Question is, whether Christian Magistrates may not punish Apostate Heretics and Seducers, not for dissenting from the Church, but for seducing from Christ, and blaspheming against his Name. And (if you will) whether the Church may not stir up the Christian Magistrate, (after all milder helps used without a vail) to do his Duty in such a case.

2. It is another begging of the Question, to take that for granted (*which is not yet proved*) that it is a mark of no true Christian Church to procure the civil punishment of incurable obstinate Heretics and Seducers.

#### Discusser.

*When the Answerer saith, that to Excommunicate an Heretic is not to persecute.*

*I answer, If the Answerer were throughly awaked from the Spouses spiritual slumber (Canticles 5.) and had recovered from the Drunkenness of the great Whore (who intoxicateth the Nations, Revelation 17.) It is impossible, that he should so answer.*

*For who questionth, whether to excommunicate an Heretic be to persecute? Excommunication being of a spiritual nature, & sentence denounced by the word of Christ Jesus (the spiritual King of the Church:) find a spiritual killing by the two edged Sword of the Spirit, in delivering up the person Excommunicate unto Satan. Therefore who seeth not this Answer cometh not near the Question?*

**Defender.**

I must still profess my self to be one of them that see it not. For first the Author of the Letter did no where express himself to put any difference, neither between Church and Court, in point of censure for cause of Conscience: nor between causes of Religion, whether true, or false. If it be unlawful to banish any from the Common-wealth for cause of Conscience, it is unlawful to banish any from the Church for cause of Conscience. The Church ought to be more tender of the Liberty of Conscience, then the Court, as being more acquainted with the tenderness of Conscience.

Secondly, if the censure of a man for cause of Conscience by the civil Sword, be persecution, it is a far greater persecution to censure a man for cause of Conscience, by the Spiritual Sword, by how much the more sharp and keen the spiritual Sword is above the civil. Sure I am, Christ Jesus reckoneth) Excommunication for persecution, *Luke 21:12*. They shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the Synagogues, and into Prisons. To deliver up into Synagogues is as much persecution, as to deliver into Prisons. And will the *Discusser* then say, that if Christ had been awakened from *his spiritual slumber, and from the Drunkenness of the great Whore, it had been impossible, he should have accounted Excommunication a persecution?*

Me thinks, if a soul were awakened unto spiritual sobriety, he should judge it a sorer and a deeper affliction, to be bound with spiritual chains, both in Earth and Heaven, then to be bound in material chains on Earth only.

Discusser.

*But Hilary his complaint, speaketh not to Excommunications, but to civil censures.*

**Defender.**

Therefore. my Answer was to him partly by proportion, partly by concession. *Hilary* said, the Christian Church did not persecute, but is persecuted. Whereto I Answered,

1. That Excommunication of an Heretic is no persecution: and therefore by proportion neither is the civil punishment of an Heretic persecution; And the Reason in my words *following reacheth both: for to persecute is to punish an Innocent: But an Heretic is not an Innocent, but a culpable and damnable person.*

2. I answered by concession of *Hilary's* words in *Hilary's* meaning, *it is true, what Hilary saith, neither did the Apostles, nor may we propagate Christian Religion by the Sword, &c.*

**Discusser.**

*But a Christian Church doth no more persecute, then a Lilly doth scratch thorns, or a Lamb persue and tear the Wolves, or a Turtle Dove doth hunt the Hawks or Eaglet, or a chaste modest virgin fight and scratch like whores and Harlots.*

**Defender.**

If by persecution, the *Discusser* meancth (as it seemeth he doth) the infliction of the civil punishments, his speech is true, and the proportion holdeth, civil punishments are as improper for Christian Churches to inflict, as for Lillies to scratch Thornes, or Lambs to tear Wolves, &c.

But if the Lambes he speaketh of in his comparison, were as reasonable, as the Lambs of Christ be, though they would not themselves pursue and tear the Wolves, yet they would run to their Shepherds (and civil Magistrates are the shepherds of all their people) to send out their dogs after the Wolves, to pursue and scare them. I see no reason, why the chaste and modest eye of a Christian Church should any more spare, and pity a spirirual Adulterer, that seeketh to withdraw her from her spouse to a false Christ, then the eye of an Holy *Israelite* was to spare and pity the like Tempters in days of old, *Deuteronomy* 13:8.

---

## CHAPTER 66. *A Reply to his Chapter 69.*

### Discusser.

THE Answer by concession to *Hilary's* words may further be *discussed*. It is true (saith the Answerer) as *Hilary speaketh*, that neither the Apostles, nor we, may propagate Christian Religion by the Sword: But if Pagans cannot be won by the word, they are not to be compelled by the Sword. Nevertheless this hindreth not, but if they, or any other should blaspheme the true God, and the true Religion, they ought to be severely punished: and no less do they deserve who seduce from the Truth to damnable Heresy and Idolatry.

In which Answer, I observe, First, his Agreement with *Hilary*, that Christian Religion may not be propagated by the civil Sword.

Unto which I Reply, what meaneth then this passage in his first Answer to the former speeches of the Kings, viz. We acknowledge that none is to be constrained to believe or profess the true Religion, till he be convinced in Judgement of the Truth of it.

### Defender.

If it be observed, my Agreement with *Hilary* I then let it be observed, that the *Discusser* in whetting the words of the Authors of the Letter against us, layeth a false charge upon us, as if we maintained *such persecutions for cause of Conscience, as is condemned by the Ancient Writers. Of whom Hilary is named for one, and for the first:* and yet in the Discussion it is found that we agree with him.

In that Answer to the speeches of the Kings, when I acknowledged, *that none was to be constrained to believe, or profess the true Religion, till he be convinced of the Truth of it.*

I did not mean, that after he was convinced, he might then be constrained with civil censures: for neither believing nor professing to believe, is co be constrained with civil censures.

But yet thus far he may be constrained, by withholding such countenance and favour from him, such encouragement, and employment from him, as a wise and discerning Prince, would otherwise grant, to such as believe the Truth, and profess it, so far as they are convinced of it in Judgement and Conscience. For such as will not walk according to their Light, are neither trusty servants to God, nor man.

**Discusser.**

*That Answer to the speech of the Kings implyeth two things.*

1. *That the civil Magistrate, who is to constrain, must judge of all the Consciences of their Subjects, whether they be convinced or no.*

2. *That when the civil Magistrate discerneth that his Subjects Consciences are convinced, then he may constrain them vi & armis, hostily. And accordingly, who knoweth not what constraint lieth upon all Consciences in Old and New-England, to come to Church, and to pay Church Duties? which is upon the point (though with a Sword of a finer gilt and trim in New-England) nothing else, but that which he confesseth, Hilary saith, should not be done, to wit, a Propagation of Religion by the Sword.*

**Defender.**

Neither of both these things are implied in that Answer. Not the first, (that the civil Magistrate must then Judge of all of the Consciences of their Subjects, whether they be convinced, or no:) For it implieth no more than that he is not to constrain them, till he see they be convinced. If he never see them convinced, he is to see they be never constrained. But how far the Magistrate may discern, and judge in matters of Religion, hath been spoken above. Nor the second: For the nonstraint I spake of; was not by positive means, *vi*, & *Armis*, but negative, withholding such trust and employment from such, as he seeth are not faithful and trusty to their God, of whose Truth they are convinced, and yet withhold it in unrighteousness. I know no constraint at all, that lieth upon the consciences of any in *New-England*, to come to Church: neither do I know that any scruple lieth upon any Conscience in *New-England*, that withholdeth any from hearing the word, amongst us. But least of all do I know, that any are constrained to pay Church duties in *New-England*. Sure I am, none in our own Town, neither Church-members, nor other, are constrained to pay any Church-duties at all. What they pay, they give voluntarily, each one with his own hand, without any constraint at all, but their own will, as the Lord directs them.

**Discusser.**

*Again, although he confesseth, that Propagation of Religion ought not to be by the Sword; yet he maintaineth the use of the Sword, when persons (in the Judgment of the Civil State, for that is implied) shall blaspheme the true God, and the true Religion, and also seduce others to damnable Heresy and Idolatry*

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

True: but this is not the Propagation of Religion but the preservation of it; or if it do conduce to Propagation, it is only *removendo prohibens*.

---

**CHAPTER 67. A Reply to his Chapter 70. Discussing  
the  
Testimony of Tertullian.**

*Discusser.*

TO Tertullian, *the Answerer giveth the like Answer*. Tertullian's Intent (saith he) is only to restrain Scapula, the Roman Governor of Africa) from persecuting the Christians, for not offering Sacrifice to their Heathen Gods: and for that end fetcheth an Argument from the Law of Natural Equity, not to compel any to any Religion, but to permit them to believe, or not to believe at all.

Which we acknowledge: we judge, the English may permit the Indians to continue in their unbelief. Nevertheless, it will not therefore be lawful to tolerate the public worship of Devils, or Idols, in a Christian State, or the seduction of any from the Truth,

In this passage, he agreeth with Tertullian: but it is well known, that in New-England, they not only permit the Indians to continue in their unbelief, (which they cannot help) but they also permit or tolerate them in their Paganish worship, which cannot be denied to be a worshipping of Devils.

And therefore consequently according to the same practice, did they walk by Rule, and impartially, not only the Indians, but their Countymen, French, Dutch, Spanish, Persians, Turks, Jews, should also be permitted in their Worship, if correspondent in civil obedience.

*Defender.*

It is not true, that the *New-English* do tolerate the *Indians* (who have submitted to the *English* protection, and Government) in their worship of Devils openly. What the *Indians* do, that are not under the *English* Government, the *English* have no warrant from God, or Law of Nations to restrain them; nor is it in the power of the *English* to restrain the private Worship, which some of the *Indians* under the *English* Government may possibly adhere unto to this day. What courses have been used to bring them on

to Civility, and to the knowledge of our Religion, by fair means, are not pertinent to the present controversy to relate. It hath been an Article of the Covenant between such *Indians* as have submitted to our Government, that they shall submit to the ten Commandements, which they thought reasonable. Some of their *Sachims* young children are brought up with us, and trained up to knowledge. Such of them as come to our Houses are fed with courtesy, and care taken often to instruct them, as far, yea further than they are greatly willing to hear. Some of them of late, frequent our markets, to get money, by selling Fish, Baskets, whortleberries, Cramberries, which taketh them off from some idleness; Some *English* are studious of the *Indian* Language, to deal with them in their own Tongue. Of late some of our Ministers have preached to a Congregation of them, whilst others at first interpreted what was preached: but since one of our Minsters preacheth to them in their own Language. The other day, whilst I was at the College with other Elders, an *Indian* from *Plimmouth* side, (an hopeful youth) was received into some employment in the College, that he might be trained up to knowledge for the help of his Country-men. But no violent course taken with them at all, to constrain them to the Faith, or Profession of Christianity. The time is hastening (we hope) when all the vials of God's wrath will be poured out on the Antichristian State; and then we look for the fulness of the *Gentiles* to come in, and with the *Jews*, multitudes of Pagans. But till the seven-plagues of the seven Angels be fulfilled, we cannot easily hope for the entrance of any New multitudes of men into the Church according to the word of the Lord, *Revelation* 15:8. No man (that is, no man out of the Temple, no Pagan) was able to enter into the Temple, till the seven plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled.

But to return to our *Discussor*, he speaketh at random, when he intimateth, that we walk not by Rule but partially, at if we permitted not the like liberty of worship to our Country-men, nor to the French, Dutch, Spanish, Persians, Turks, Jews, which we do to the *Indians*.

For we Neither constraine them to worship God with us, nor restrain them from worshipping God in their own way. *Persians,*  
*Turks,*

*Turks and Jews*, come not amongst us: those of other Nations of *Europe*, when they do come amongst us, their manner of Worship is not taken notice of amongst us. Our Country-men worship God with us for the most part, if some of them come not to our Assemblies by reason of the distance of their dwellings from us, they have Liberty of public prayer and preaching of the word amongst themselves, by such as themselves choose, without disturbance.

**Discusser.**

*The Answerer addeth a further Answer to Tertullian, for whereas Tertullian had said, that one man's Religion doth neither hurt, nor profit another: the Answerer saith, it must be understood of private Worship, or of Religion professed in private. Otherwise a false Religion professed in public, by the Members of the Church, or by such as have given their Names to Christ, will be the ruin and Defoliation of the Churches, Revelation 2.*

*Whereto I Answer, 1. Those that are Members of the Church, and those that have given their names to Christ, are all one: the distinction therefore is unsound.*

**Defender.**

The *Discusser* must excuse me, though I do not take them for all one. For men of years must give up their names to Christ, before they can be received Members into the Church, as is evident, *Isaiah 56:6,7*. Therefore they are not all one: the one precedeth the other.

**Discusser.**

*I answer secondly, that Tertullian doth not there speak of private, but of public worship, and Religion,*

**Defender.**

*Tertullian's* speech may possibly be meant of either public or private But as I said, to make the speech true, it must either be understood of private, or if of public profession of Religion, it must be understood not of Christian, but of Pagan: and of Pagan during the time of God's Patience, and their ignorance. But after God revealed the Truth of the Gospel-Religion to them, it was not safe to continue a public Profession of Pagan Religion: for after the White-Horse hath revealed the Gospel, a Red, and Black, and pale-horse follow, to avenge the

the rejection of it upon the Roman-Pagan-Empire, *Revelation*. 6: 2. to 8.

### Discusser.

I answer thirdly; although it be true in a Church of *Christ*, that a false Religion, or Worship permitted will do hurt according to those Threats of Christ, *Revelation* 2, yet in two cases, I believe a false Religion will not hurt (which is most like to have been Tertullians meaning.)

1. A false Religion out of the Church will not hurt the Church: no more than weeds in the Wilderness will hurt the enclosed Gardens: nor poison hurt the body, when it is not touched, or taken, yea and Antidotes are received against it.

2. A false Religion and worship will not hurt a Civil State, in case the worshippers break no civil Law. And the Answerer elsewhere acknowledgeth, that the civil Peace is not broken, where the civil Laws are not broken. And this only is the point in Question.

### Defender.

If this only be the point in Question, where then lieth the controversy? for if I say (as the *Discusser* saith I do) that the Civil Peace is not broken, when the Civil Law is not broken; and if a false Religion or worship do not hurt the civil State, unless the Worshippers break some civil Law, then where lieth the pinch of the controversy?

But I would not have the *Discusser* mistake himself; I do not remember, that I have any where said, that the civil Peace is not broken, where the civil Law is not broken. He saith, I say so elsewhere: If he mean, that I say so in the Model drawn up by my Brethren (the Elders of those Churches) he wrongeth and polluteth himself much (*Crimine falsi*) when he saith that Mr. Cotton with the rest of the Ministers of *New-England* composed that Model of Church and civil power. It is no new thing with him, to say I did that, which I did not: that Model was drawn up by some other fellow-Brethren, but not by me. There is a Truth in the speech which they speak, rightly understood, but not as the *Discusser* here taketh it.

For first, what if no civil Law be made for the establishment of Religion, nor against the violation of the Fundamentals of it? this very defect of so needful a Law, may bring the wrath of God upon

upon the civil State: as did the defect of a King in *Israel*, *Judges 21:25*.

Again secondly, there may be a Law made for the establishing of true Religion: and it though it be violated, yet the *Discusser* will say, no civil Law is violated, because no Law concerning the second Table is violated. But that is his mistake, to think the civil Laws concern only the outward Estate of the People, and not their Religion.

That is a civil Law whatsoever concerneth the good of the City, and the propulsing of the contrary. Now Religion is the best good of the City: and therefore Laws about Religion are truly called civil Laws, enacted by civil Authority, about the best good of the City, for the promoting, and preserving of that good of the City. But having thus *spoken to his second case first (wherein he saith, a first Religion will not hurt a civil State.)*

I come now to his first: which was, that a false *Religion will not hurt, if it be out of the Church, no more then weeds in the wilderness will hurt the enclosed Garden.*

But what if the Garden be enclosed in the midst of a wilderness? what if the weeds grow so near the enclosure (or hedge) round about the Garden, that they easily creep into the Garden? what if every blast of wind blow the seeds of the weeds into the Garden, which are ready to overspread the Garden, and to choke the good herbs? The *Discusser* will say, they that keep and dress the Garden should weed them out.

True, so they ought, to their best endeavour. But were it not also needful, that the Lord of the soil, who hath his Officers both to dress his Garden & to keep his wilderness, should provide, that the keepers of his wilderness should suffer no venomous weeds to grow near his garden, hedge, or pale, least the seeds thereof should annoy his Garden, and poison those within the Garden that feed on them?

It is true, which the *Discusser* saith, poison will *not hurt the body, unless it be taken, or touched, yea and Antidotes taken against it.*

But who shall prevent the Members of the Church from touching or taking poison? or who shall provide, that all the Members shall take the Antidotes which are prepared for them? Here will be needful the faithful vigilancy of the Christian Magistrate,

to

to assist the Officers of the Church in the Lord's work: the one to lay in Antidotes to prevent infection: the other to weed out infectious noisome weeds, which the sheep of Christ will be touching and taking, when they will sometime neglect their Antidotes. It is a very unlikely thing *which the Discusser saith (is most likely) that Tertullian meant one of these two cases.*

For doubtless his meaning was, to plead for the Innocency and impunity of his own Religion, which was indeed the Truth of God. And he might safely plead, that if the Pagan Religion did not hurt their civil Government, (as the Roman Governors doubted not of that) he biddeth them to be secure of the Christian Religion, it will never hurt them at all. When therefore he speaks of Religion indefinitely, that one man's Religion will not hurt another, it is *Argumentum ad hominem*, let not *Scapula* suspect hurt from Christian Religion to the Roman State. If the Roman Religion be the preservation of the Roman Empire (as *Scapula* thought) Christian Religion (though tolerated, yea though received, and advanced) will never be their destruction, nor disturbance.

## CHAPTER 68. *A Reply to his Chapter 71. Discussing the Testimony of Jerome.*

### Discusser.

**J**EROME (saith the Answerer) consisteth not the Truth, nor advantage your cause: for we grant, what he saith, That Heresy must be cut off by the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. But this hindereth not, but that being so cut down, if the Heretic do still persist in his Heresy to the seduction of others, he may be cut off also by the civil Sword, to prevent the perdition of others.

And that to be Jerome's meaning, appeareth by his Note upon that of the Apostle (Galatians 5.) *A little Leaven leaveneth the whole lump.* Therefore saith he, a spark, as soon as it appeareth, is to be extinguished, and the Leaven to be removed from the rest of the dough: Rotten pieces of flesh are to be cut off, and a scabbed Beast is to be driven from the sheepfold: least the whole house, body, mass of dough, and Flock, be set on fire with the spark, he putrified with the rotten flesh, soured with the Leaven, perish with the scabbed Beast.

But

*But to this I Answer, 1. He granteth to Tertullian, that Heresy must be cut off with the Sword of the Spirit: yet withal he maintaineth a cutting off by the second Sword, the Sword of the Magistrate, and Conceiveth that Terrullian, so meaneth, because he quoteth that of the Apostle, a little Leaven leaveneth the whole lump.*

*Answer 2. It is no Argument to prove that Tertullian meant a civil Sword, by alleging, 1 Corinthians 5 or Galatians 5, which properly and only approve a cutting off by the Sword of the Spirit, and purging out leaven in the Church.*

*And if Tertullian should so mean, as the Answerer doth: yet 1. The cutting off of Heresy by the Sword of the Spirit implyeth an absolute sufficiency in the Sword of the Spirit to cut it down, according to 2 Corinthians 10:4.*

*2. It is clear to be the meaning of the holy Spirit and of the Apostle in the words alleged by him, a little Leaven &c.*

**Defender.**

Reply 1. This Testimony of *Jerome*; which the Author of the Letter allegeth against persecution for Conscience, I might justly refuse to spend time about it, till either the Author or the Discusser do make it appear to be the words of *Jerome*. For though I at first gave Answer to it, as presuming the Letter had not forged it: yet now looking into the place of *Jerome*, whence it is quoted, I find no such matter. The Letter quoteth it out of *Hierom's Proæme* upon the fourth Book of his Commentaries upon *Jeremiah*. But perusing the place, I find no such words, neither in that *Proæme* on his fourth Book on *Jeremiah*, nor in any other *Proæme* of any other of his Books on *Jeremiah* which are six in all,

Reply. 2. I might here observe, (if I should deal with him, as he doth with me, in his Chapter 38.) the like failings in the Discusser, in putting *Tertullian* four times in this passage instead of *Jerome*, whom he hath in hand. When I had once named *Titus* for *Timothy*, *be observeth the haste and light attention, anJ sleepiness of the Answerer*. But I will not make such an observation upon his misnaming of an Author, which might easily slip from his pen, or from his Scribe, or from the error of the Printer.

Reply 3. In this he doth me wrong, to put upon me that for a Reason, which hath no reason in it, to wit, that I should conceive,

that *Tertullian* (*Jerome*, he would say) meaneth a civil Sword because he quoteth that of the Apostle, a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

For I gather it, not from his quotation of those words of the Apostle (which I easily grant, do clearly speak of Church censure, not of Civil censure:) But I gather it partly from his exposition of the paralell words in the same Chapter: and partly from the words he useth in opening the very Text. The parallel place in the same Chapter is *verse 12. I would* (saith the Apostle) *they were cut off that trouble you.* This cutting off, (or ἀποκοπή) He expoundeth the cutting off of their virility which no man will say in Church-Censure. I spake not here of the true meaning of the Text (which doubtless, speaketh of a Church-Censure) but of the true meaning of *Jerome's* words.

Again, when *Jerome* would have the spark, as soon as it appeareth, to be extinguished, and the leaven to be removed from the rest of the Dough &c. though it be true (which the Discussers speaketh) that the Apostle intendeth a Church-Censure: yet doubtless *Jerome* aimed at more in those comparisons, even to a civil censure also. For to these comparisons, he immediately subjoineth these words, *Arius in Alexandria una scintilla fuit: sed quia nun statim oppresse est, totum orbem, eius flamma de populata est.* *Arius* (saith he) was but one sparkle: yet because he was not speedily executed (or suppressed) his flame depopulated all the world. When by the extinguishing of that spark, he doth not mean, by excommunication: for he was not ignorant, that *Arius* had been speedily excommunicate, once and again out of the Church of *Alexandria*; once whilst he was Deacon, as *Sozomene* reporteth in *Lib. 1. Ecclesiast Historia, Chap. 14.* And though afterwards, he got into the Church again, yet he was again excommunicated; when he was *Presbyter*, and call out of his *Presbytery*, as *Socrates* reporteth in his *lib. 1. Ecclesiast Historia, Cap. 6.* of the Greek Edition; Chapter 3 of the latin. So that *Hierome* complaining, of the great hurt, which the spark of *Arius* did, because he was not timely put out, he did not mean, of putting out of the Church (which was done timely enough, and twice for failing) but because he was not put out either out of the world, or at least, out of the Confines of Neighbour Churches.

Say

Say not: yet *Paul* doubtless spake of putting out of the Church. For though that be true: yet now the Question is not of *Paul's* judgement in this place, but of *Hierorme's* judgement, which the Author of the Letter allegeth as a witness for himself, and the Discussor would maintain it: though *Jerome's* words will not bear it. It argueth, men are more led by will, then judgement to uphold a cause, when the witnesses which themselves produce, bear witness against them. Neither let any man say, That this grant of his, *This Heresy must be cut off with the Sword of the spirit, doth imply an absolute sufficiency in the Sword of the Spirit to cut it down, according to 2 Corinthians 10:4,5.*

For though Spirirual weapons be absolutely sufficient to the end for which God hath appointed them (as hath been opened above) to wit, for the conviction, and (it he belong to God) for the conversion of the offender, for the mortifying of his flesh, & for the saving of his soul, and for the cleansing of the Church from the fellowship of that guilt: yet if an Heretic still continue obstinate, and persist in seducing, creep into Houses, lead captive silly souls, and destroy the faith of some, (it may be, of many) such *Gangrenes* would be cut off by another Sword, which is the hand of the Magistrate is not born in vain.

#### **Discussor.**

*But the eye of this Answerer could never be so obscured, as to run to a Smoth's ship, for a Sword of Iron, and steel, to help the Sword of the Spirit, if the Sun of righteousness had once been pleased to show him; That a National Church (which elsewhere he professeth against) a State-Church, (whether explicit, as in Old England, or implicit, as in New) is not the Institution of the Lord Jesus Christ. The National Typical-State-Church of the Jews, necessarily called for such weapons: But the particular Churches of Christ in all parts of the world, consisting of Jews and Gentiles, is powerfully able to defend itself, and offend men and Divels, although the State and Kingdom (wherein the Churches be) had neither carnal Sword, nor Spear, as once it was in the National Church in the Land of Canaan; 1 Samuel 13.*

#### **Defender.**

I should think mine eye were very obscure indeed, if I should run the a *Smith's* shop to fetch the authority of the civil Magistrate from hence: or if I should think his authority could not

be put forth against all evil doers (and amongst others, against Heretics) without a Sword of Iron or Steel. If their be stones in the streets, the Magistrate need not fetch a Sword from the *Smith's* shop, nor an Halter from the Ropers, to punish an Heretic. A pleasant wit can play with a feather of every flying Fancy, and yet (which is to be lamented) bring in such light conceits into grave Discourses, and Disputes about the holy things of God.

But two things let the Discusser understand, 1. That the Lord (through his grace) hath opened mine eye many a year ago, to discern, that a National Church is not the Institution of the Lord Jesus. And himself confesseth, that elsewhere I have professed against such a Church State: nor will he ever be able to make it good, that the Church in *New-England* is implicitly any National, or State-Church.

2. Let him understand further, that I should think mine eye not only obscured, but the sight of it utterly put out; if I should conceive, as he doth, That the National Church State of the *Jews* did necessarily call for such weapons to punish Heretics, more then the Congregational State of particular Churches doth call for the same, now in the days of the New-Testament. For was not the National Church of the *Jews* as completely furnished with spiritual Armour to defend itself, and to offend men: and Divels, as the particular Churches of the New-Testament be? Had they not power to convince false Prophets, as *Elijah* did the Prophets of *Baal*? Had they not power to seporate all evil doers from the fellowship of the Congregation? what power have our particular Churches now, which their National Church wanted? or what efficacy is their found in the exercise of our power which was wanting to them?

If it be said, Their Nation was an holy Nation, and an unclean person might not live amongst them:

*Answer.* It is true, he might not enter inno the Congregation with the rest of the *Israelites*, to worship the Lord: but he was permitted to live in the Common-wealth of *Israel*, men uncircumcised both in heart, and flesh.

It is therefore a Sophistical imagination of man's Brain, to make a man's self, or the world believe, that the National Church-State of the *Jews*, required a civil Sword, whereas the particular

cular Church-State of the Gospel needs no such help.

*Why not I pray you? Because particular Churches are powerfully able by the Sword of the Spirit, to defend themselves, and to offend men, or Divels?*

And was not the National Church of Israel as powerfully able, by the same Spirit to do the same? Surely it was both spoken and meant of the National Church of the *Jews*, Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts? *Zechariah* 4:6. And doth not the Discusser himself observe, that time was in the National Church of the Land of *Canaan*, when there was neither carnal Spear, nor Sword to be found? *1 Samuel* 13. And was not then the National Church powerfully able (by the Spirit of God) to defend itself, and to offend men, and Divels, as well as particular Churches now?

---

## **CHAPTER 69. *A Reply to his Chapter 72. discussing the Testimony of Brentius.***

### **Discussor.**

**B**rentius upon *1 Corinthians* 3. saith, *no man hath power to make or give Laws to Christians, whereby to bind their Consciences. For willingly, freely, and uncompelled, with a ready desire, and cheerful mind, must those that come, run unto Christ.*

*To this the Answerer returneth, Brentius (saith he) speaketh not to your cause. We willingly grant you, that man hath no power to bind Conscience: but this hindereth not, that men may see the Laws of God observed, which do bind Conscience.*

*But the granting this, That men have no power to make Laws to bind conscience, overthroweth such his Tenent, and practice as restrain men from their worship, according to their Conscience, and belief, and constrain them to such worships, which their own souls tell them, they have no satisfaction, nor faith in.*

1. It is an untruth that either we restrain men from worship according to Conscience: or constrain them to worship against Conscience: or that such is my Tenent and practice.

2. Though it were true that we did both: yet this did nor  
make

make Laws to bind Conscience, but the outward man only: nor would we think it meet to bind the outward man against Conscience.

**Discusser.**

*Again, whereas the Answerer affirmeth, That men may make Laws to see the Law of God observed.*

*I Answer, As God needs not the help of a material Sword of Steel to assist the Sword of the Spirit in the affairs of Conscience: so those men, those Magistrates, yea that Common-wealth which makes such Magistrates must needs have power and Authority from Christ Jesus to sit Judge, and to determine in all the great Controversies concerning Doctrine, Worship, Government, &c.*

**Defender.**

God needeth not the help of a material Sword of Steel, to assist the Sword of his Spirit of righteousness in the duties of the Second Table, no more than to assist the Sword of the Spirit of holiness in the days of the first Table. The Law of Righteousness is as fully and plainly written by the Spirit of God in the hearts and Consciences of men, as is the Law of holiness: yea and more too. And yet the *Discusser* doth not (for ought I know) make it a needless matter for God to accept the help of the material Sword to assist the Spirit of Righteousness in the affairs of Conscience, which pertain to the second Table. The truth is, God needeth not the Arm of flesh to help him, that is, he needeth not any help, which the wisdom or strength of the creature can invent, or bring forth, which himself appointed not. But yet God thinks it no dishonour to himself, to make use of his own Ordinances, in their own bounds, to his own ends; Nor doth he then need them, when he useh them, but we need such helps for the performance of our duty both to God, and man. Which made it a cursed sin in *Meroz*, not to come out to help the Lord, *Judges* 5:23.

Nor will it hence follow, that such Magistrates as are chosen to help forward the work of God in matters of Religion, that either themselves, *or the Common-wealth that chooseth them, must needs have power, and Authority from Christ, to sit Judge, and to determine in all great controversies of Religion, in Doctrine, Discipline and Government:*

It

It is enough that they are called of God to be wise and learned in the service of Christ, and in the ways of his Kingdom. *Psalm 2:10,11,12.* which if they have learned, they ought to rule with him, and for him: or else how shall it be fulfilled, which is written of them, The Kingdoms of the world, are become the Kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever? *Revelation 7:15.* Yea in this case, it is learning enough, if they know the Principles and Foundations of Religion, and can discern the Arrogancy of a tumultuous spirit after conviction For such want not judgement; to censure Apostasy, to Heresy in doctrine, to Idolatry in worship, to Tyranny in Government.

**Discusser.**

*But then I ask, whether upon this ground, it must not evidently follow, that then either there is no Common-wealth, nor Civil State of men in the world, that if not qualified with this discerning: (and then the Common-wealth hath more light concerning the Church, than the Church itself:) Or that the Common-wealth and Magistrates thererof must judge and punish as they are persuaded in their own belief and Conscience (be their Conscience, Paganish, Turkish, or Anti-christian:) And what is this, but to confound Heaven and Earth together? and to take away not only the being of Christianity out of the world, but all civility, yea the world out of the world, and to lay all upon heaps of confusion?*

**Defender.**

See what strange effects, a strong fancy can produce? would you not think, it must be some strange, and strong paradox, that if it be granted shall produce such strange and strong effects, as to take away the being of Christianity out of the world, yea and all civility, yea and the world out of the world?

But when men have slept a while, and strong fancies are evaporated, the world will stand where it is, and civility stand in the world, and Christianity in civility.

I say therefore (that which no sober mind can contradict) that though Magistrates be bound to become wise and learned, to know Christ, and to establish the Religion of Christ, yet it will not (as the Discusser saith) evidently follow, no nor follow at all, *That then there is no lawful Commonwealth nor Civil State of men in the world, which is not qualified with this spiritual discerning.*

For

For though it be the duty of Civil States, thus to be qualified: yet their want of such qualifications, doth not make them unlawful States. Many due qualifications are required in Husbands, Wives, Children, Servants, Magistrates, Churches, the want of which maketh them defective, and sinful, but doth not make them unlawful. This will need no proof to any sober mind.

Much less will it follow upon the former Premises, *that the very Common-wealth hath then more light concerning the Church of Christ, than the Church itself.*

For it is a weak Church, that knows no more light, than Principles: And what light the Common-wealth hath, it may have received from the Church. Howsoever, the Magistrates power to establish the Religion of Christ doth no way infer. That he that establisheth that Religion, which is professed in the Church, hath more light concerning that Religion, or any part of it, than the Church itself. Albeit, it is not impossible, nor is it absurd that sometime the Magistrate may have more light in matters of Religion, than the Church itself. *David* (for ought we read) was the first that discerned the disorder in Carting the Ark of God, 1 *Chronicles* 15:2. And *Hezekiah* was the first, that prevented the Preists and *Levites*, and the whole Church, in the work of Reformation, from the Apostasy of *Ahaz*, 2 *Chronicles* 29:4 to 11.

But there is no colour of consequence, that because Magistrates are bound to discern, and know the will of Christ, and to serve him with their power, That therefore such as have no discerning of Christ, nor of his holy will, That they should punish and destroy Christ, and Christians, and seek only to advance their own Religion, which is but Idolatry and Superstition.

Chap. 70.

---

## CHAP. 70.

---

### *A Reply to his Chapter 73. Discussing the Testimony of Luther.*

---

#### Discusser.

**L**uther's Testimony, saith the Answerer, reacheth to two things, neither of which we deny.

First, that the Government of the civil Magistrate reacheth no further, then to the bodies and goods of their Subjects, not over their souls: and therefore they may not undertake to give Laws to the souls and Consciences of men.

Secondly, that the Church-of Christ doth not use the Arm of secular power, to compel men to the true profession of the Truth. For this is to be done with spiritual weapons, whereby Christians are to be exhorted, and compelled.

But this (saith he) hindereth not,

That Christians sinning against the Light of Faith, and Conscience, may justly be censured of the Church, by Excommunication, and of the civil Magistrate also, in case they shall corrupt others to the perdition of their souls.

This Joint-confession of the Answerer with Luther (to wit, that the Government of the civil Magistrate extendeth no further than over the bodies and goods of their Subjects, not over their souls) who seeth not, that hereby is given a clear Testimony, that either the spiritual and Church Estate, the preaching of the word, Baptism, Ministry, Government thereof, belongeth to the civil body of the Common-wealth, (that is, to the bodies and goods of men, which seemeth monstrous to Imagine:) or else, that the civil Magistrate cannot (without exceeding the bounds of his Office) meddle with those spiritual Affairs.

#### Defender.

A man that is willing to open his eyes, may easily see, that though the Government of the civil Magistrate do extend no further than over the bodies and goods of his Subjects, yet he may and ought to improve that power over their bodies and goods, to the good of their souls: yea and by promoting the good of their souls, he may much advance the good of their

Y

outward

outward man also. The bodies, and goods, and outward Estates of men may expect a blessing, when their souls prosper. Though God may keep his Saints low in outward Estate, that grow fastest in Godliness: yet sure Godliness hath the Promises of this life, and of a better, 1 *Timothy* 4:8. And such as first seek the Kingdom of God, may expect all these outward things to be cast in upon them: If it seem a monstrous thing in the eyes of the *Discusser*, to imagine, that the good Estate of one Church, and the well-ordering of the Ordinances of God therein, should concern the civil good of the Common-wealth, it may well seem monstrous to him, to imagine that the flourishing of Religion is the flourishing of the civil State, and the decay of Religion in the decay and ruin of the civil State. But such Virgin souls, as follow the Lamb, wheresoever he goeth (*Revelation* 14:4.) would be loath to go to live in such a Common-wealth, to whom it should seem monstrous, that the things of God should belong to them.

And therefore the Magistrate need not to fear, that he should exceed the bounds of his Office, if he should meddle with the spiritual affairs of the Church in God's way. It is true, if he shall meddle with the execution of a Ministers Office, as *Uzziah* did: or if he shall set up human Inventions in Doctrine, Worship, Government, instead of Christ's Institutions, as *David* brought the Ark of God upon Oxen, instead of the shoulders of the Levites. Or if he shall thrust in *Jeroboams* Priests upon the Church, and cast out faithful Ministers: or if he shall make Laws to bind Conscience, in all these, or any such Like, he exceedeth the bounds of his Office. But if he shall diligently seek after the Lord, and read in the word of the Lord all the days of his life (*Deuteronomy* 17: 19.) that he may both live as a Christian, and rule as a Christian, if he shall seek to establish and advance the Kingdom of Christ more then his own: If he shall encourage the good in a Christian course, and discourage such as have evil will to *Sion*: and punish none for matter of Religion, but such as subvert the Principles of saving Truth (which no good Christian, much less good Magistrate can be ignorant of) or at least such as disturb the Order of the Gospel in a turbulent way, verily the Lord will build up and establish the House and Kingdom of such Princes, as do thus build up his.

Discusser.

**Discusser.**

*Again necessarily it must follow that these two are contradictory to themselves (which yet both of them are Mr. Cotton's Positions) the Magistrate's Power extends no further than to the bodies and goods of the Subject, and yet*

*The Magistrate must punish Christians for sinning against the Light of Faith and Conscience, and for corrupting the souls of men.*

**Defender.**

If the Christian Faith, and a good Conscience be a part, and a great part, a chief part of the good of Christians, then these two are so far from contradicting one another, that they establish one another. For if a Magistrates power extend to the preserving of the Goods of the Subject, and to the punishment of the Impachers or purloiners thereof: then he falleth short of his duty, if he suffer their Faith and good Conscience to be corrupted or dispoiled without revenge. Again, this I say further (which also will easily avoide appearance of Contradiction) suppose by Goods were meant only outward Goods, and that the Magistrates power extended no further then the bodies and goods of the Subjects: yet though he have no power over Faith and Conscience, he hath nevertheless lawful power to punish such evil doers in their Bodies and goods, as do seduce his people to make shipwreck of Faith, and a good Conscience. For in seeking God's Kingdom and Righteousness, men prosper in their outward Estates, *Matthew 6:33*, otherways they decay. Besides, I do not remember, that this Proposition is any of mine (which yet the *Discusser* fasteneth upon me) that the *Magistrates power extendeth no further than the bodies and Goods of his Subjects.*

I do not deny the Truth of it, rightly understood, but it seemeth to me somewhat too loose, and confused, for me to own it as mine own. For the Magistrate's power may be said to extend no further than the bodies and Goods of his Subjects, either as the Subject of his power, or as the end of his power. If Goods be meant outward Goods, and the Magistrate power be said to extend no further than to the body and Goods of his Subjects, as to the Object of his power, the Position is true. But if it be meant of the end of his power, as if a Magistrate's power reached no further than to the preservation of their bodies and outward Goods

it is false. For the Adequate end of the Magistrates power, is ἐν Πολιτεῦειν, *benè administrare Rempublicam*, well to govern the Common-wealth. Now can it be well with a Common-wealth, that liveth in bodily health, and worldly wealth, but yet without Church, without Christ, without God in the world? But though God for a time may preserve a civil State in health and wealth, through his Patience, and bounty, especially till means of Grace be offered to them: yet after means of Grace be offered, they cannot long expect bodily health, or wealth to be continued to them, if they neglect, or despise, or depart from so great salvation. Witness the Roman Empire, which though it abounded in worldly blessings, till the Lord Jesus came riding forth amongst them upon a White Horse of the Gospel of his Grace: yet after they neglected so great Salvation, then followed a Red Horse of war, and a black Horse of Famine, and a Pale Horse of Pestilence and other Judgements, which much impeached both the health, and wealth of that State, and would have ruined it, had it not cast away her Idols, and advanced the Scepter of the Lord Jesus.

Now the God of all Grace be pleased at length to shake the heart of this *Discusser*, that he may not thus delight to seduce himself, and others against the Light of Grace, and Conscience, against Reason and Experience.

**Discusser.**

*Again, in the Answerer's Joint-confession with Luther, that the Church doth not use the secular power to compel men to the Faith, and Profession of the Truth, he condemneth (as before I have observed.)*

1. *His former implication, that they may be compelled, when they are convinced of the Truth of it.*

**Defender.**

This implication where it was formerly observed, it hath been formerly cleared from implication of Contradiction. I have never said, that after men be convinced of the Truth, they may be compelled to the Profession of it, by any penalties, but only by withdrawing such favours as are not comely or safe for faithless persons.

**Discusser.**

2. *He condemneth their own Practice, who suffer no man of any different Conscience and worship to live in their Jurisdiction, unless he depart from the Exercise of his own Religion, and worship, differing*

*from*

*from that allowed of in their civill Estate, yea and also actually submit to come to their Church.*

**Defender.**

This charge of the *Discusser*, let him consider, if it be not contradictory to his own Relation, *chapter 60.* where he saith; *we permit and tolerate the Indians in their Paganish worship, which we might restrain. Yet here be faith, we suffer no man of any different Conscience, or worship to live in our Jurisdiction.*

Neither is it true, that we suffer no man of any different Conscience or worship to live in our Jurisdiction. For not to speak of *Presbyterians*, who do not only live amongst us, but exercise their public Ministry without disturbance, there be *Anabaptists*, and *Antinomians* tolerated to live not only in our jurisdictions, but even in some of our Churches. *Yea saith the Discusser, but they must actually submit to come to our Church.*

I cannot say, nor do I believe, that any man is compelled to come to our Church, against his Conscience. Nay we are so far from that, (and that the *Discusser* is not ignorant of) that our Churches do not expostulate with our Members who hear in *England*, no not then, when there was more difference from us in manner of worship, then (through the mercy of God) now there is. The which the *Discusser* himself hath declared to have been no little Offence unto himself. Which maketh me the more to marvel, that he should now charge it upon us, that we compel all to come to hear in our Churches, against their Consciences: when he is wont to be offended, that we suffer them to hear in any true Church (though polluted) according to their Consciences.

**Discusser.**

*Howsoever they cover the matter with this varnish, that none are compelled further unto their Churches, then unto the hearing of the word, unto which all men are bound: yet it will appear, that Teaching, and being taught in a Church-Estate is a Church-worship, as true and proper a Church-worship, as is the Supper of the Lord, Acts 2:46.*

I cannot call to mind, that either upon that colour, or any other, any man in this Country was ever compelled to hear the word of God, in any of our Churches, in this Country. But there is indeed some colour for the varnish he speaketh of: but not that which he pretendeth (our compulsion of any man for to hear:) but a controversy with himself upon another occasion, as I remember.

The

The *Discusser* sometimes endeavoured to draw away the Church of Salem (whereof he was sometime Teacher) from holding Communion with all the Churches in the *Bay*, because we tolerated our Members to hear the word in the Parishes of *England*. We to satisfy him in that, held forth (that which here he calleth a varnish) that hearing was a common Duty lying upon all men, where the word of God was truly taught. He replied, as he doth now, that Teaching and hearing in a Church-Estate is Church worship, *Acts* 2:46. To which we gave Answer (as now again) That though Teaching and being taught in a Church-Estate be Church-worship (according to *Acts* 2:46.) yet it is not a Church-worship, but to such as are in a Church-Estate. To all it is an holy Ordinance of God's worship, and a Christian Duty. And though Teaching and hearing doth imply a Relation, yet not a Church-relation. There is a relation between a Teacher, and a Learner, in any Art, or Knowledge: and there may be a nearer relation between a Preacher and an Hearer, in case the Hearer be begotten to God by such a Sermon (even the same relation as is between a spiritual Father, and Son:) but this doth not amount to Church- relation, and Communion, till there pass some mutual profession of Covenant (explicit or implicit) between them. A Pagan Infidel may come into a Christian Church-Assembly to hear the word, and may be convinced and converted by it, (as suppose he in *Corinth*, 1 *Corinthians* 14:24, 25.) yet is he not therefore joined in Church-Estate, and Fellowship with them, without profession of acknowledgement, and acceptance.

***Discusser.***

*Secondly, all persons (Papist, and Protestant) that are Conscientious have always suffered upon this ground especially, that they have refused to come to each other's Church, or meeting.*

***Defender.***

It is too large an *Hyperbole*, to affirm, that all persons that are Conscientious (whether Papist, or Protestant,) have always suffered upon this ground. Are no men conscientious but such as have suffered upon this ground? are there not many that were never put upon this Trial? and are not many conscientious, that never scrupled this point? and are there not many consciencious,

that

that have suffered upon other points, that never suffered upon this point?

Besides though many conscientious Protestants and Papists do refuse to hear in each others Assembly, or Church, it is not because such hearing doth implant them into their Church-State: but out of fear to be leavened with their corrupt Doctrine, or polluted with some other part of false worship.

---

## CHAPTER 71.

---

### *A Reply to his Chaper 14. Touching the Testmony of the Papists against Persecution.*

---

#### **Discusser.**

**A**S for the Testimony of the Popish Book (saith the Answerer) we weigh it not: as knowing what ever they speak for toleration of Religion, where themselves are under Hatches: yet when themselves come to sit at Stern, they Judge and practice quite contrary: as both their writings, and judicial proceedings have testified to the world these many years.

But (for Answer to him) though both their writings and practices have been such: yet the Scriptures, and expressions of Truth alleged by them, do speak loudly and fully for them, that where they are under the Hatchs they should not be smothered, but suffered to breath and walk upon the Decks in the air of civil Liberty.

#### **Defender.**

*Reply 1.* When the Author of the Letter calleth that Popish Book (out of which he quoteth that Testimony) a wicked Book, why may not that Testimony be a wicked Testimony, (as by his own Judgement) the Book, a wicked Book?

*Reply 2.* It is true, which they say, the means which Almighty God appointed for the conversion of Kingdoms, was Humility, Patience and Charity: neither do we allow any means of rigour for Conversion of souls, but only the power of Spiritual Armour.

It is true also which they allege out of *Matthew 10:16. That Christ sent his Apostles as sheep into the midst of Wolves: He did not*  
*send*

*send Wolves amongst sheep, to kill, imprison, spoil, &c.* But this only showeth, what the condition and Commission, and work of Ministers is, when they are sent among Pagans, and Persecutors. But this is no prohibition to Ministers, when they live in a Church of Christ, to drive away Wolves from the Sheepfolds of Christ, as knowing they come to kill and to destroy. And drive them away they may, not only by Church-censures, if they be of the Church (*Titus 3:10,11.*) but also if they be out of the Church, by miraculous vengeance, (in case they have such a gift, as *Paul* had, and used it against *Elymas*, *Acts 13:9,10,11.*) or by their Prayers, (though the *Discusser* deny it, *chapter 27*, all *Paul* did against *Alexander*, *2 Timothy 4:14*, or by stirring up the civil power against them, a *Elijah* did *Ahab* and the people, against the Prophets of *Baal*, *1 Kings 18:40*.

*Reply 3.* That which they allege out of *Matthew 10:7.* (they mean *17.*) is as far wide from the purpose, as the former. It is true, the Apostles ought not to deliver the *People* (whom they are sent to convert) unto *Counsels*, or *Prison*, or to make their Religion *Felony*, or *Treason*.

But what is this to such as being converted to the Profession of the Faith, do Apostate from the Faith, and seek to subvert the Faith, which they have professed? Or what is this to such, as do seek also to subvert the civil State, to kill Kings, or dethrone them, and to dispose of their Kingdoms? may not such (Religion, shall I say, or Rebellion:) be made Felony or Treason! But see here the partiality both of the Letter, and of the *Discusser*: if a Christian King set not up the Popish Religion, but make Laws for the establishment of the Truth, this shall be condemned in him as Heretical pravity, himself prescribed, dethroned, killed, and his Kingdom alienated to a stranger. And this shall pass with Toleration. But if a Prince shall make Laws for the security of himself and his Kingdom, and condemn such seditious, and rebellious Attempts for Felony and Treason, this shall be taxed as unchristian Persecution, and contrary to the way of Christ, and his Apostles.

*Reply 4.* It is true likewise, what they quote out of *verse 32.* *When ye enter into an House Christ had them salute it, saying, Peace be to the House; he doth not say, send Pursevants, to ransack and spoil it.*

For

For Christ sent not his Apostles with devil power: nor doth he allow Princes, to send Pursevants to ransack Houses, that so they might convert the Householders, or sojourners therein. But if Seducers to Idolatry be found there, and Rebels, and Conspirators against the civil State be found there, though that Commission to the Apostles speak not to such case: yet it is enough, the Magistrates Commission from God, *Romans* 13:4. Armeth him to take vengeance on evil doers.

*Reply* 5. To *John*, 10. *verse* 10,11. The Answer is as easy as to the former. *The Pastor giveth his Life for the sheep: he cometh not to kill, or to destroy the sheep. But what if he see the Wolf coming? or what if he see the Thief coming? both of them, to steal, and kill, and to destroy? Shall the Pastor now sit still, and not hazard his life in their defence, contrary to verse* 11,12,13? Or shall he betake himself only to spiritual censures, when it may be they are not capable of such strokes? Or shall it be an heinous and unchristian carriage in him, to seek aid against such Thieves and Wolves from them who should see that the sheep of Christ: *may lead a quiet, and peaceable Life in all Godliness and Himself?* 1 *Timothy* 2:1,2. The Apostles themselves, and the Churches planted by them, they do not so much as desire it of God from their Magistrates, that they may live a quiet and peaceable life in a way of ungodliness, no more then a way of dishonesty. So *Paul* himself professeth, *Acts* 25:8,11. But in a way of Godliness and Honesty, they desire of God, they may find by the protection of their Magistrates, a quiet and peaceable life, in that Text of *Timothy*.

Thus to satisfy the *Discusser's* mind, and to prevent any pretence of exception, I have run over the Scriptures, and expressions of Truth alleged in the Popish Book, which he *saith, speak loudly, and fully for their Toleration: but how truly*, let the servants of God judge.

### Discusser.

*But Protestants herein show themselves partial, and practice that themselves which they tax in Papists. For though they cry out of Persecution when themselves under Hatches, yet when they come to sit at Helm, they run the same course both in Doctrine and Practice.*

*When Mr. Cotton and others have formerly been under Hatches,*

Z

*what*

*what sad and true complaints have they poured out against Persecution? But coming to the Helm, how do they themselves both by Preaching, Writing, Printing, practice unnaturally, and partially express towards other, the cruel Nature of such Lions, and Leopards, as some of them have opened out of Canticles 4:8.*

**Defender.**

What we have opened out of *Canticles* 4:8. against Persecution, when (as he saith) we were under the Hatches, amounted to this, That it was lawful for the sheep of Christ, to follow Christ, and to come along with him, and fly away from persecution. Did any of us then teach, that it was unlawful for Magistrates to pursue with just revenge Apostate Seducers unto Idolatry, Heresy, or blasphemy? or turbulent subverters of civil or Church-Order? And since we are come hither, where he is pleased to honour us with sitting at Helm (which is far from us) what have we taught or practised more, than ourselves allowed in times of our own restraint? But men that can allow themselves a Liberty of calumny, it may well become them to plead for a Liberty of impunity for all Religions.

We keep not a weight and a weight (as he calumniateth) a measure and a measure: what we measure out to others, we should never think it hard measure to have the same returned to our selves in the like case, Only this measure we desire of all hands to be kept (that which *Abraham* the Father of the faithful, and God the Judge of all the Earth, thought equal, *Genesis* 18:25.) that the Righteous should not be as the wicked: nor that Truth, and Fidelity, should suffer as Heresy and Apostasy.

**Discusser.**

*Yea, but it is not confidence of being in the Truth (which they judge the Papists and others are not in) no nor the Truth itself that can privilege them to persecute others, and to exempt themselves from persecution, for three Considerations.*

*First, because it is against the nature of true sheep, to persecute, or hunt the Beasts of the Forest, no not the Wolves, who have persecuted themselves.*

**Defender.**

It is a feeble kind of reasoning, from a similitude in some things, to press a resemblance in everything: Sheep do fitly resemble Christians in many proprieties: but he that shall therefore press them

them to be like in all, shall not suffer a Magistrate(if he be a sheep of Christ) to punish Rubbers, Adulterers, Murderers: why? for it is against the Nature of true sheep, to persecute any Beasts of the Forest.

Besides, I demand, whether *Paul* was a sheep, or a Wolf, when he smote *Elymas* with blindness? If he were a Wolfe, how is he then said, to be filled with the Holy Ghost; *Acts* 13:9. If he were a sheep, why did he strike such a Beast of the Forest? *verses* 10,11.

Furthermore, when the Wolf runneth ravenously upon the sheep, is it against the nature of the true sheep, to run to their Shepherd? And is it then against the Nature of the true Shepherd to send forth his Dogs to worry such a Wolf, without incurring the reproach of a persecutor?

**Discusser.**

*Secondly, if it be a Duty and charge upon all Magistrates in all parts of the world to judge and persecute, in, and for spiritual Causes, then either they are no Magistrates, who are not able to judge in such cases: or else they must judge according to their Consciences, whether Pagan, Turkish, or Antichristian.*

**Defender.**

This hath been again, and again Answered above, though it be the Duty of all Magistrates in the world, to judge and punish Blasphemers, Idolaters, and Seducers: yet not *in sensu composite*, whilst they are ignorant of the Truth, and cannot judge of such causes: but in *sensu diviso*, they are bound to be wise, and instructed in the knowledge, and worship of Christ, (*Psalms* 2:10,11, 12.) and then to judge accordingly.

But in the mean time, it doth not follow, that they are no Magistrates, who are not able to do all the Duties of a Magistrate. Neither will it follow, that they must judge according to their Consciences, when their Consciences are blind, and erroneous, Pagan, Turkish, Antichristian. Let them first cast Beams out of their own eyes, and then they will better discern between Beams, and motes in other men.

**Discusser.**

*Thirdly, the Experience of our Fathers errors, and of our own mistakes and ignorance, the sense of our own weaknesses, and blindness in the depths of the Prophecies and mysteries of the Kingdom of Christ,*

and the great professed Expectation of the Light to come, which we are not now able to comprehend, may abate the edge and sheath up the Sword of Persecution against any, especially such as differ not from them in Doctrines of Repentance, or Faith, or Holiness of heart, and life, but only in the way, and manner of the Administration of Jesus Christ.

**Defender.**

I say, as *Augustine* sometime said in another case, *Nunquid negandum quod certum est, quia comprehendere non potest, quod occultum est?* There are depths of sundry Prophecies, which we yet comprehend not: but shall we therefore be always babes, and ignorant of the Fundamental Principles of Christian Religion? yea and suffer them to be shaken, and ruined, because there are some Prophecies, and Mysteries, which we yet understand not? shall the expectation of greater Light so dazzle our eyes before we see it, that we cannot be able to see, what we do see? It is not Light, but darkness, that cloudeth the Light already revealed. Nor is it darkness only, but blackness of darkness, that putteth Light for darkness, and darkness for Light, and would have both tolerated to live together in the same Hemisphere, because some blind Christians cannot yet tell, which is whether?

It is true, the Experience of former Errors, and sense of present weaknesses, may justly abate the edge, and sheath up the Sword of persecution against any, that differ only in errors of weakness, and differ not in Doctrines of Faith, Repentance, and Holiness of heart, and life. Yea we willingly grant more, than the *Discusser* requireth in such a case. For though there should be some Difference in Doctrines of faith, or Repentance, or Holiness; Yet we should not approve the unsheathing of the Sword against such, unless the Doctrine were fundamentally subversive to faith, or Repentance, or Holiness, and that obstinately maintained against light, and conviction: and broached, and dispersed to the Infection, and Seduction of others.

If the Difference be only in the way and manner of Administration of Christ Jesus, and that Difference held forth in a Christian and Peaceable way. God forbid a staff should be shaken against such, much less a Sword unsheathed.

---

## CHAPTER 72.

---

### *A Reply to his Chapter 75th. Discussing a Testimony of Augustine.*

#### **Discusser.**

**T**O begin with Augustine, *They murder (saith He) Souls, and themselves are afflicted in Body. They put men to everlasting Death, and yet they complain when themselves are put to a temporal Death.*

*This Rhetorical persuasion of human wisdom seemeth very reasonable in the Eye of flesh, and blood: but one Scripture more prevaieth with faithful and obedient souls, then thousands of plausible, and Eloquent speeches.*

#### **Defender.**

Neither this Testimony, nor the rest of those Ancients that follow, were alleged to prevail with the Faith of any, further than Light of Scripture might shine forth in them: but only to counterpoise the Testimonies of the Ancients alleged in the Letter against the Truth. And the *Discusser*, in his entrance into this chapter, is forced to acknowledge, that the cause we maintain hath more number of Votes (and I may add, weight of Voters) than the contrary Tenent: only he putteth it off with this evasion: that *Antichrist is too hard for Christ at Votes, and Numbers.*

Which yet is the more to be marvelled at, that when the cause is about the Toleration of Hereticks, and Antichristians, that Antichrist should procure more Votes against Antichristians, and Christ to procure any Votes, though fewer for them. And it is but another evasion, whereby he here putteth off *Augustines* speech, as if it were but a Rhetorical evasion. Whereas indeed the weight of the speech lieth not in the Rhetorick, which is little, or none: but in the Logic, in an Argument taken from the Excellency of the soul above the body, and thence inferring the equity of killing the bodies of such, as kill the souls of God's people, and the iniquity of such, as think this unequal.

But to weaken the force of this Argument, the *Discusser* bestirreth himself to draw up six Answers.

1. *From*

1. *From the large extent of soul-killing, which may reach to many sins, that are not Capital, 1 Corinthians 8:11.*

2. *From the dissimilitude of body and spiritual Death. A body being killed can die but once: but a soul killed may recover.*

3. *From the different punishment, which Christ hath provided for soul-killers: to wit the two edged Sword, which cometh out of his mouth, which is able to cut down Heresy, and to kills the souls of Heretics everastingly.*

4. *From the toleration, which Christ himself giveth to such soul-killers, or soul-wounders, in the Parable of Tares, Matthew 13.*

5. *From the impossibility of killing any soul by any Heretic: not the souls of natural men: for they are dead already: nor can false Teachers so much prevent the means of spiritual Life, as doth the force of a material Sword, either imprisoning the souls of men in a National-State-Religion: or cutting them off immediately without any longer means of Repentance. Nor can there be a killing of the souls of men alive in Christ, partly by reason of the sufficiency and power of Spiritual Ordinances to preserve that Life in them against all Enemies.*

*Partly from the Immortality of the spiritual Life in Christ, which can no more do than Christ himself who is alive for ever.*

6. *From the possibility of a false Teachers, and a Wolves recovery from the Estate of a soul-killer, to become a soul-saver, as it was in the case of Paul.*

For a just Reply to all these, let me first premise four things: and then speak to the Arguments in Order.

1. It is not every murder of the body, that is a capital crime, but murder executed in some gross Attempt. *For he that hateth his brother is a man-slayer, or murderer (1 John 3:15.)* and yet not for that to be put to death.

2. Murder unadvisedly committed, when the Act done was not intended, is not a capital crime: there were Cities of Refuge provided in such a case, *Exodus 21:13.*

3. The very Attempt of murder, in the abuse of an Ordinance of God, is a capital crime. As in a case, a man shall rise up before a Court of Justice to bear false witness against his Neighbour, of some capital offence, this very attempt of killing his Neighbour by the abuse of public Justice, is a capital crime, *Deuteronomy 19:18 to 21.*

4. The

4. The murder of the soul is not the only *Formalis Ratio* (as they call it ) the only proper cause of an Heretics capital Crime, but chiefly his bitter root of Apostasy from God, not only falling off himself from God, but seducing others to fall away from him.

These four things being premised, come we now to consider of the several Answers given by the *Discusser* to *Augustine's* Argument.

His first Answer reacheth not the point: for as every killing of the body is not a capital crime, so neither is every killing of the soul, but such as is more voluntary, and presumptuous, and joined with some gross and murderous attempt.

His second Answer falleth short in this respect, that though a soul wounded and killed may recover again, yet the very murderous Attempt of killing a soul, in abusing an Ordinance of God, in corrupting Religion, is a capital crime, whether the soul die of that wound or no: or if it die whether it be recovered, or no. *Thine eye shall not spare him, because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, Deuteronomy 13:10. Though he did not thrust thee away, yet because he sought to do it he shall die.*

His third Answer hath been removed above. Church-censures are sufficient to heal the Heretic, if he belong to God, and to remove the guilt of his wickedness from the Church: but not sufficient, to prevent his further spreading of the Leaven of his corruption: nor sufficient to cleanse the Common-wealth from the guilt of such Rebellion, as hath been taught by him against the Lord.

His fourth Answer taken from Christ's toleration of the Tares hath been largely, and (as I conceive) fully refelled above.

His fifth Answer hath also been cleared already. If the Answer were good, it would evacuate not only *Augustine's* Argument, but *Paul's* also, 1 *Corinthians* 8:11. *Paul* disuadeth from eating things sacrificed to Idols in Idols Temples. The Argument to dissuade it, is from the offence, thereby given to the Conscience of the weak: and that backed and strengthened from the heinousness of the sin of offence to Conscience: It is the murder, or perishing of a weak Brother's soul. Now if this Answer of the *Dis-*

*cusser*

*cusser* might stand, it would make the Argument of the Apostle of none effect. For either this weak Brother is a *natural man, dead in sin already, and then no man can kill him: or else he is in Christ, and then his Life is immortal, and Christ hath provided Ordinances powerfully sufficient to prevent or heal such deadly Dangers.*

It is an high presumptuous tempting of God, and wanton treading under foot the precious souls of men for whom Christ died, to wound and (as much as in us lieth) to kill the souls of men, upon pretence, the Lord can save them, and raise them again by his all-sufficient Grace. It is a putting of fear, where none is, that the punishment of obstinate seducing *Heretics with the material Sword, is the imprisoning of the souls of men to a National Religion: for if the Religion of the Nation be good, it is no Imprisonment: if naught, there should be no punishment.* And it is a like causeless Fear, that, the cutting off of Heretics, *will cut off men immediately without any longer means of Repentance: for if they belong to God, God will give them Repentance before they go hence: but whether they belong to God, or no, the revealed will of God is fulfilled in their just Execution*

The last Answer falleth as short of strength, as any of the former. For if men be such Wolves, and Blasphemers as *Paul* was, before his Conversion, neither the Law of God or man would put such an one to Death, who sinned at ignorance, and walked (as himself professeth) with all good Conscience, even in his former evil times, *Acts 23:1.* But as for such as Apostate from the known Truth of Religion, and seek to subvert the Foundation of it, and to draw away others from it, to plead for their Toleration in hope of their Conversion, is as much as to proclaim a general pardon for all malefactors, (save such only as sin against the Holy Ghost:) for he that is a wilful murderer, and Adulterer now, may come to be converted and die a martyr hereafter.

Chap. 73.

---

**CHAPTER 73. *A Reply to his Chapter 76.  
discussing the Testimony of Optatus.***

**Discusser.**

**T**He Answerer allegeth from Optatus his third Book, that he, justified Macarius; who had put some Heretics to death, for that he had done no more herein, than what Moses, Phineas, and Elias had done before him,

*But these are shafts usually drawn from the Quiver of the Ceremonial and Typical State of the National Church of the Jews, which vanished at the appearing of the Body, and substance of the Sun of Righteousness, who set up another Kingdom, or Church (Hebrews 12.) Ministry, and Worship: In which we find no such Ordinance, Precept, or Precedent of killing men for Religion sake.*

**Defender.**

Whether these shafts be taken from the Quiver of the Ceremonial and Typical State of the National Church of the *Jews*, or no: Sure this Answer is taken from no Law of God, nor any Scripture ground: but from the Topics of human invention.

Did ever any Apostle or Evangelist make the judicial Laws of *Moses* concerning life and death, Ceremonial, or Typical? Time was, when human inventions in God's Worship, were accounted superstition: but now human inventions in Doctrine, may pass for current Evangelical Divinity.

It is true the Sun of Righteousness hath set up another Church, Ministry, and Worship: But did he ever set up another civil Righteousness? or a Magistracy to walk by another rule of Righteousness, than that which God gave by *Moses*? If it be true, that Christ gave no express Ordinance, Precept, or Precedent of killing men by material Sword, for Religion sake: It is as true that neither did he for any breach of civil Justice, no not for murder, nor adultery. Which maketh it therefore evident, that seeing he hath expressly authorized civil Magistracy in the New-testament, and hath given no express Laws or Rules of Righteousness for them to walk by an Administration of civil Justice, therefore either he leaveth them to act and rule without

a Rule (which derogateth from the perfection of Scripture:) or else they must fetch their rules of Righteousness from the Law of *Moses*, and from the Prophets, who have expounded him in the Old-Testament.

**Discusser.**

*More particularly, concerning Moses, I Query what Commandment, or practice of Moses, either Optatus, or the Answerer here intendeth. Probably that of Moses, Deuteronomy 13. If so I shall particularly Reply to that, in Answer to the reasons here under mentioned.*

**Defender.**

When *Optatus* speaketh that *Maecius* in putting Heretics to death had done no more, than *Moses* had done before him: It appeareth he meant not that passage of *Deuteronomy* 13, but of *Exodus* 32, where he put to death Idolaters and that of *Leviticus* 24, where he put the Blasphemer to death. For *Optatus* speaketh of what *Moses* had done, not what *Moses* had commanded to be done. But I shall (Gcd willing) consider his Answer, if it come in my way.

**Discusser.**

*Concerning Phinehas his zealous Act.*

1. *His slaying the Israelitish man and woman of Midian was not for spiritual, but corporal filthiness.*

**Defender.**

Was it for bodily or corporal filthiness; Surely for spiritual. For the *Israelites* that committed whoredom with the daughters of the Land, they were invited to the Sacrifices of their God: And being invited they did eat and bowed down to their Gods, and so joined themselves to *Baal Peor*: this is plain in the text *Numbers* 25:1,2,3.

Now I do not know, that corporal filthiness between a young man and single woman was any Capital Crime, by the Law of *Moses*. But the Discusser contenteth himself, if any thing be said, it may go for an Answer.

**Discusser.**

2. *No man will produce this fact as Precedential to any Minister of the Gospel, so to act in any Civil State &c.*

*Defender.*

*Defender.*

It is true, it is no Precedent for Ministers: but the fact so clearly acknowledged, and approved, and rewarded of God, is doubtless an act of righteousness to have been done by some in their ordinary calling (to wit, by *Moses* and the Princes of *Israel*;) which *Phineha* did by an extraordinary motion. God is not wont to approve any act of holiness, or righteousness (though never so extraordinary) which doth not fall under the ordinary Rule of holiness, and righteousness, in the ordinary calling of some or other Function, which himself hath ordained. Therefore though *Phinehas* his fact be no Precedent for Ministers of the Gospel: yet it is Precedential to such as bear not the Sword in vain, but for the punishment of evil doers.

**Discusser.**

*Concerning Elijah, There were two famous acts of Elijah of a killing nature.*

1. *That of slaying 850 of Baal's Prophets, 1 Kings 18.*
2. *Of the two Captains, and their fifties by fire.*

*For the first, It cannot figure or Type out any material slaughter of the many thousands of false Prophets in the world by any material Sword of Iron, or steel: for as that passage was miraculous: so we find not any such Commission given by the Lord Jesus to the Ministers of the Gospel.*

*Defender.*

It will do the Discusser no hurt to take notice, that he that is forward to take hold of any flip of Pen, or memory, if subject to the like flips himself. The number of the false Prophets, which he saith, were slain by *Elijah* exceedeth the Truth by half in half: the Text numbeth them 450, and he numbeth them 850. Again, it is a vain thing to inquire what this fact of *Elijah* should figure or Type out. Acts of Moral Justice, though they may sometimes be extraordinary: yet they are never accounted Typical, or Figurative: but by such is would transform all the Scripture into an Allegory.

Besides, why should he call the fact Miraculous? Is it a miracle for *Elijah* with the aid of so many thousand people of *Israel* put to death 450 men, whose spirits were discouraged being convinced of their forgery and Idolatry?

Moreover, Though Christ gave no such Commission to Ministers of the Gospel to put false Prophets to death, as *Elijah* did: yet the same Answer holdeth here which was given to the fact of *Phinehas*: though the hand which executed Justice was extraordinary: yet the act of Justice, was an ordinary duty of Moral Righteousness, belonging to such as bear the Sword.

**Discusser.**

*Lastly, such a slaughter must not only extend to all the false Prophets in the world, but (according to the Answerer's grounds) to the many thousands of thousands of Idolaters, and false worshippers in the Kingdoms and Nations of the world:*

**Defender.**

Such a slaughter being only made of the false Prophets in *Israel* (a people in Covenant with the true and living God) the example of it will only extend to the like execution of all the false Prophets in the Church of God, who have turned the hearts of the People of God from *Jehovah* to an Idol. What hath any Officer in the Church, or Magistrate in the Common-wealth to do, to censure or punish all the false Prophets in the world, when many hundreds of them (if not thousands) are exempt from their jurisdiction? much less will this example extend to the slaughter of many thousands of thousands of Idolaters, and false worshippers in the Kingdoms and Nations of the world.

For 1. many thousand thousands of them are exempt from the civil Magistracy of Christians.

2. They were never in Covenant with God to whom only the Law of *Moses* (concerning the punishment of Idolaters) extendeth.

3. Though the *Israelites* were Idolaters, yet *Elijah* spared them, as having been lead aside from the days of their Fathers, in their simplicity, and Ignorance, by these false Teachers. And for sins of Ignorance God hath appointed other expiatory Sacrifices, than the slaughter of offenders. Nor hath the Answerer any grounds, or thoughts to the contrary.

As for the other fact of *Elijah* in slaying the Captains of their fifties, as it is not pertinent to the punishment of false Prophets, nor of Idolaters (as such:) so I do not find it alleged by any in this cause, but only by the Discusser, to make himself work.

But

But when the *Discusser* is pleased to glory in his Answers to *Augustine*, before, and to *Optatus* here, That if *Augustine* were now living, he would be of his mind, and *Optatus*, and the Answerer himself might rest satisfied.

Let the *Discusser* revise again what he hath written, and see if he can satisfy himself (much less the Answerer, and least of all *Augustine*, and *Optatus*) in such Cobweb Evasions.

## CHAP. 74. *A Reply to his Chap. 77.*

### Discusser.

**A**S for Calvin, Beza, and Aretius, mine Answer is, since matter of fact and opinion are barely related by the Answerer without their grounds, (whose grounds notwithstanding, in this Book are Answered) If Paul himself were joined with them, yea or an Angel from heaven, bringing any other Rule than what the Lord Jesus hath once delivered, we have Paul's Conclusion, and Resolution, peremptory, and dreadful, Galatians 1:8.

### Defender.

That I only quoted the Names of those blessed men of God, It was partly because it was enough to counterpoise the Names of Authors alleged by the Letter against the Truth, by the Names of greater and more holy men of God, for the Truth: partly also, because if I had quoted their grounds, I must have transcribed their whole Books of the Argument. *Calvin's* discourse about it, against *Servetus*, is bound up in his *Opuscula*. *Beza* his Book *de Hæreticis a Magistratii puniendis*, is bound up also in his *Opuscula*: but both of them too large by me to be copied, and to strong and accurate, by them of the adverse part to be refuted. *Aretius*, a like solid writer, may sooner be shifted off, than sifted to Bran. But it seemeth, if *Paul* himself had joined with them in the like fullness of expressions, himself should rather have been accursed by the *Discusser*, than his Doctrine accepted. Which seemeth to me a strange both prejudice, and presidence met together. For since God laid this charge upon Magistrates in the Old Testament, to punish Seducers, & the Lord Jesus never took this charge off in the New-  
Testament

Testament, who is this *Discusser*, that he should account *Paul* himself, or an Angel from Heaven accursed, that should leave this charge still upon Magistrates, which God laid on, and Christ never took off? That Argument from the Parable Let both grow together to the Harvest is not at all expounded in the Interpretation, Let Seducers be suffered to live in the world till the last Judgement. And how weak a Foundation that is, to cast a curse upon a chosen Apostle, or upon an holy Angel, I hope hath been cleared in discussing that Text.

**Discusser.**

*Let me finish the whole, by proposing one Conclusion of the Author of the arguments in the Letter, viz. It is no prejudice to the Common-wealth, if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such, as fear God indeed.*

*Abraham abode a long time amongst the Canaanites: though contrary to them in Religion &c. So did Isaac: so did Jacob twenty years with his Uncle Laban.*

*So the People of Israel were about four and thirty years in Ægypt: and afterwards seventy in Babylon, differing from Religion in both States.*

*Come to the tome of Christ, Israel lived under the Romans, and divers Sects in Israel, besides Christ, and his Apostles &c. Alle these lived under Cæsar's Government, being nothing hurtful to the Common-wealth, he leaves them to themselves, as having no Dominion over their souls and Consciences. And when the enemies of the Truth raised up any tumults, the wisdom of the Magistrates most wisely appeased them, Acts 18:14 and 19:35. Unto this, the Answerer returneth thus much: It is true, That without prejudice to the Common-wealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to such as fear God indeed: as knowing they will not persist in Heresy, or turbulent Schism, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.*

*But the Question is, whether an Heretic after once or twice Admonition (and so after conviction) or any other scandalous and heinous Offender, may be Tolerated either in the Church, without Excommunication: or in the Common-wealth without such punishment, as may preserve others from dangerous and damnable infection.*

---

## CHAPTER 75. *A Reply to his Chapter 78.*

### Discusser.

**B**Ut here I observe the Answerers partiality, That none but such as truly fear God should enjoy Liberty of Conscience &c.

### Defender.

But I Observe the *Discussers* both partiality and falsehood. Partiality, for I did not repeat the very words of the Author of the Letter, and grant them to be good. The Letter has said (as himself repeateth it, *It is no prejudice to a Common-wealth if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such as fear God indeed whereto I subjoin my Association, It is true, that without prejudice to the Common-wealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to men that fear God indeed.*

Here the *Discusser* in me observeth Partiality: but in the Letter the very same speech passeth for Currant, and approveable. But the Lord help him to remember *Divers weights, and divers measures are abomination to the Lord, Proverbs 20:10.* But I trily observe in his speech, not only partiality, but falsehood also. For it is a very falsehood, that I should say, *None but such as truly fear God should enjoy Liberty of Conscience. I say no more than the Letter saith: It saith, That it is no prejudice to the Common-wealth, if Liberty of Conscience were suffered to such as fear God indeed.* I say, It is true, without prejudice to the Common-wealth, Liberty of Conscience may be suffered to such as fear God indeed. Now if a man should gather the same Observation out of the Letter, *That none but such as truly fear God should enjoy Liberty of Conscience,* I believe the *Discusser* would observe notorious falsehood in such dealing. And justly he might: for it is one thing to say, liberty of Conscience may be suffered to men that truly fear God, without prejudice to the Common-wealth: another thing to say, it may be suffered to none else.

I easily grant, nor did I ever deny it, that the Inhabitants of the world, though they never come into the estate of men fearing God, yet they may and ought to be suffered to live in the world

world, unless they disturb the Countries of the world where they live, with some Capital Crimes. And if they do disturb the Countries where they live, they stand and fall to the Laws, and Governments of the Countries where they inhabit.

And therefore all the dangerous consequences, which the *Discusser* gathereth from my speech (but indeed not my speech, but his own) *as if I should drive the world out of the world, or turn the world upside down, or leave it to men that have not God's fear, to judge who fear God, and who not,* and the rest that follow, they are all of them consequences without an Antecedent, or an Antecedent without existence in any speech of mine, but only in its own imagination.

Neither hath it any better ground, that passionate exclamation of his, with which he endeth this Chapter.

*Hear (saith he) O Heavens, and give care O Earth, yea let the Heavens be astonished, and the Earth tremble at such an Answer.*

What Answer (forsooth) is that which he calleth a wonderful Answer, which the Ministers of New-England gave to the third Question sent to them by some Ministers of Old-England, to wit, that although they confessed them to be such persons whom they approved of, far above themselves, yea, who were in their hearts to live and die together: yet if they or other godly people with them coming over to them, should differ in Church-Constitution, they then could not approve their civil Co-habitation with them and consequently could not advise their Magistrates, to suffer them to enjoy a civil being within their jurisdiction.

Now sure, if there were any such Answers to be found in that Book sounding to such a purpose, I myself should join with him in the like exclamation, and wonderment. But when I came to search for that speech, and neither find it in the Answer which he quoteth to the third Question, nor in that, which I rather think he meant, the 31. I cannot but admire and adore the righteous Judgement of God, who having left the *Discusser* (in this Book, and some other) to write against the Truth in point of Doctrine, hath herein left him to break forth in his own hand

hand writing, into notorious impudent falsehood in matter of fact: which any man that readeth that Book cannot but discern in this Allegation. The Answer is too large for me to transcribe but who so will may read it, and when he compareth the Answer in that Book, with the Answer in this, he may well wonder with what heart and forehead, the *Discusser* could so express it.

---

## CHAPTER 76. *A Reply to his 79 Chapter.*

### Discusser.

**Y***ea, but say they, they doubt not if those Ministers of Old-England should come over to them, and were here with them, they should agree. For, say they, either you will come to us, or show us light to come to you: for we are but weak men, and dream not of perfection in this life.*

*Alas who knoweth not what lamentable differences have been between the same Ministers of the Church of England? &c.*

*Let none now think, that the passage to New-England by Sea, or the nature of the Country can do, what only the Key of David can do, to wit, open and shut the Consciences of men.*

### Defender.

I did not think that any man in *Old-England*, or *New*, had been so ignorant, or uncharitable, as to think, the Pen-man of the Answer to these Questions had conceived, that either the voyage by Sea, or the change of the air from *Old England* to *New*, could change the judgements or Consciences of men. Nature could tell, *Cælum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare Currunt*. But yet no Christian man is ignorant that mutual conference between Godly, ingenuous, and self-denying Christians is a notable means sanctified of God for the instruction & edification one of another, till we all come to be of one mind in the Lord. Else how shall thereby mutual convictions without mutual conferences? It is the Key of *David* only, that can open and shut the Consciences of men: but that Key ordinarily doth it in the dispensation of Ordinances, whereof Conference is one.

B b

Discusser.

**Discusser.**

*Besides, how can this be a faithful and upright acknowledgement of their weakness, and imperfection, when they Preach, Print, and practice such violence to the souls and bodies of others? And by their Rules and grounds ought to proceed to the killing of those, whom they judge so dear unto them, and in respect of godliness far above themselves?*

**Defender.**

This violence to the souls & bodies of men is often charged upon us by the *Discusser*: But he hath not yet given us an instance of any one soul or body, which hath undergone this violence from us. *Si Accusasse sufficiat quis innocens exit?* It is no new practice to be an accuser of the Brethren: neither is their any slander so false and scurrilous, but findeth ready, yea and greedy entertainment even of many professors, especially such, whose best Religion lieth in the observing and censuring the ways of others. How welcome to such, are evil reports of them, that dare not allow themselves in any known evil?

This acknowledgement of our weakness and imperfection would then truly appeare to be neither faithful nor upright, if we Preached or practiced violence against such, in comparison of whom we acknowledge our own weakness and imperfection. *Meanwhile we may well stand and wonder, what rules and Grounds or ours those be, by which we ought to proceed even to the killing of those, whom we judge so dear unto us, and in respect of Godliness far above us?*

Are any of them whom we so respect, such as subvert the Foundation of the Christian Faith, and persist therein obstinately after conviction? are any of them presumptuous Blasphemers of the great Name of God? Or Idolaters themselves, and Seducers of others to Idolatry?

---

## CHAPTER 77. *A Reply to his Chapter 80.*

**Discusser.**

**W***hat though, they say, the Godly will not persist in Heresy, or turbulent Schism, when they are convinced thereof in Conscience? If the Civil Court and Magistrates must judge, and those civil Courts, are as lawful, consisting of natural men, as of Godly persons, then what consequences will follow, I have before mentioned.*

**Defender.**

Mentioned, indeed, but not proved: I hope (by the help of Christ) the inconsequence of them hath been cleared.

**Discusser.**

*And I add, according to this Conclusion it must follow, that if the most godly persons yield not to once or twice Admonition (as is maintained by the Answerer) they must necessarily be esteemed obstinate persons: for if they were godly, they would yield.*

**Defender.**

Here again the *Discusser* misreporteth my words: For I did not say, that if persons be godly, they would yield to once or twice Admonition: and if they did not yield to once or twice Admonition, they must necessarily be esteemed obstinate persons. But my words were, *The godly will not persist in Heresy or turbulent Schism, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.*

Here is then a three-fold wresting of my words & accordingly so much false dealing. For 1. Admonition is one thing: Conviction in their own Conscience, is another. For though Admonition ought not to be dispensed till after conviction: yet it may fall out, that the Church (through mistake) proceedeth to Admonition, before the Offender be convinced in his own Conscience of the sinfulness of his way.

2. He carrieth my words, as they who yield not to once or twice Admonition must needs be esteemed obstinate persons: whereas I only say, they will not persist in Heresy, (that is, in obstinacy of Fundamental Error) nor in turbulent Schism, when they are convinced in Conscience of the sinfulness thereof.

B b 2

3. He

3. He propoundeth my words generally, as if I had said that godly person (in whatsoever Error they hold) if they yield not to once or twice Admonition, they must needs be esteemed obstinate, whereas I spake not of every Error, but of persisting in Heresy and turbulent Schisme.

But you may see how far the love of an Error, and desire of contention, will transport the mind and spirit!

The two stories that he telleth, upon this occasion (in his next words) because he nameth neither time, nor persons, nor occasions of the speeches (which he representeth as odious) a short Answer will serve to them. 1. I have too much experience of the *Discussers* mistakes of permanent Printed words, and therefore am afraid to credit every report of transient words spoken, without further Testimony. 2. The words might be spoken by some persons, concerning others, upon such occasions, as I will by no means excuse, or justify: but they might be spoken upon such weights, as might justly hold weight in the Balance of the Sanctuary.

The latter part of my Answer which he saith, cometh not near the Question, I now understand so much by the *Discussers*: but it did not so appear to me by the Author of the Letter.

#### **Discussers.**

*Mr. Cotton concludeth with a confident persuasion, of having removed the grounds of that great Error, viz. that persons are not to be persecuted for cause of Conscience.*

#### **Defender.**

How hard a thing is it, to write against the Truth, and yet to speak with a lip of Truth? Compare the words of my conclusion with the *Discussers*'s relation or representation thereof. The words of my conclusion were these

*Thus much I thought needful to be spoken for the avoiding of the grounds of your Error.*

1. Then, let him speak, what words of mine do express the confidence of my persuasion? It is true, I believe, and therefore speak what I have written: but wherein did I blow up my belief to a confident persuasion? I thank God: I doubt not of the truth of what I have written: but it is one thing, what I conceive in my mind: another thing what I think meet to express.

2. I

2. I do not say in this conclusion, that I have removed the grounds of his Error: but that I have spoken so much for that end: but whether I have done it or no (according to the help of Christ received) I leave others to judge.

3. The name of a great Error is foisted in by himself, *ad exaggerandum gloriationis invidiam et indignitatem*: but though the Error be indeed great: yet I did not so style it, when I spake of mine own endeavour to remove the grounds of it.

4. It is an evident falsehood that I should conclude, *This to be that great Error, That persons are not to be persecuted for cause of Conscience.*

For it is that which in stating the Question, I did in express terms deny, that any was to be persecuted for cause of Conscience: no not an Heretic, no not in a Church-way, much less in a civil way till being convinced in his own Conscience of his wickedness, he do stand out therein, not only against the Truth, but against the light of his own Conscience, that so it may appear, he is not persecuted for cause of Conscience, but punished for sinning against Conscience.

Only this, I now further add, which I know not, whether I had not occasion to speak to in this Discourse hitherto (unless in a touch) that sometime it may be an aggravation of sin both in judgement and practice, that a man holdeth it, or committeth it in Conscience. But that is only in case, when a man hath been wonted to sin so oft against his light, and against the clear Principles of Truth, and godliness, that it may appear, the just curse of God hath given him up to a reprobate-blinded-mind, and feared Conscience. But of what we have not had occasion to dispute in this Discourse.

#### **Discusser.**

*But I believe it shall appear, That the charge of Error Reboundeth back, even such an Error as may be called the Bloody-Tenent.*

#### **Defender.**

I hope, It hath by this time appeared, in the former dispute, (through the blessing of Christ) That, that which he calleth the *Bloody-Tenent* is washed white in the blood of the *Lamb*: and tendeth both to the ends, for which the Prince of peace died, viz: To the saving of his sheep from devouring to the dissolving  
of

of the cursed works of Satan, to the maintenance of his Truth, and to the preservation of sacred and civil peace, both in Churches, and Common-wealth.

---

## CHAPTER 78. A Reply to his Chapter 81.

### Defender.

TO the last Chapter of the *Discusser*, I think it not worth the while to speak any thing: it consisting chiefly of the *Discussers* self-applauses, and vain-glorious Triumphs; As that he knoweth, *That the God, the Spirit, and Prince, the Angels of peace, and that all the true awaked sons of peace will call the Truth (he meaneth this Doctrine of Toleration held forth by himself) blessed:*

*That the contemplations thereof are sweet and petitions: but Oh how sweet the actions, and Fruitions!*

*That these lips of Truth (to wit, distilling in his Pen) drop as the honey Comb: Honey and milk are under her Tongue: and oh that these drops, these streams might flow without interpretation?*

Only one passage of his glorious boasting, I may not let pass, without some Animadversion because the Name of Christ is interested in it, and dishonoured by it.

### Discusser.

*Were I (saith he) believed in this, That Christ is not delighted with the blood of men, (but shed his own blood for his bloodiest enemies:) That the word of Christ, No man for gainsaying Christ, or joining with his enemy Antichrist, should be molested with the Civil sword: were this foundation laid, and the Magna Carta of highest Libraries, and good security given on all hands for the preservation of it, How soon would every Brow and House be stuck with Olive Branches?*

Whether this be not to Conclude with confident persuasion (the same, and far greater than that which he noted in me, even now) I matter not. Let him reserve conclusions with confident persuasions to himself alone. Had he ground (from the eternal word of Truth) for such confidence, It would nevrer trouble me, nor hurt him.

But

But this is not, pleasing to Christ, nor to the Spirit of his wisdom: and Truth, that the *Discussor* should publish the delights of Christ in a confused way, without distinguishing things that differ, and so not dividing the Word aright. *It is true, that Christ delighteth not in the blood of men, but shed his own for his bloodiest enemies, and gainsayers:* to wit, whilst they gainsaying him, and bloodily persecute him, or his out of ignorance. In this case indeed, he prayeth for them, and dieth for them, *Father forgive them, they know not what they do,* Luke 23:34, *whilst we were enemies Christ died for us,* Romans 5:8,10.

But to say that Christ delighteth not in the blood of men, who after the acknowledgement of his Truth do tread the blood of his Covenant under foot, and wittingly and willingly reject him from reigning over them: To hold it forth, that Christ delighteth not in the blood of such men, or that he would not have such molested by the civil Sword, who gainsay Christ known and professed, and join with his enemy Antichrist, in blaspheming and persecuting Christ and his Saints, this is the *Discussor* can never make good to be the word of Christ. It is indeed, to publish the glad Tidings of the Gospel, not to the humble and meek *Lambs* of Christ, but to the seed of the Serpent, to sow pillows under all elbows: to make the hearts of the righteous sad, whom God would not make sad: and to strengthen the hands of the wicked in their Apostasy from the truth, and malignity against it. Christ hath pronounced it upon earth, and ratified it in Heaven, *Those mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither and slay them before my face,* Luke 19:27. Are these words of him, that delighteth not in the blood of his bloodiest enemies, and gainsayers? when the Lord Jesus sendeth forth his servants to pour out bloody vengeance upon Antichristian emissaries, and openeth the hearts and mouths of his Saints to praise him for thus judging (*Revelation 16:4-7*) Is this to proclaim a *Magna-Charta* of highest liberties, even to his gainsayers, and to such as join with his enemy Antichrist?

Time was, when *John* justly demanded, *What peace (what hast thou to do with peace) so long as the whoredoms of thy Mother Jezebel, and her witchcrafts are so many?* 2 Kings 9:22. And are the times now so far changed, that the Sword of *Jehu* shall proclaim  
peace

peace to *Jezebel*, and peace to all that call her mother, and peace to her whoredoms, and peace to her witchcrafts: and then to bless ourselves with a glorious expectation, *That soon shall every Brow and house be stuck with Olive branches?*

The Lord keep us from being bewitched with the Whore's cup, lest whilst we seem to detest and reject her with open face of profession we do not bring her in by a back door of Toleration, and so come at last, to drink deeply of the cup of the Lord's wrath, and be filled with the cup of her plagues.

*Amen.*

## CHAPTER 79.

*Touching the Model of Church and civil power, composed by Mr Cotton and the Ministers of New-England, and sent to the Church of Salem &c. Examined (by the Discussor) and Answered.*

THIS Title or Inscription (which the Examiner setteth up of this Model) holdeth forth to the world a double falsehood.

1. That the Model was composed by Mr *Cotton*, and other Ministers of *New-England*.

This is one falsehood. What other Ministers of *New-England* did in it, themselves know: But so Mr *Cotton*, I know, that he was none of them that composed it.

2. That this Model was sent to the Church of *Salem*, if he mean, sent by those Ministers (as the following words imply, for the confirmation of their Doctrine) that is another falsehood. The Ministers themselves, that composed the Model, do deny it; Howsoever the Model came to *Salem*, the Ministers say, it was not sent by them. But see, when men are left of God, openly, and boldly to write against the truth in matter of Doctrine, how readily and freely, they can write and speak falsehood in matter of fact?

It

It is therefore less marvel, that in Answer to the preface of the Model, he breaketh forth into such vast hyperboles, *That the Model awakeneth Moses from his unknown Grave: and denieth Jesus yet to have seen the earth.* A speech as devoid of reason, as of truth. The observation of *Moses* Laws doth not awaken *Moses* out of his grave, nor is there any reason it should. The validity of Laws doth not (in reason) depend upon the life or resurrection of the Lawgiver: the Examiner himself (I suppose) would not doubt, but the Laws of *Moses* were of force to the *Israelites* in the Land of *Canaan*, when yet *Moses* was dead and buried before their entrance into the Land. Neither did their observation of them awaken *Moses* out of his grave, but argued his Laws to be in force as well after his death, as whilst he was yet living. If it be said, That Christ at his coming in the flesh when he was buried himself, buried also the Laws of *Moses* with him in his grave.

Then the Examiner should not have said, that the Model raised up *Moses* out of his grave, but that it raised up Christ out of his grave.

If it be said again, the Examiner saith, It denied Christ to have seen the earth, which was of as ill consequence. Be it so: but yet still, this maketh nothing to the raising up of *Moses* out of his grave.

I Answer further, Neither doth it at all deny, Christ to have seen the earth. For Christ came not to destroy the Law of *Moses*, *Matthew* 5:17. Neither the Moral Law: for if the sequel of that Chapter, he doth at large expound it, and establish it:

No, nor did he come to destroy the judicial Laws, such of them as are of Moral equity. Or else, the Conscience of the civil Magistrate could never do any act of civil justice out of faith, because he should have no word of God to be the ground of his action, if the Laws of judgement in the Old Testament were abrogated, and none extant in the New. As for the exception, which the Examiner taketh against the Preface. It is as easily avoided, as Objected.

*If (saith he) the civil Magistrate (even the highest) being a Member of the Church, be subject to Church-Censure, how can this stand with their common Tenent, that he must keep the first Table, Reform the*

*Church, be Judge and Governor in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as Civil?*

*Secondly, how can a Magistrate both sit on the Bench, and stand at the Bar of Christ Jesus? Is it not as impossible, as to reconcile east and west together? Yea, is not the Text in Isaiah 49:23 Lamentably wrested to prove both these?*

### ***Reply***

One Answer may easily remove both Exceptions: And that one Text doth expressly hold forth both these Points, which the Examiner conceiveth to be so irreconcilable.

For if Princes be nursing Fathers to the Church (as that Text speaketh) then they are to provide, that the children of the Church be not nursed with poison instead of milk. And in so doing, they keep the first Table. *Reform the Church, & judge in causes Ecclesiastical,*

Again, If the same Princes shall bow down to the Church with their faces towards the earth, and list the dust of her feet (as the same Tax expresseth) then they being members of the Church, shall be subject also to Church-Censure. In one word, Princes sit on the Bench over the Church in the offensive Government of the Church: & yet may themselves (being members of the Church) be subject to Church-Censure in the offensive Government of themselves against the Rules of the Gospel.

The Examiner himself confesseth, that in several respects, *He that is a governor may also be a Subject.*

Behold here are several respects, to wit, several objects of Judicature; In the Mal-Administration of the Church, the Magistrate sitteth as Judge, and Governor: in the Mal-Administration of a Church-Member-Magistrate are contrary to the express rules of the Gospel, he is subject to the power of Christ in the Church. If it be said, nay rather, The Church is subject to the Church in spiritual causes:

I Answer, That easeth not the difficulty, no more than the other. For suppose the Magistrate (a Church member) live in Incest, break forth into murder, and notorious oppression: these are all civil causes, belonging to the second Table. If the Magistrate sit as Judge and supreme Governor in this case, then must the

the Church tolerate him herein, to the dishonour of the great Name of Christ, to the leavening of the Church, and to the perdition of his soul. If it be granted, that in such a case though civil, the Church is bound to deal faithfully with the Magistrate, and not to suffer sin upon him: let the like power be granted to the Magistrate to deal faithfully with the Church in the notorious transgressions of the first Table, as is granted to the Church to deal with the Magistrate in the notorious transgressions of the second Table, and the controversy is ended.

If any further matter be claimed in making the Supreme Magistrate, the Supreme Judge and Governor in all causes, as well Ecclesiastical, as civil, I do not understand, that the Ministers or Churches of Christ are called to acknowledge such a meaning. Sure I am, the Interpretation of that high style, which godly learned *Reynolds* made of it in the 10 Chapter of his Conference with *Hart*, It was accepted of the State in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*. And the same interpretation (if no more be intended by that style) doth well stand with our defence.

But wherefore do I put my sickle into the Harvest of my Brethren? my Brethren, who penned that Model, are richly furnished by Christ with ability to defend it. I therefore leave it to them, whom it chiefly concerneth, to maintain the Truth, which themselves have witnessed in that Model.

And the Lord Jesus Christ himself (the God of Truth) who came into the world, that he might bear witness to the Truth, be pleased to bear witness from Heaven to his own Truth and blast that peace (a fraudulent and false peace) which the Examiner proclaimeth to all the ways of falsehood in Religion, to Heresy in Doctrine, to idolatry in worship, to blasphemy of the great Name of God, to Pollution, and profanation of all his holy Ordinances.

*Amen, Even So, Come Lord Jesus.*

A REPLY



---

**A REPLY TO  
Mr. WILLIAMS his  
EXAMINATION;**

**And Answer of the Letters sent  
to him by JOHN COTTON.**

**S**uch a Letter to such a purpose, I do remember I wrote unto Mr. *Williams* about half a score years ago. But whether this printed Letter be a true Copy thereof, or no, I do not know; for the Letter being sent so long since, and no Copy of it (that I can find) reserved by me; I can own it no further then I find the matter and style, expressing the judgement which I then had of his cause of Separation, and the affection I bare unto his person. And for ought I see, the Letter doth not unfitly express both.

But how it came to be put in print, I cannot imagine. Sure I am it was without my privitie: and when I heard of it, it was to me unwelcome News, as knowing the truth, and weight of *Pliny's* speech, *Aliud est scribere uni, aliud omnibus*. There be who think it was published by Mr. *Williams* himself, or by some of his friends, who had the Copy from him. Which latter might be the more probable, because himself denieth the publishing of it: and it sticketh in my mind that I received many years ago, a refutation of it (in a brothy and ingenuous way) from a stranger to me, but one (as I hear) well affected to him, Mr. *Sabine Staresmore*. To whom I hold long ago returned an Answer, but that he did

A a

not

not direct me where my Letter might find him. But I do not suspect Mr. *Staresmore*, nor Mr. *Williams* himself to have published it; but rather for some other (unadvised) Christian, who (having gotten a copy of the Letter, took more liberty, then God alloweth, to draw such a private Admonition to public notice in a disorderly way.

But howsoever it was, upon the publishing of this Letter, Mr. *Williams* hath taken occasion (as is observed by some who are acquainted with the Spirit of the man) first to rise up against me (the meanest of many) in the examining and refuting of that Lecter: And then (as if one *Mordecai* were too small a morsel) to stand forch against all the Churches. and Elders in *New-England*, in his *Bloudy Tenent*: And then (as if *New-England* were but an handful) from thence to rise up against the choicest Ornaments of two populous Nations, *England* and *Scotland*, the reverend Assembly of Divines, together with the reverend Brethren of the Apology: and above them all to address himself (according to his high thoughts) to propound Quæries of high concernment (as he calleth them) to the High and Honourable Court of Parliament, So a Bird of prey, affecting to soar aloft, getteth first upon the top of a molehill, and from thence taketh his rise from Pale to Tree, till he have furmounted the highest Mountains.

In this apprehension of him they are the more confirmed, as having discerned the like frame of Spirit in his former walking a-amongst us. Time was, when of all Christian Churches, the Churches of *New-England* were accounted, and professed by him, to be the most pure: and of all the Churches in *New-England*, *Salem* (where himself was Teacher) to be the most pure. But when the Churches of *New-England* woke just offence at sundry of his proceedings, he first renounced communion with them all: and because the Church of *Salem* refused to join with him in such a groundless Censure, he then renounced communion, with *Salem* also. And then fell off from his Ministry, and then from all Church-fellowship, and then from his Baptism, (and was himself baptized again) and then from the Lord's Supper, and from all Ordinances of Christ dispensed in any Church-way, till God shall stir up himself, or some other new Apostles to, recover, and restore all the Ordinances, and Churches of Christ out of the ruins of Antichristian Apostacy.

But

But for mine own part, whatsoever thoughts, others (who seem to know him well) have conceived of his Spirit, and course in these things: yet I choose rather to leave all Judgement of him, to Him, who seeth, and searcheth the heart, and reins, and will one day bring every secret thing, yea the very thoughts, and intents of the sons of men, unto righteous Judgement.

Nevertheless, seeing the Tree is known by his fruits, I do rather apprehend, that he knowing the Spirit breatheth where he pleaseth, and conceiving himself to have received a clearer illumination and apprehension of the estate of Christ's Kingdom, and of the purity of holy Communion, then all Christendom (yea even Christendom it self is an unsavoury word to him) he therefore taketh it to be his duty, to give public advertisement, and admonition to all men, whether of meaner note, (such as my self) or of more public note, and place, of the corruptions of Religion, which himself observeth in their judgement, and practice. Neither would I deny, *but that* (to use his own words) *God sometimes stirreth up one Elijah against eight hundred of Baals Priests, one Micaiah against four hundred of Ahabs Prophets; one Athanasius against many hundreds of Arian Bishops; one John Hus against the whole Counsel of Constance; Luther and the two witnesses against thousands, &c.* And therefore I durst not neglect much less despise any advertisement from him alone against so many; provided that the word of the Lord be found in his mouth, or pen. I come therefore to consider, and weigh what he saith to my self, without prejudice against him, and (I hope) without partiality to my self.

In his Epistle to the Reader, before his Answer to my Letter, he utterly misconstrueth the ground and scope, whether of this Letter, or of any other Letters of mine to him, *As if I wrote upon occasion of the grief, which some friends conceived, that such an one as himself (publicly acknowledged to be godly, and dearly beloved) should be exposed to the mercy of an howling Wilderness, in frost and snow, &c. And that my intent in writing was, to take off the edge of Censure from my self, by professing in speech, and writing, That I was no procurer of his sorrows, &c.* In which few lines, sour things present themselves, which if they be cleared, may dear both his mistake of himself, and his cause, and together therewith the innocency of others.

1. When he speaketh of himself as one publicly acknowledged

ged, to be godly and dearly beloved, I did never perceive just ground for such public acknowledgement. For before my coming into *New-England*, the godly-wife, and vigilant Ruling-Elder of *Plymouth* (aged Mr. *Brewster*) had warned the whole Church of the danger of his spirit, which moved the better part of the Church, to be glad of his removal from them into the Bay. And in the Bay not long before my coming, he began to oppose the Kings Patent with much vehemency, (as he had done at *Plymouth* before;) which made the Magistrates to fear, they should have more to do with him, then with a man publicly acknowledged to be godly, and dearly beloved,

Soon after, when upon hearing of some Episcopal, and malignant practises against the Country, the Magistrates, and whole general Court thought meet to take a trial of the fidelity of the people (not by Imposing upon them, but) by offering to them an Oath of Fidelity, That in case any should refuse, they might not betruest them with place of public Command; He vehemently withstood it, partly because it was Christ's Prerogative to have his Office established by Oath; partly, because an Oath was a part of Gods worship, and many of the people being carnal (as he conceived) it was not meet to put upon them an Oath, which was an act or God's worship. Upon such, and the like disturbances to the Civil Peace (for upon this sundry refused the Oath, and upon their refusal the Magistrates could not discern how the people stood affected to the public Safety) therefore, both the Magistrates, and sundry Elders (though I do not remember my self to be one) advised the Church of *Salem*, not to proceed to choose him (as they were then about to do) unto office in the Church. Yea and in *Salem* (though many of the Members were taken with him) some judicious amongst them told me, they could not choose him to office, because they found him to be contrary to the Apostles rule) αὐθάδης, self-pleasing, self-full, or (as it is translated) self-willed, *Tit.* 1. 7. Nevertheless, the major part of the Church made choice of him. Soon after the Church of *Salem* made suit to the Court, for a parcel of Land, which lay commodious for them: But the Court delayed to grant their request, because the Church had refilled to hearken to their motion, in forbearing the choice of Mr. *Williams*, Which so much incensed Mr. *Williams*, that he caused  
the

the Church to join with him, in writing Letters of Admonition to all the Churches, whereof any of the Magistrates were members, to admonish their Magistrates of their breach of the rule of Justice, in not granting their Petition. Which following upon all the former disturbances raised by Mr. *Williams*, it still aggravated the former jealousies, which generally, the judicious fort of Christians had conceived of his self-conceited, and unquiet, and unlambelike frame of his Spirit: So that from first to last of my knowledge of him here, I cannot see, nor say, what ground he had of such a Testimony, as he giveth of himself, as of one *publicly acknowledged to be godly, and dearly beloved*.

2. *When he maketh it an occasion of my excuse of my self, (from having an hand in his sufferings) that some friends were much grieved that such an one should be exposed to such sufferings.*

I do believe indeed, that not some friends only, but many were grieved at the unmoveable stiffness, and headiness of his Spirit, that exposed him to such sufferings.

*But he doth not well to say, that same friends were grieved, that one so publicly acknowledged, should be exposed to such sufferings; thereby to intimate as if his sufferings were greater then his deservings. For neither might such friends be truly called his friends; nor was their judgement of any weight in his cause. For they cleaved to him, and his cause, not out of judicious charity, but out of an itching levity, taken with every wind of new Doctrine: which soon after appeared. For within a short time, when his new Notions grew stale to them, they separated from him, (as he from them) and began to listen after a more prodigious Minter of exorbitant novelties, (the very dregs of Familism) held forth by one Mr. Gorton. Gorton at first arrived in our Bay, and continued a while in our Town, till a reverend Minister in London, (Mr. Walker) sent over Directions to some friends, to demand an 100.<sup>li</sup> debt of him, which he having borrowed of a Citizen, the Citizen bequeathed it to some good use, whereof Mr. Walker was called to some Trust. But then Mr. Gorton departed out of this Jurisdiction to Plymouth: and there beginning to spread some of his Opinions, to the disturbance of the Church, and fearing disturbance to himself, he came to Rhode-Island; and there raising some seditious disturbance against the Magistrates, he met with public correction. From thence there-*

therefore he went to *Providence*, the place where Mr. *Williams*, (and those some friends he spake of) sat down. But those friends of Mr. *Williams* were soon taken with that greater Light, which they conceived was held forth by Mr. *Gorton*.

What kind of light that was came to our view upon this occasion: One or two of the *Indian-Sagamores*, who lived near *Providence*, came over into the Bay, to offer the subjection of themselves, and their people, to the Government of the *English*, hoping by this means to avoid the oppression of the *Narhagansets* (their potent Neighbours) as also of Mr. *Gorton's* company, who took their lands from them. Afterwards those *Indians* complaining to our Magistrates of some further injury done to them by Mr. *Gorton's* company; our Court sent over to Mr. *Gorton's* company, requiring some of them to come over, and shew what right they had to those lands, which they had taken from the *Indians*, their Subjects. He and his company instead of coming, or sending any to clear their Right, sent two Books written by some of themselves, full of sundry heresies, and malignant blasphemies, against *Christ*, against his Churches, Ministers, Sacraments, Censures, and Magistrates: yet withal offered that if this Court would send their Agents over unto them, they would desire their Right to the Land, which they took from the *Indians*. The Court therefore sent over some, with Commission to Treat with them; and because *Gorton's* company had threatened the former Messengers with the offer of some violence, they therefore sent as many armed men with these, as might secure their Agents from injury: And in case they refused to show the right, and equity of their cause, then to bring some of the principal of them, by strong hand, to clear it here. When hither they were come, (not to digress to another Story) *Gorton*, desiring liberty to speak his mind freely, held it forth (as the mind of himself, and his company,) (whereof those of Mr. *Williams* his friends were no small part;) *That Christ was Incarnate whm Adam was made after God's Image: For God had but one Image, and that Image was Christ. And this making of Adam in that Image, was the exinanition of Christ.* But when it was objected, that that exinanition of Christ was unto life in *Adam*, but Christ was to suffer exinanition unto death: He answered; *that Christ died whm the Image of God died: and the Image of God died in Adam's fall.*

But

But when it was further objected, That Christ's death was the Price and Purchase of our Redemption; but the fall of *Adam* was not the Price of our Redemption, but the cause of our condemnation. He stopped, and would neither proceed to clear his mind further, nor by any means be persuaded to revoke that hellish blasphemy. These, and many such like Tenents were vented by him, and his company: and this company was made up of those friends of Mr. *Williams*, who (as he saith) were grieved at his exposure to the mercy of the Wilderness. Which I thought meet to declare, lest any should think that his sufferings (considering the causes of them) were grievous or offensive to godly minds.

Where by the way, a sincere hearted humble Christian may easily discern the vast difference between the spirit of Mr. *Williams*, and of *John* the Apostle, in relating their sufferings by way of Banishment: *John* was a beloved Disciple, yea (by way of eminency) the Disciple whom Jesus loved: and He, for the testimony of Jesus, was banished by the bloody Emperour *Domitian*, into the Isle of *Patmos*, a desolate Wilderness, destitute (for the most part) of Inhabitants: yet he maketh no express mention of his Banishment, nor of the howling Wilderness, nor of frost, and snow, and such winter miseries: But (saith he) *I was in the Isle of Patmos for the Testimony of Jesus*. But Mr. *Williams* being called by a weak man beloved in Christ, he aggravateth the banishment of such an one as himself, by all the sad exaggerations, which wit and words could well paint it out withal; to wit, *That he was, namely for the holy Truth of Christ Jesus, denied the common air to breathe in, and a civil cohabitation upon the same common earth, yea and without mercy, and humane compassion exposed to winter miseries in an howling Wilderness, in frost, and snow, and that amongst Barbarians*. So deeply affected the sons of men can be in describing their own sufferings for themselves, and their own ways, above what the children of God be in their far greater sufferings for the Testimony of Jesus.

3. What causes moved the Magistrates so to proceed against him at that time, is fully declared by another faithful and diligent hand, in another Treatise of that matter.

But whereas he saith, *He was exposed to the mercies of an howling Wilderness in frost and snow, &c.*

The truth is, the Sentence of his Banishment out of the Patent  
was

was pronounced against him in the Court before winter; and respite was given him to tarry certain weeks (six or more) to prepare for his journey.

In the mean time, some of his friends went to the place appointed by himself before hand, to make provision of housing, and other necessities for him against his coming; otherwise he might have chosen to have gone either Southward to his acquaintance at *Plymouth*, or Eastward to *Pascatoque*, or *Aganimiticus*. And then the wilderness had been as no wilderness, (at least, no howling wilderness) where men sit down under warm and dry Roofs, sheltered from the annoyance of frost, and snow, and other winter hardships.

4. When he saith, *That itself professed in speech and writing, that I was no procurer of his sorrowes.* I do not believe that I made any such profession at all, either in speech, or writing. For it was my serious intendment, (if it had been the will of God to breath in such weak means for such an end) to have procured his unfained godly forrow for his Errors in Judgement, and for his offensive disturbances of Churches, and Common-wealth. But this is that which I have professed, That I had no hand in procuring, or soliciting the Sentence of his Banishment. And that not for the cause, which he noteth in his margent, as if I had some reluctancy in my self, concerning the way of Persecution.

For 1. I did never doubt, that the way of perfecution, (truly so called) that is, the affliction of others for righteousness sake, was utterly unlawful.

2. I did never believe, that the sentence passed against him was an act of Persecution.

3. Nor did I ever see cause to doubt, but that in some cases, (such as this of his was,) Banishment is a lawful, and just punishment: if it be in proper speech a punishment at all in such a Country as this is, where the Jurisdiction (whence a man is banished) is but small, and the Country round about it, large, and fruitful: where a man may make his choice of variety of more pleasant, and profitable feats, then he leaveth behinde him. In which respect, Banishment in this Country, is not counted so much a confinement, as an enlargement, where a man doth noe so much loose civil comforts, as change them. And as for spiritual liberties, (liberty

berty of Church Ordinances) they were a burden and bondage to his spirit here: And therefore he cast them off, before they left him; neither doth he to this day, look at it as a way of God, for any Christian man to look after the Ordinances of God in a Church-estate at all; As conceiving that the Apostacy of Antichrist hath so far corrupted all, that there can be no recovery out of thar Apostacy, till Christ shall send forth new Apostles to plant Churches anew,

But as for the true cause why I meddled not in his civil Censure, it was, chiefly because Civil Censures belong unto another Kingdom, then that which we are called to administer: (Civil Censures are not the weapons of our warfare:) and partly also because I was carried (as still I am) with a compassion of his Person, and likewise of his wife, (a woman as then, of a meek and modest spirit) who a long time suffered in spirit, (as I was informed) for his offensive course which occasioned him for a season to withdraw communion in spiritual duties, even from her also, till at length he drew her to partake with him in the error of his way.

But Mr. *Williams* affirmeth, *That in Letters past between him, and me, he proved, and expressed, that if he had perished in that sorrowful winters flight, only the blood of Christ could have washed me from the guilt of his.*

*Answ.* That he did express such a thing in some Letters to me, as I do not remember it, so neither will I deny it: but that he proved it, I may as safely deny it, as he boldly affirm it. Could he then have given any such proofs, doubtless he would not have concealed them now, when he undertaketh to clear to the world the pretended innocency of himself, and the supposed iniquity of his supposed Persecutors. How precious the blood of Christ is to me and how needful (I bless the Lord) my soul knoweth: but that I needed it to wash away the guilt of any injurious proceedings against the blood of Mr. *Williams*, (I speak it in holy confidence) I never discerned it to this day. The proofs which he alledgeth in the sequel for my hand in his Banishment, I shall (God willing) clear them anon in due place. Mean while, what answers I made to him concerning the same in other Letters, he wisely concealeth: but contendeth himself to tell us, that my small Answer was; *That had he perished in his flight, his blood had been upon*

*his own head: It was his sin to procure it, and his sorrow to suffer it.*

If this was my small Answer, it seemeth I gave him other further Answers: what they were I have now forgotten; but I suppose, had they been insufficient, or impertinent, I should have heard of them.

But what is amiss in this sin all Answer? The margent noteth it, "*as an unmerciful speech, of a merciful man.*"

But when it shall please the Father or mercies to soften the heart of Mr. *Williams*, and to give him an heart, and ear to hearken unto the wholesome Counsel of his true friends, he will at length see the speech was truly merciful, as well as the man that spake it. *When a Fountain it opened to Hierusalem for sin, and for uncleanness*, the Prophets who have deceived the people shall at length see, and acknowledge their error, and being demanded the cause of the wounds in their hands, They shall answer (each of them for himself) *thus was I wounded in the house of my Friends*, Zech. 13. 1. with verses 4, 5, 6. An heart softened with the Blood of Christ, will judge the wounds of his friends faithful; *Prov.* 27. 6. I mean, such reproofs for sin, which though they may seem to wound, yet wound to heal, *David* thought such smiting to be a kindness, yea an excellent Oil, which doth not betake the head; but haal the heart, *Psal.* 141, 5.

There is one thing more in his Epistle to the Readers which calleth for Answer:

*It cannot now* (saith he) *be justly offensive, that finding this Letter public, (by whose procurement know not) I now present to public view my formerly intended Answer,*

*Answ.* It had not been offensive to me, that he did present his Answer to public view, if he found my Letter public, without his own, or his friends procurement: especially if his Answer had been returned in words of truth, and faithfulness. Which how far they fall short of, I hope (by the help of Christ) will appear in the sequel.

Mean while, I fear it is justly offensive to the Spirit of Grace, and Love, That whereas he judged me to allow my self, and others, to rest securely in the Doctrine, and Practise of bloody Persecution, that all this while (even for the space of nine or ten years) be suffered me to sleep so long so quietly under the guilt of such a crying

crying sin. Nay, it may seem by his own words, if he had not found my Letter public, it my be doubted whether ever I should have heard any further word from him hereabouts, at all. If I had been esteemed as a Brother, sin should not have been suffered to lie so long upon a Brother, *Levit. 9. 17.* If an enemy, yet the very Ox or Ass of an enemy, is not to be suffered to lie so long groveling under his burden, *Deut. 22. 4.*

But when he addeth in the next sentence; *That he rejoiceth in the goodness, and wisdom of him, who is the Father of lights, and mercies, in ordering the season of his own present opportunity of Answer.*

I confess we on the contrary have cause to admire, and adore the wisdom, and dreadful Justice of God herein, That seeing Mr. *Williams* hath been now as a branch curt off from the Church of *Salem* these many years, he should bring forth no spiritual good fruits in due season: and that which he bringeth forth now at the last is bitter, and wild fruit: and that in such a season, when the Spirit of Error is let loose to deceive so many thousand souls of our English Nation: So that now their hearts are become as Tinder, ready to catch and kindle at every spark of false light. Even so, O Father, because thy good pleasure is such, to let loose this Spirit of Error in the mouth of this Backslider, in the very hour and power of darkness: for these are the days of vengeance; when the Antinomians deny the whole Law; the Anti-Sabbatarians deny the Morality of the fourth Commandement; the Papists deny the Negative part the second Commandment. It is a woeful opportunity that God hath left Mr. *Williams* to, now to step in, and deny the Affirmative part of it also, (as the Papists do the Negative) and so He and the Papist; to combine together to evacuate the whole second Commandement altogether. For, take away (as Mr. *Williams* doth) all Instituted worship of God, as Churches, Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, Members, public Ministry of the Word, Covenant, Seals of the Covenant, (Baptism, and the Lord's Supper) the Censures of the Church, and the like, what is then least of all the Institutions, and Ordinances of God, which the Lord established in the second Commandement, against the Institutions, Images, and Inventions of men in his worship? But it is an holy wisdom, and righteousness of the Lord, that he that refuseth the Communion with the Churches of the Saints, should

join in communion with the enemies of the Saints, even Antichristians; and that in such a worke, as to blot out and extinguish that holy second Commandment of the Law: The violating whereof kindleth the jealousy of the most High: and the observation thereof would have opened a door of mercy to a thousand Generations! It is no vain word of our Saviour, *He that shall break one of the least Commandments, and shall Teach men so to do, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven.*

This advice would I shut up this Point withal, (if I had any hope of an open ear in him to hear it) he that separateth from all Churches, and all Ordinances, let him at last separate also from himself: and so he shall then be better able to discern the way to return again unto holy Communion with the Lord, and his people.

Let me conclude this Preface with this Advertisement to the Reader, who may perhaps marvel, that I now (so much against my usual custom) should by open the nakedness of another to public view. I bless the Lord, I am not ignorant, That love covereth a multitude of offences: and that the Disciples of Christ, when they are reviled are taught to Bless. And therefore were the case merely mine own, and all the reproaches and slanders cast upon my self, had terminated in my self, I should have been as a deaf man, and as a dumb man that openeth not his lips. But when through my sides, not only so many Elders, and Churches in this Country, who had as much (or more) influence into his sufferings, as my self, (and yet none of us any further influence, then by private, and public conviction of himself, and of the demerit of his way;) yea when Court of Justice suffer for Justice sake: yea further, when the Truth and Righteousness of God also suffer for inflicting just recompence of reward upon the disturbers of Civil and sacred Truth, and Peace: and under pretence of maintaining Liberty of Conscience, Purity of Conscience is violated, and destroyed: In such a case as this, just it is, and equal, rather that the name of an evil-worker should justly suffer, then that the name of God called upon Judgement feats, upon the Churches of Christ, and upon the Ministers of the Gospel, should unjustly suffer for his sake.

To

---

## To his CHAP. I.

**M**y Letter to Mr. *Williams*, (which he undertaketh to Examine, and Answer) began (it seemeth) with this Compellation of him; *Beloved in Christ*, For I considered, he had been not only a member, but an Officer of the Church at *Salem*: and though from thence he was then Excommunicate; yet I took the Apostles Commandment for a Rule, *Accountt him not as an enemy but Admonish him as a Brother*, 2 Thes. 3.14. If a Brother of the Church, (though cast out of the Church, yet not cast out of Christ) then in Christ, at least in judgement of charity. And if in Christ (though but in judgement of charity, yet) in charity to be Beloved.

*But (saith Mr. Williams) how can it be well-pleasing to Christ, that one beloved in Christ, should be so afflicted, and persecuted by himself, and others, (for such causes) as to be denied the common air to breath in, and a civil cohabitation upon the same common earth, yea and also without mercy, and human compassion, be exposed to winter miseries in an howling Wilderness?*

*Ans.* If Mr. *Williams* may be Judge in his own cause, himself hath been persecuted without mercy, and without human compassion: And which the more concerneth my self to enquire into, he hath been so persecuted by me, and some others; but chiefly (it should seem) by me; for I only am charged herewith by name: and those others, who ever they were, are not so much as described, much less expressly named. But such Priests, and Persons, as be thus partial in the Law, the Holy Ghost threatneth to make them base, and contemptible in the eyes of all the People, *Mal.* 2.9. Which the Lord give him to foresee, and self, that he may timely prevent such a Judgement.

But to weigh his words particularly: Persecution is the affliction of another for Righteousness sake. Now two things it will be requisite for Mr. *Williams* to prove, to make good his charge. 1. That the cause for which he suffered, was a cause of Righteousness. 2. That he suffered this Persecution, which he complaineth of, by me. And to make this latter charge good in such manner as he layeth it upon me, it were further requisite that he should prove two things more. 1. That my self was the principal mover and actor  
in

in this his Persecution, (for I only am singled out by name;) 2. That this hath been evidenced to him by two or three witnesses at least, if he account me for an Elder of a Church, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. But whether he account me for an Elder, or no Elder. (I claim no priviledge of Office;) yet I require attendance to an eternal Law of moral Righteousness; *One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall every word be established,* Deut. 15. 15. But on the contrary, if it do appear, that the cause for which he suffered was not for Righteousness sake: and that the affliction which he did suffer was not put upon him by me at all, much less in any eminent, and singular manner, then it will behove Mr. *Williams* in Conscience to understand, that himself is the Persecutor, as of other servants of God, so of myself especially. For it is a case judged by the Holy Ghost, that he who mocketh, or reproacheth any of the least of Christ's little ones, for walking in his way, he is a Persecutor, *Gal.* 4. 29. It hath been the lot of the faithful of old to be tried by cruel mockings, *Heb.* 11. 36. If a man be publicly accused to the world as a Persecutor, in case the accusation be proved true, Persecution is a cruel, and crying sin: but if it be not proved, nor true, the false accusation is a grievous Persecution, even a cruel mocking. But I shall refer the trial of his accusation to the place himself appointed, where he giveth Instance of the cause of his sufferings.

Mean while, let him suspend his Marginal note, *That it it a monstrous Paradox, that God's children should Persecute God's children, and they that hope to live eternally with Christ Jesus in Heaven, should not suffer each other to live in the common air together.*

For though God's children may not persecute God's children, nor wicked men neither, for well-doing: yet if the children of God be found to walk in the way of the wicked, their sin is the greater, because they sin against greater light, and grace; and their Brethren (in Place) may justly afflict them for it; to deprive them, in some cases, not only of the common air of the Country by banishment, but even of the common air of the World by death: & yet hope to live eternally with them in the Heavens with Christ Jesus. Yea what if a child of God were infected with a plague-sore, or some other contagious disease, may not their Brethren exclude them

them the common air, both of their religious, and Civil Assemblies, and yet hope to live eternally with them in the Heavens? Truly there be some unsound, and corrupt opinions, and practises) (and that of him too) which are more infectious, and contagious, than any plague-sore.

That other Marginal note of his, (*What Christ Persecute Christ in New-England?*) calleth for another Answer.

Christ doth not persecute Christ in *New-England*: For Christ doth not persecute any at all, (to speake in the proper sence of Persecution;) much less doth Christ persecute Christ. For though Christ may and doth afflict his own members; yet he doth not afflict (much less persecute) Christ in them, but that which is left of old *Adam* in them, or that which is found of the seed of the Serpent in them. For even Satan may fill the heart of Church-members, *Acts* 5. 3. Yea breath and act in an Elect Apostle, *Mat.* 16. 22, 23. And then the Lord Jesus may afflict in his members, that which he seeth in them not of his own.

But he proeeeds, and asks further, (*Since Mr. Cotton expecteth far greater light than yet shineth*) *whether upon the same grounds, and practice, if Christ Jesus in any of his servants shall be pleased to hold forth a further light, shall he himself find the mercy, and humanity of Christ, and temporal life, and being with them?*

*Answ.* The greatest light that I expect is not above the Word, much less against it: nor is it destructive to the Church, and Ordinances of Christ, established according to the Word, but instructive of them in the way of the word. If therefore Christ Jesus shall come in any of his servants, holding forth a further light to us, we trust, that he that offereth us light, will give us (as hitherto he hath done) eyes to see it, and hearts to follow it. Light is discernable through the Grace of the Father of lights) by the children of light: The Spirit of the Prophets is discerned, and judged by the Prophets: Wisdom is justified of her Children: When Judgement returneth to Righteousness, all the upright in heart shall follow it: The Sheep of Christ that see his face, will see his Light, and hear his voice: his Spirit of Truth will lead them into all truth. And yet because we all know in part, and Prophecy in part, we are taught of God in meekness of wisdom to instruct one another, (till light of Instruction be obstinately rejected;) and to suffer one

one another in differences of weakness, till weakness prove wilfulness, and will not suffer Truth to live in Peace.

But what is all this to Mr. *Williams*? *Hath he therefore not found the mercy, and humaniyy of Christ, and temporal life, and being amongst us because Christ Jesus held forth by him a further light unto us?*

So it should seem, or else his Quære is nothing to the purpose; surely if it be a further light which is held forth by him, it is such a transcendent light, as putteth out all other lights in the world besides: as (they say) *Majus lumen extinguit minus*. The Churches of Christ have been wont to be counted lights, the Ministry, lights, the Sacraments, and Censures, lights. But this new light held forth by Mr. *Williams*, hath put out all these lihts, yea and all possibility of their shining forth again, till the Restitution of new Apostles. And yet if he had held forth any light from the word of light to manifest this great new light to us, truly I hope the Lord would give us hearts, not to shut our eyes against the light, but to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, and to follow the light of his word whitherdoever it leadeth us. Christian Magistrates, they also have been wonted to be counted the light of *Israel*: and Oaths likewise have been thought to give light to discern the end of all Controversies: But by this new light, we may not accept from the Patents of Princes any light or direction where to fit down, with their warrant, and leave, in foreign Plantations: Neither may we make use of the light of Oaths between Magistrates, and people, to discern of the fidelity and constancy of the one to the other in times of danger. Where then shall his Marginal Note appear?

Mr. *Cotton* (saith he) *expecting more light, must (according to his way of Persecution) Persecute Christ Jesus, if he bring it.*

Doth Mr. *Williams* hold me so far forsaken of common sense, as to frustrate, and destroy mine own expectations? If I expect more light, must I (according to mine own way) needs Persecute him that brings it, yea persecute Christ himself, if he bring it? But thus when a man's head runneth round, he thinketh all the House runneth round about him.

But what is my way of Persecution, according to which, I expecting more light, musst needs persecute him that brings it? It is but a few days ago, since there came to my hand a book, published

shed (as is said) by Mr. *Williams*, and entituled, *The Bloody Tenent*. In which Mr. *Williams* (without my privity) published a private Letter of mine, and therewith a Confutation of it, touching Persecution for cause of Conscience. In my stating of that Question, (which he relateth in the 7th Page of that Book) he declareth my Judgement to be so far from persecuting any for cause of Conscience, that he layeth it down for my first Conclusion; *That it is not lawful to persecute any for Conscience sake rightly informed [that is to say, bringing more, and true light.]*

2. *For an erroneous and blind Conscience, (even in fundamental, and weigly Points) it is not lawful to persecute any, till after Admonition once or twice, according to the Apostles direction, Tit. 3. 10, 11. that so such a man being convinced of the dangerous error of his way; if he still persist (being condemned of himself, ver. 11.) it may appear, he is not persecuted for Cause of Conscience, but for sinning against his own Conscience.*

3. *In things of less moment, whether Points of Doctrine or worship, if a man hold them forth in aspirit of Christian meekness and love, (though with zeal and constancy) he is not to be persecuted, but tolerated, till God may be pleased to manifest his Truth to him, Phil. 3. 17.*

Rom. 14. 11, 12, 13, 14.

4. *But if a man hold forth or profess any error, or false way, with a boisterous, and arrogant spirit, to the dsturbance of Civil Peace, he may justly be punished according to the measure of the disturbance caused by him.*

This is that way of Persecution which Mr. *Williams* expresseth to be mine. In all which I durst appeal to Mr. *Williams* his own Conscience, (were it not Leavened, with over-deep prejudice) whether in all this way there be any crevise opening a door for the Persecution of Christ himself bringing further light?

Let no man take it amiss, that (in the Parenthesis) I intimate, the Conscience of Mr. *Williams* in this case to be leavened with overmuch prejudice. For if extreme prejudice were not predominant in him in this case, I should stand amazed how a man of understanding could out of such Conclusions make up this Inference; which he gives in the Title of the Chapt, pag. 7. *That I do professedly maintain Persecution for Cause of Consciene.* I that do expressly, professedly deny Persecution of any, even of Heretics, unless it be

when they come to persist in heresy, after conviction, against conscience: how can I be said to maintain Persecution for Cause of Conscience? But oh the woeful perverseness and blindness of a Conscience, when it is left of God, to be so far transported with prejudice, as to judge a Cause of Conscience, and a cause against Conscience to be all one.

For the shutting up of his Chapter, he is pleased to Comment upon a phrase in my Letter, wherein I styled myself a man of uncircumcised lips. And he doth acknowledge it to be *an holy Character of an heavenly Spirit, to make an ingenuous, and true acknowledgement of an uncircumcised lip.* Yet (saith he) *that discerning Spirit, which God graciously vouchsafeth to them that tremble at his Word, shall find, that not only the will-worships of men may be painted, and varnished over with the glittering shew of Humility, Colos. 2. but even God's dearest servants (eminent for humility, and meekness) may yet be troubled with a swelling of spiritual pride, out of the very sence of their humility, &c. Humility is never in season to set up superstition, or persecute Gods children.*

*Answ.* I could intreat some or other of Mr. *Williams* his acquaintance (whose words may find better acceptance with him, then mine do) to persuade him, not to attribute too much to his own Spirit of discerning; which though he truly saith, God doth vouchsafe to them that tremble at his word: yet I never read, nor heard, that God did vouchsafe a Spirit of discerning to any that are so far from trembling at the word, that they do not vouchsafe to hear the word from the mouth of so many thousand faithful Ministers of the Gospel. As for me, I desire not to neglect any word from the mouth of Mr. *Williams*, (upon what pretence soever spoken) that putteth me in mind of spiritual pride) arising out of the very sense of humility. Such smiting shall nor break my head.

But when he concludeth with this Aphorism; *Humility is never in season to set up superstition, or to persecute God's children.*

I desire it may be considered, what is Superstition? what is Persecution? and whether my Letter unto him tended to fet up the one, or to set forward the other?

Superstition is properly *cultus supra statutum*, which I speak not from the Etymology of the word, (for I know Latinists do otherwise

wise derive it) but from the nature of the thing. And what is Persecution? It hath been answered above, the affliction of any for their Righteousness sake. If it appear in the sequel, that my Letter tended either to set up any worship of God, which he hath not appointed, or to afflict any for their Righteousness sake, then I will consent it tended to set up Superstition, and Persecution: And the humility which he acknowledgeth to be expressed in my Letter, I shall acknowledge to be out of season: Mean while, *Affirmanti incumbit Probatio*.

---

## TO CHAP. II.

**H**is second Chapter is spent in answering to a double charge, which he saith, he observeth, I laid against him. Though in very Truth, I laid neither of them down as charges against him, but as discharges to my self from expressing that *He should vouchsafe to hearken to my voice, who had refused to hearken both to the voice of the body of the whole Church of Salem (whereof he was a member) and to the voices of so many Elders, and brethren of other Churches.*

But suppose I did charge him with a double sin in refusing to hearken to this double voice, (though I did not say it was a sin:) how doth he discharge himself? *For neglect of the former, he excuseth himself by the charge of his Office, which lay upon him, on a Fast-day to discover to them eleven public sins, as causes of the present, and public calamities. Which most of the Church seemed at first to assent unto, until afterwards, the greater part of the Church (whether for fear of Persecution, or otherwise) was swayed, and bowed to practise such things, which with sighs and groans many of them mowned under.*

But will this indeed discharge an Elder of the Church before the Lord, from coming into the presence of the Church, when they send for him, because the greater part of them, *are bowed, and swayed for fear of Persecution, to slip, and slide, and to say and practise that, which with sighs and groans they mowned under?* Why then, if the Wolf come, and scatter the sheep, and they slip out of the way, let the Shepherd fly, and leave them; that the word of the Lord Jesus might be fulfilled; *He that is an Hireling, and not the Shepherd,*

*whose own the sheep are not, he seeth the Wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth, and the Wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep, Job. 10. 12.*

Or will it goe for current Doctrine before the Lord, that if the greater part of a Church fall (through fear, or otherwise) into sin, and such a sin, which they mourn under with sighs, and groans, and which in it self is not heinous, that then they do *ipso facto*, cease to be a Church, and utterly to be cast out? Why then let the Covenant between the Lord and his Church be no more reputed any branch of the Covenant of Grace, but let it stand and fall as a Covenant of works.

But surely if the greater part of the Church were gone astray, I should think it would well become the faithfulness of a Church-Elder, to hasten to them, (specially when he is lovingly and respectively sent for) and to convince them of the error of their way before the Lord, and to seek to bring them back again to the Bishop and Shepherd of their souls. Sure I am, that in a case of greater defection of the Churches of *Galatia*, then Mr. *Williams* imagined was found in the Church of *Salem*; *Paul* did not reject them, but professed; *I desire* (saith he) *to be present with you now, and to change my voice, for I stand in doubt of you*, Gal. 4. 20.

Mr. *Williams* acknowledgeth in the next Paragraph, *That the Church of Colossæ might say to Archippus; Take, heed to thy Ministry, and that Archippus might negligently, and proudly refuse to hearken to them: but for his case, his faithfulness, and uprightness to God, and the souls of the people will witness for him, when his soul shall come to Hezekiah's case on his death-bed, and in the great day approaching.*

I do not know but that *Archippus* might as justly refuse to hearken to the Church of *Colossæ*, as Mr. *Williams* to the Church of *Salem*. What though *Colossæ* was more eminent in gifts then *Salem*, yet the mutual power, and subjection of Pastor and people, dependeth not upon eminency of gifts, but upon the Institution of Christ, and their mutual Covenant, and Relation. If it had been a negligent and proud part in *Archippus* (as Mr. *Williams* confesseth) to refuse to hearken to the lawful voice of the Church of *Colossæ*, admonishing him of his slackness in his Ministry: I know not but it might be such a like part in Mr. *Williams* to refuse to hearken to the voice of the Church of *Salem*, admonishing him to  
take

take heed of deserting his Ministry. Whether is a greater sin in a Minister, not to fulfill his Ministry, or to desert his Ministry? Neither do I know but that *Archippus* might have pretended the like evasions with Mr. *Williams*, if not fairer. For he might plead there were amongst them, such as spoiled them through Philosophy, and vain deceit, after the Traditions of men, and Rudiments of the world, and not after Christ, (*Col.* 2. 8.) that beguiled them also in a voluntary humility, and worship of Angels, not holding the Head, (*ver.* 18, 19.) Yea so far that themselves come to be dogmatized with the Traditions of men, *ver.* 20, 21, 22, And why might not then *Archippus* as justly refuse to hear the Church of *Colossæ*, as Mr. *Williams* refuse to hear the Church of *Salem*?

Let not Mr. *Williams* please himself in suiting his faithfulness, and uprightness to *Hezekiah's* case. *Hezekiah* faithfully, and uprightly endeavoured, and (through grace) procured the reformation of the Apostate Church of *Hiemsalem* in the days of his Father *Ahaz*: But Mr. *Williams* in stead of reforming one Church, renounceth all.

*For he neglect of hearkening to the second voice, the voice and testimony of so many Elders, and Brethren of other Churches; He saith (because he truly esteemeth the Persons) he will not answer the Argument of numbers, and multitudes against one, as our men are wont to answer the Popish universality, that God stirreth up sometimes one Elijah against eight hundred of Baal's Priests, &c. But this he saith that David himself, and the Princes of Israel, and 30000. of Israel carrying up the Ark, were not to be hearkened unto in their holy intentions of rejoycings, and triumphs, when the due order of the Lord was wanting to them. In which case one Scripture in the mouth of a Mechanic, it to be preferred before a whole Councel.*

*Answ.* I will not here observe (as Mr. *Williams* doth in a like case, in Chap. 38. of his *Bloody Tenent*) his hast and light attention to the Scriptures which himself alledgeth. The Text speaketh but of 450. of *Baal's* Priests, *1 Kings* 18. 19. Now for him to multiply them to 800, is to fetch in also the Prophets of the Groves, (the Prophets of *Jeroboam's* Calves) whom the Text expressly distinguisheth from the Prophets of *Baal*.

But to let that pass, as not material to the Argument, (no more then the misquotation, which he, observeth of *Titus* for *Timothy*)

*thy*) we will not reply as the Papists due against single witnesses, let him call for fire from Heaven as *Elijah* did, and we will submit the testimonies of many to one single witness: No we call not for Miracles at his hand: but let him produce one testimony of holy Scripture (rightly understood, and applied) against the advice, and voice of those Elders, and Brethren, and then though he be but one (yea though that one were but a Mechanic too) we shall gratify his demand, and (by the Grace of Christ) be ready rather to hearken to him, than require that he should hearken to us.

Meanwhile, we answer him as the Apostle did to the *Corinthians*, (1 Cor. 14. 36.) *What, came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?*

It is true, *David* and the Princes, and the 30000. of *Israel*, were not to be hearkened unto, nor followed in their disorderly carrying of the Ark; because the word of the Lord had given express order to the contrary, requiring that the *Kohathites* should bear the Ark upon their shoulders, and not touch it, least they die, *Num.* 4. 15. Let him shew us the like order violated by us, and we shall freely excuse him (yea and justify him) in not hearkening to us, nor following of us.

But suppose some one Proppher, or Brother of *Israel*, had discerned the disorder of *David*, and of the whole Congregation of the 30000, of *Israel*, and had therefore not only refused to follow them, but had proceeded further (as many of Christ's Disciples did with him, *Job.* 6. 66.) to go back from them with an utter Apostasy, and to walk no more with them, no not though they were willing to reform their disorder, if any were made known to them? Would *Perez Uzzah* have justified that? Or did that disorder of *David*, and of that Congregation of *Israel*, dischurche them all from fellowship with God, or discharge their Brethren from having any fellowship with them, as with the Church of God?

### TO CHAP. III.

THIS third Chapter is taken up in answering to a Phrase in my Letter, in which I had said, *I endeavourd to shew him the sandiness of those grounds, upon which he had banished himself from the fellowship of all the Churches in this Country.*

The

The sum of his Answer is, *That his grounds were the firm rock of the truth of Jesus, and that my endeavours to prove them sandy, are but the weak, and uncertain sand of man's Invention, which shall therefore perish, and burn like hay, or stubble; And the Rocky strength of his ground shall appear in the Lord's season, and that my self also may yet confess so much, as I have (since I came to New-England) confessed the sandiness of the grounds of many of my Practises in Old England: and the rockiness of their grounds that witnessed against me, and them: for Instance, that himself had discovered to me, and other servants of God, his grounds against the use of the Common Prayer Book: which though they then seemed sandy to me, yet since I have acknowledged to be rocky, and have seen cause so to publish to the world in my Discourse to Mr. Ball, against set forms of Prayer,*

For a reply, let me begin where he leaverh; How ready he is to build upon sandy grounds, may appear by this very Passage, where he maintaineth his rockiness. For here he avoucheth, *I have seen cause to publish to the world, the rockiness of his grounds in a Discourse to Mr. Ball against set Forms of Prayer.*

What rocky ground do you think this assertion of his standeth upon? I know no other but this; He findeth such a Discourse published to the world: and he thence concludeth (for other Grounds he hath none) *that I published that Discourse, and that I saw cause to publish it:* both which hang upon that ground like ropes of sand. The truth is, I did not publish that Discourse to the world, much less did I see cause to publish it upon the Grounds he speaketh of. A brief Discourse in defence of set forms of Prayer was penned by Mr. *Ball*, much briefer than that which since is put forth in Print, That brief Discourse a religious Knight sent over, (whether to my self, or to a Gentleman of note then dwelling in my house, I remember not) but with desire to beare our judgement of it. At his request I drew up a short Answer, and sent one Copy of it to the Knight, and another to Mr. *Ball*, divers years ago. How it came (in process of time) to be published to the world, or by whom, I do not know. And yet Mr. *Williams* doubteth not to affirm it, *that I published that Discourse to the world, and saw cause to do it.* Rocky spirits can express all their conceits, in rocky firmness, though upon sandy conjectures.

Besides, when he saith, *That himself discovered to me, and to other*  
servants

*servants of God, his grounds against our using of the Common Prayer; which then seemed sandy to us, but now in New England, I have acknowledged to be rocky in my Discourse to Mr. Ball. I could have wished he had expressed, what grounds those were, which he discovered to us; For my self I can call to mind no such matter, that ever I heard, or received from him, either by word, or writing, any solid grounds against that Practice. But this I am sure of, that the grounds of altering my judgement touching that practise, did chiefly stand upon the exposition of the second Commandment; which if I should say, I received from him, I should greatly fear my forehead were more rocky then his grounds were. I think it no disgrace to change either my judgement of practise upon better grounds then I formerly discerned. Nor would I think it a disgrace to learn any grounds of truth, and to profess that I had learned them from himself, if so I had done. But sure I am, it hath not been wont to be the manner of the servants of God to upbraid their Brethren, with their Retractations of their former Aberrations.*

I have read of the Churches of *Judea*, that when they heard *Paul* now preached the Faith, which once he destroyed, they glorified God for him, (*Gal. 1. 23, 24.*) but I never read, that any of the Churches of Christ, or any sincere member of the Churches, did ever upbraid *Paul* for his former Persecution, or for his present change,

The other part of the Chapter, he spendeth in relating the grounds of the sentence of his Banishment, and in the avouchment of his confidence of the firmeness of them.

The grounds of the sentence of his Banishment, some whereof *He saith, I am pleased to discuss in the Letter, and others not to mention; He saith were rightly summed up by one of the Magistrates after his public Trial, and Answers.*

*Mr. Williams (said that public Person) holdeth forth these four particulars.*

1. *That we have not our Land by Patent from the King, but that the Natives are the true owners of it; and that we ought to repent of such a receiving it by Patent.*

2. *That it is not lawful to call a wicked Person to swear, to pray, as being actions of God's worship.*

4. *That*

3. *That it is not lawful to hear any of the Ministers of the Parish-Assemblies in England.*

4. *That the Civil Magistrate's Power extends only to the bodies, and goods, and outward state of men, &c.*

*These particulars he hopeth, that as he maintained the rocky strength of them to his own, and other Consciences satisfaction: So (through the Lords assistance,) he shall be ready not only to be bound, and banished, but to die also in New-England, as for most holy Truths of God in Christ Jesus.*

It was not my intent in that Letter which he examineth, to discuss the Grounds of his Civil Banishment at all, neither did I discuss one or other of them. And it is a preposterous shifting of the State of the Question, to put it upon me to give account of the cause of his Banishment, who neither did banish him, nor provoked the Court to banish him out of the Country. The Magistrates and Deputies of the Common-wealth (who were then the Members of that Court) are all of them of age, and able themselves to give account of their own actions. To them or some of them he should in reason have addressed himself for satisfaction in this case (if any were due) and not to me, who am as seldom present at any Civil Court, (if not more seldom) then any man of our calling in Town or Country, where the Courts are kept. It were more than *Ægyptian* bondage to me, and more than Pharaonical tyranny in him, to exact of me, an account of all the capital, or notable sentences of Judgement, which pass in all the Civil Courts of Justice in the Country, unless I had a calling to sit amongst them.

But why did I then endeavour in my Letter *to shew him the sandiness of those grounds, upon which he had banished himself, &c.* If I did not mean to declare, and discuss the causes of his Banishment?

He doth very well, and wisely to express the Grounds upon which I said he banished himself with an, &c. For he knows that if he had related my whole sentence in my own words, he had cut off himself from all opportunity of pleading with me the causes of his Civil Banishment.

My words are plain,—*I endeavour to shew you the sandiness of those grounds, upon which you have banished your self from the fellowship of all the Churches in these Countries.*

It is one thing to banish ones self (or to be banished) out of the

fellowship of all the Churches in the Country; another thing to banish one's self (or to be banished) out of the Country. There be at this day that banish (and separate) themselves from all the Churches in the Country, and yet are not banished out of the Country: and there be that are banished out of the Country, and yet are not banished out of the fellowship of all the Churches in the Country. Himself hath separated (and so banished himself) from the fellowship of all the Churches in the world: and yet he hath not banished himself out of the world.

But though it be impertinent to my Letter to discuss the grounds of his Civil Banishment: yet since he is pleased (by hook or crook) to draw it in, I refer the Reader for Answer to a full Treatise of that Argument, penned by a reverend faithful Brother, (the Teacher of the Church at *Rocksbury*;) and withal as I have touched somewhat of it above in Answer to his Preface, so I shall speak a word or two more unto it here.

Whom that eminent Magistrate was, that so summed up the grounds of Mr. *Williams* his Banishment in those four Particulars above mentioned, Mr. *Williams* doth wisely conceal his name, lest if he were named, he should be occasioned to bear witness against such fraudulent expression of the Particulars: whereof some were no causes of his Banishment at all, and such as were causes, were not delivered in such general Terms, For *in universalibus latet Dokus*. It is evident the two latter causes which he giveth of his Banishment, were no causes at all, as he expresseth them. There are many known to hold both these Opinions, *That it is not lawful to hear any of the Ministers of the Parish-Assemblies in England, and that the Civil Magistrates power extendeth only to the bodies, and goods, and outward estates of men:* and yet they are tolerated not only to live in the Common-wealth, but also in the fellowship of the Churches.

The two former, though they be not so much noised, yet there be many, if not most, that hold, *That we have not our Land, merely by right of Patent from the King, but that the Natives are true owners of all that they possess, or improve.* Neither do I know any amongst us, that either then were, or now are of another mind.

And as for the other Point; *That it is not lawful to call a wicked Person to swear, or pray*

Though

Though that be not commonly held, yet it is known to be held of some, who yet are tolerated to enjoy both Civil, and Church-liberties amongst us.

To come therefore to Particulars: Two things there were, which (to my best observation, and remembrance) caused the Sentence of his Banishment: and two other fell in, that hastened it.

1. His violent and tumultuous carriage against the Patent.

By the Patent it is, that we received allowance from the King to depart his Kingdom, and to carry our goods with us, without offence to his Officers, and without paying custom to himself.

By the Patent, certain select men (as Magistrates, and Freemen) have power to make Laws, and the Magistrates to execute Justice, and Judgement amongst the People, according to such Laws.

By the Patent we have Power to erect such a Government of the Church, as is most agreeable to the Word, to the estate of the People, and to the gaining of Natives (in God's time) first to Civility, and then to Christianity.

To this Authority established by this Patent, *English-men* do readily submit themselves: and foreign Plantations (the *French*, the *Dutch*, and *Swedish*) do willingly transact their Negotiations with us; as with a Colony established by the Royal Authority of the State of *England*.

This Patent, Mr. *Williams* publicly, and vehemently preached against, as containing matter of falsehood, and injustice: Falsehood in making the King the first Christian Prince who had discovered these parts: and injustice, in giving the Country to his *English* Subjects, which belonged to the Native *Indians*, This therefore, he pressed upon the Magistrates and People, to be humbled for from time to time in days of solemn Humiliation, and to return the Patent back again to the King. It was answered to him, first, That it was neither the Kings intendment, nor the *English* Planters to take possession of the Country by murder of the Natives, or by robbery: but either to take possession of the void places of the Country by the Law of Nature, (for *Vacuum Domicilium cedit occupanti*:) or if we took any Lands from the Natives, it was by way of purchase, and tree consent.

A little before our coming, God had by pestilence, and other contagious diseases, swept away many thousands of the Natives,

who had inhabited the Bay of *Massachusetts*, for which the Patent was granted. Such few of them as survived were glad of the coming of the *English*, who might preserve them from the oppression of the *Nahargansets*. For it is the manner of the Natives, the stronger Nations to oppress the weaker.

This answer did not satisfy Mr. *Williams*, who pleaded, the Natives, though they did not, nor could subdue the Country, (but left it *vacuum Domicilium*) yet they hunted all the Country over, and for the expedition of their hunting voyages, they burnt up all the underwoods in the Country, once or twice a year, and therefore as Noble men in *England* possessed great Parks, and the King, great Forests in *England* only for their game, and no man might lawfully invade their Propriety: So might the Natives challenge the like Propriety of the Country here.

It was replied unto him. 1. That the King, and Noble men in *England*, as they possessed greater Territories than other men, so they did greater service to Church, and Common-wealth.

2. That they employed their Parks, and Forests, not for hunting only, but for Timber, and for the nourishment of tame beasts, as well as wild, and also for habitation to sundry Tenants.

3. That our Towns here did not disturb the huntings of the Natives, but did rather keep their Game fitter for their taking; for they take their Deer by Traps, and not by Hounds.

4. That if they complained of any straits we put upon them, wee gave satisfaction in some payments, or other, to their content.

5. We did not conceive that it is a justify to so vast a Continent, to make no other improvement of millions of Acres in it, but only to burn it up for pastime.

But there Answers not satisfying him, this was still pressed by him as a National sin, to hold to the Patent, yea, and a National duty to renounce the Patent: which to have done, had subverted the fundamemal State, and Government of the Country.

2. The second offence, which procured his Banishment, was occasioned as I touched before. The Magistrates, and other members of the General Court upon Intelligence of some Episcopal, and malignant practises against the Country, they made an order of Court to take trial of the fidelity of the People, (not by imposing

sing upon them, but) by offering to them an Oath of Fidelity: that in case any should refuse to take it, they might not betrust them with place of public charge, and Command. This Oath when it came abroad, he vehemently withstood it, and dissuaded sundry from it, partly because it was, as he said, Christ's Prerogative, to have his Office established by Oath: partly because an oath was a part of God's worship, and God's worship was not to be put upon carnal persons, as he conceived many of the People to be. So by his Tenent neither might Church members, nor other godly men, take the Oath, because it was the establishment not of Christ, but of mortal men in their office; nor might men out of the Church take it, because in his eye they were but carnal. So the Court was forced to desist from that proceeding: which practise of his was held to be the more dangerous, because it tended to unsettle all the Kingdoms, and Common-wealths in Europe.

These were (as I took it) the causes of his Banishment: two other things fell in upon these that hastened the Sentence. The former fell out thus: The Magistrates discerning by the former passages, the heady and turbulent spirit of Mr. *Williams*, both they, and others advised the Church of *Salem* not to call him to office in their Church; nevertheless, the major part of the Church made choice of him. Soon after, when the Church made suit to the Court for a parcel of Land adjoining to them, the Court delayed to grant their Request (as hath been mentioned before) because the Church had refused to hearken to the Magistrates, and others in forbearing the choice of Mr. *Williams*. Whereupon Mr. *Williams* took occasion to stir up the Church to join with him in writing Letters of Admonition unto all the Churches, whereof those Magistrates were members, to admonish them of their open transgression of the Rule of Justice. Which Letters coming to the several Churches, provoked the Magistrates to take the more speedy course with so heady, and violent a Spirit.

But to prevent his sufferings, (if it might be) it was moved by some of the Elders, that themselves might have liberty (according to the Rule of Christ) to deal with him, and with the Church also in a Church-way. It might be, the Church might hear us, and he the Church; which being consented to, some of our Churches wrote to the Church of *Salem*, to present before them the of-

sensitive

sensitive Spirit, and way of their Officer, (Mr. *Williams*) both in Judgement, and Practice. The Church finally began to hearken to us, and accordingly began to address themselves to the healing of his Spirit. Which he discerning, renounced communion with the Church of *Salem*, pretending they held communion with the Churches in the Bay, and the Churches in the Bay held communion with the Parish-Churches in *England*, because they suffered their members to hear the word amongst them in *England*, as they came over into their native Country. He then refusing to resort to the Public Assembly of the Church. Soon after sundry began to resort to his Family, where he preached to them on the Lord's day. But this carriage of his in renouncing the Church upon such an occasion, and with them all the Churches in the Country, and the spreading of his Leaven to sundry that resorted to him; this gave the Magistrates the more cause to observe the heady unruliness of his spirit, and the incorrigibleness thereof by any Church-way, all the Churches in the Country being then renounced by him. And this was the other occasion which hastened the Sentence of his Banishment, upon the former Grounds,

If upon these Grounds Mr. *Williams* be ready, (as he professeth) *not only to be bound, and banished, but also to die in New-England*; let him remember, (what he knows) *Non pœna, sed causa facit Martyrem*; No Martyr of Christ did ever suffer for such a cause.

When he feareth not to profess, that *he did in open Court maintain the rocky strength of his grounds, to the satisfaction of his own, and (as he saith) of other mens Consciences.*

I can but wonder at the rocky flintiness of his self confidence: To give a taste of the rocky strength of his maintenance of these things; He made complaint in open Court, that he was wronged by a slanderous report up and down the Country, as if he did hold it to be unlawful for a Father to call upon his child to eat his meat. Our reverend Brother Mr. *Hooker*, (the Pastor of the Church, where the Court was then kept) being moved to speak a word to it, Why, saith he, you will say as much again, (if you stand to your own Principles) or be forced to say nothing. When Mr. *Williams* was confident he should never say it: Mr. *Hooker* replied, If it be unlawful to call an unregenerate, person to take an Oath, or to Pray, as being actions of God's worship, then it is unlawful

lawful for your unregenerate child, to pray for a blessing upon his own meat. If it be unlawful for him to pray, for a blessing upon his meat, It is unlawfull for him to eat it, (for it is sanctified by prayer, and without prayer unsanctified, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4, 5.) If it be unlawful for him to eat it, it is unlawful for you to call upon him to eat it, for it is unlawful for you to call upon him to sin.

Here Mr. *Williams* thought better to hold his peace, then to give an Answer.

But thus have I opened the grounds, and occasions of his Civil Banishment; which whether they be sandy, or rocky, let the servants of Christ judge. Howsoever, my Letter gave him no occasion at all to put me upon this Discourse; for in my Letter I intended only to shew him *the soundness of those grounds upon which he banished himself from the society (not of the Commonwealth, but) of all the Churches in these Countries.*

But whether I intended the one, or the other, he giveth an Answer for both; *If Mr. Cotton mean (saith he) my own voluntary withdrawing from all these Churches resolves to continue in those evils, and in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord, presenting light unto them. I confess it was mine own voluntary act: yea I hope the act of the Lord Jesus sounding forth in me (a poor despised Rams-horn) the blast which shall in his own holy season cast down the strength, and confidence of the Inventions of men in the worship of God: and lastly his act in enabling me to be faithful in any measure to suffer such great, and mighty Trials for his Names sake.*

Reply. That I meant only his own act in withdrawing himself from these Churches, doth plainly enough appear both from my express words, and from the Reasons which I expressly assign of that act of his, which I called the sandy grounds, upon which he built his Separation. My express words are, *He had banished himself from the society of all the Churches in this Country.* The society of the Church is one thing, the society of the Common-wealth, is another. And the Grounds upon which he built his Separation, were not the causes of his banishment, but of his withdrawing from the society of the Churches.

But if I so meant, *He confesseth it was his own voluntary act; and professeth also, it was a double act of the Lord Jesus in him.*

The

The ground which he giveth of his own voluntary act, *was because these Churches were resolved to continue in those evils, and persecuting the witness of the Lord Jesus, presenting light to them.*

Reply; Those evils? What were those evils which we were resolved to continue in? He expresseth none: but sure meet it had been, that as his voluntary withdrawing from these Churches was publicly known; so the evils in which we resolved to continue, and for which he withdrew himself, should in like manner have been publicly known also. It is an unrighteous thing to pass public known acts, upon private unknown evils. But whatsoever those unknown evils were, I suppose he conceiveth them to be such ways, either of Judgement, or Practise, wherein we walk according to the light of our Consciences. And then by his Rule he should have allowed us the like liberty of conscience, which himself requireth. And surely by the Royal Rule of the Lord Jesus, no Brother may be so much as admonished, (much less separated from) till he be convinced, (ἐλεγχον ἅντ'ν) Mat. 18. 15.

And as for *persecuting the witnesses of the Lord, presenting light to us*; himself (for ought I know) was the first in this Country, that ever pretended suffering for bearing witness in any matter of Religion true or false: And for him to withdraw himself from the society of all the Churches for their persecution of him, before he had suffered from them any thing but conference, and conviction, is to make them sufferers for well-doing, and to choose suffering, that he might have cause to complain of sufferings. Let him, if he be able, name any one in this Country of the witnesses of the Lord, (for he speaketh of witnesses) that ever did so much as pretend before himself to further Persecution, for presenting light to us.

Thus he maketh that the ground of his withdrawing, which was not then *in Rerum naturâ*, (no not in pretence) till after his withdrawing. As a furious School-master, will beat a child for nothing till he cry, and then beat him for crying.

But he further presumeth to affirm; *That his withdrawing was the act of the Lord Jesus in him, sounding forth that Blast, which shall one day cast down the strength, and confidence of the Inventions of men in the worship of God.*

Reply. If a particular visible Church, consisting of visible Saints, and united by holy Covenant into one Congregation, to worship the

the Lord, and to edify one another in all his holy Ordinances; If such a Church be an Invention of man; If Elders called, and ordained by them for Administration of there Ordinances, be an Invention of man; If the Covenant of Grace between the Lord, and his Church, and the Seals thereof, and the Censures dispensed against the violation thereof; If all these be the Inventions of man, then indeed the Lord hath sounded a blast in Mr. *Williams* his horn, to cast down the Inventions of men in the worship of God. But if all these be the holy Institutions of the Lord Jesus, then let Mr. *Williams* know, that this speech of his is a blast of blasphemy against the Lord Jesus, to put upon him that which is the proper work of Satan, to blast all the Churches, and Ordinances of Christ. And whereas it was wont to be the work of Antichrist to defile all the Ordinances of Christ, it is now the work of this examiner to deface, and abolish them all from the face of the earth, Whether of these works are the more Antichristian? It may be he will be ready to say, (as the Prophet said in another case of *Senacherib*, Isai. 10. 7.) he meaneth not so, nor doth his heart think so: and as *Hazael* said to the Prophet, *Is thy servant a dog, that he should do that great thing?* (2 Kings 8. 13.) *Sed quid verba audiam, cum facta vidiam?* Why doth he separate from all Churches under Heaven, and refuse to gather into any Church where himself liveth, if he did not in these times look at all Church-Estate, and Fellowship, and Ordinances, as not to be found in the Land of the Living?

Lastly, *He looketh at it, as an act of Christ enabling him to be faithful in any measure, to suffer such great and mighty Trials for his Names sake.*

But if the Spirit of the Apostle *John* had in some measure rested upon him, he would no more have mentioned (much less have magnified) his great, and mighty Trials, till he had seen *John* go before him in such a like predication of his sufferings, who doubtless had less deserved it, and yet suffered more great, and mighty Trials, *Revel.* 1. 9. But full vessels make least found.

Again, He recoileth to his civil Banishment, and observeth, *That if by banishing himself I meant his Civil Banishment, than 1. He discerneth the language of the Dragon in a Lambs lip; to put the sufferings of the Saints upon themselves, and the Devil.*

2. *That I silently confess, that the frame and constitution of our Churches is implicitly National. Else if the Common-wealth, the Church were not one, how could he that is banished from the one, be necessarily banished from the other also?*

Reply. It was far from my meaning, and words, when I spake of his banishing of himself from the Fellowship of all the Churches in the Country, to intend his civil banishment. I knew his civil banishment was not merely his own Act. I knew also that he might have been banished from the Commonwealth, and yet have retained (as some others have done) Fellowship with some Churches, if not with all the Churches in the Country. And therefore both his observations are but empty flourishes, and vanish like Bubbles. It is the witness of the Spirit of the Serpent, to hide his head under fig-leaved evasions.

But suppose I had meant by his banishment of himself, his civil banishment, and had meant, that by exposing himself deservedly to that censure, he had deprived himself of enjoying all the spiritual liberties of the Churches in the Country might I not so have said, and yet not have spoken the language of the Dragon? What if the Dragon use such language to the Saints suffering innocently? may not the Spirit of God use the same words to a guilty person suffering deservedly? The language of the Dragon lieth not always in the words or meaning, but in the application, and intent of them. The Dragon said to Christ, *I know who thou art, the holy One of God*, Mar. 1. 24. Peter might say the same, or the like words, Mat. 16. 16. And yet in his mouth, it was not the language of the Dragon, but of the Holy Ghost.

Neither will it imply, That the Church, and Common-wealth, are all one, because he that deservedly is banished from the Commonwealth, banisheth himself also from the communion of the Churches; For the same sins which may be offensive civilly to the Commonwealth, may be also spiritually offensive to the Church, and both proceed to censure the same person in their own way severally.

To

---

## TO CHAP. IV.

IN his fourth Chapter the Examiner answereth to a speech of Imine, wherein to prevent his prejudice against my person, (which might weaken the fruit of my counsel to him) *I told him, I had not hasted forward the sentence of his Civil Banishment: and that what was done by the Magistrates in that kind, was neither done by my Counsel, nor consent.*

Whereto he answereth, first, *That he observeth, I cannot but confess, that it is hard for any man to do good, or to speak effectually to the soul, or Conscience of any, whose body he afflicteth, and Persecuteth, and that only for their soul and Conscience sake.*

Reply. All that can truly be observed from my words is, That it is hard for any to take good from those, against whom they have conceived a prejudice, whether justly, or unjustly. But when he subjoineth a Serpentine, that is, a subtle, and venomous insinuation, *as if I had afflicted, and persecuted his body, and that only for his soul, and Conscience sake.*

*Answ.* I have been so far from afflicting, or persecuting his body, (especially for his soul, or conscience sake) that in very truth, whilst I had any hope of prevailing for him, I may say, as *David* said for himself, against a like slander, *Psal. 7. 3, 4. I have sought to deliver him who without cause reproacheth me.*

Let not Mr. *Williams* please himself (as he doth in this Paragraph) in comparing the dealing of the Elders with him here, to the Persecutions of the Bishops against the godly Preachers in *England*. If the Bishops had dealt no worse with the godly Preachers there, and upon no more unjust causes, then the Elders dealt with him here, they might with good conscience, and good countenance have looked with comfort, and confidence, both God, and man in the face, even now when God hath laid their carnal pomp, and worldly honour in the dust.

Neither let him please himself (as he doth in the next Paragraph) in his undoubted Affection; *That what Mr. Cotton, and others did in procuring his sorrows, was not without some regret, and reluctancy of Conscience, and affection, (as David in procuring Uriah's death, or Asa in imprisoning the Prophet.)*

For neither was he so innocent, as was *Uriah*, and that Prophet: nor had my self the like hand in his suffering!, as *David* and *Asa* had in the other: nor did I ever see cause of regret, and reluctancy of conscience, for any act of mine own about his sufferings. Only I confess I had, (as he saith) some regret, and reluctancy of affection, and of compassion, to see one who had received from God, stirring and useful gifts, to bestir himself so busily, and eagerly to abuse them, to the disturbance of himself, his family, the Churches, and the Common-wealth.

That I consented not to his Banishment, he in part admitteth; *For what need was there (saith be) of that, being not one of the Civil Court?*

As if I might not have consented to it, though I needed not to have done it. I might have drawn up Articles against him, I might have come in as a witness against him, I might have solicited, and stirred up the body of the Magistrates against him, to rid the country of him: and then I had consented before-hand to what was done by the Magistrates in that kind, though my self had been none of the Court; but none of all these acts, nor any such like were done by me.

But be it that I consented not, yet I counselled it, (and so consented) and to prove that he saith, *He will produce a double, and unanswerable Testimony for it.*

*First, That I publicly taught, (and still do Teach, except lately Christ hath taught me better) that body killing, soul-killing, and State-killing Doctrine of Persecuting all other Consciences, and ways of worship but mine own, in the Civil State, and consequently in the whole world, if the Power, or Empire thereof were in mine hand,*

Reply. Were it not that I have learned from the word of truth, that when men are cast out of the Church of Christ, they are delivered up unto Satan, and so neither their wits, nor their tongues are their own, I could not easily have believed that Mr. *Williams* could so confidently and openly have avouched such a notorious slander. Since the Lord taught me to know any thing, what conscience, or the worship of God meant, it hath been my constant judgement, and doctrine, and practise to the contrary. Besides, *To teach the killing of the bodies of all such Conscience, and ways of worship, as are not mine own, is to make mine own conscience, and way*  
of

of worship, the infallible Rule, and sovereign Standard, by which all consciences, and ways of worship throughout the world, were to be regulated: yea, and as if this were a light measure of arrogancy, and usurpation, I make it a capital crime, (a body-killing offence) for any man to swerve from my conscience, and way of worship, even in such Points wherein the Holy Ghost hath given express charge, that we should not Judge, nor condemn one, another, *Rom.* 14. 3. But I durst appeal even unto the conscience of Mr. *Williams* himself, (if it were now in the gracious keeping of Christ, or of himself, as in former times) that himself knoweth, I do not think it lawful to Excommunicate an Heretic, much less to persecute him with the civil Sword, till it may appear, ever by just and full conviction, that he sinneth not out of conscience, but against the very light of his own conscience. Sure I am, such a Point he reporteth is received from me; to the very same purpose, (and he reporteth it truly) in his *Bloody Tenent*, pag. 8. This Answer may suffice to his first (as he calleth it) *unanswerable Testimony*.

His second unanswerable Testimony is, *That some Gentlemen that did consent to his sentence, have solemnly testified, and with tears since confessed to himself, that they could not in their souls have been brought to have consented to the Sentence of his Banishment, had not Mr. Cotton in private given them advise, and counsel, proving it just, and warrantable to their Consciences.*

Reply. I might here justly plead the equity of the Roman Custom, to excuse my self from this accusation, until the accusers come before me face to face: And truly, if Apocryphal witnesses may go for unanswerable Testimonies, it is an easy matter to oppress any innocency: I might also plead the incompetency of such a witness, as (haply lying under some censure from our Church, and removing himself from our fellowship) might take more liberty to speak against me in a pang of passion, what he would be loath to justify in cold blood.) I might likewise allege that one or two Magistrates makes not a Court, nor was his Sentence cast by the vote of one, or two: So that if I had counselled one or two to it, it would not argue that the act of the Magistrates, and of the Deputies, (which is the body of the Court) had been done by my counsel or consent. And indeed it was the very true meaning

meaning of my speech, that for the hastening of the Sentence of the Court against Mr. *Williams*, that all of the Court (which was the act of the body of the Magistrates, and of the Deputies) it was neither done by my counsel, nor consent. For the body of them neither required my counsel, nor received my consent. What one of them did (for I remember but one that consulted with me about it) was not the act done by the Magistrates, whereof I spake. And let the occasion, and scope, and matter of that speech be remembered, and it will be found to tend to that purpose, and no other. About a year before the Sentence in Court passed against Mr. *Williams*, the Governor, and other Magistrates having understood of the disturbances put upon the Civil State by Mr. *Williams*; (which have been declared above), they sent for the Elders of the Churches in these parts, to acquaint us therewith, and to declare thereupon, the just ground which they had to proceed against him: yet willing to confere thereof with us, beause he was an Elder of a Church. I do not love to predicate mine own good offices to any: but his importunity forceth me to utter it; when I heard the motion, I presented (with the consent of my fellow Elders and Brethren) a serious Request to the Magistrates, that they would be pleased to forbear all civil prosecution against him, till our selves (with our Churches) had dealt with him in a Church way, to convincc him of sin: alleging, that my self, and brethren hoped, his violent course did rather spring from scruple of conscience, (though carried with an inordinate zeal) then from a seditious Principle. To which the Governor replied, *That we were deceived in him, if we thought he would condescend to learn of any of us: And what will you do (saith he) when you have run your course, and found all your labour lost?* I answered for the rest, we hoped better things: if it fell out contrary to our hopes, we could not help it, but must sit down, and quiet our conscience in the Lord's acceptance of our will, and endeavour for the deed.

This interceding of my self, and other Elders in his behalf, gave me just occasion of that profession above-mentioned, *That I had sought to deliver him, who without cause reproached me.*

The issue was when the Church of *New-Town*, with our own, and others had endeavoured to convince both Mr. *Williams* of these offences, and the Church of *Salem* of their indulgent toleration

tion of him therein; it pleased the Lord to open the hearts of the Church to assist us in dealing with him: but he instead of hearkening, either to them, or us, renounced us all, as no Churches of Christ and therefore not at all to be hearkened unto.

Whereupon the Magistrates being to assemble to the next General Court at *New-Town*, intending (as appeared by the event) to proceed against him: And one of the Magistrates of our Town being to go thither, acquainted me that it was likely Mr. *Williams* his cause would then be issued, and asked me what I thought of it. Truly (said I,) *I pity the man, and behave already interceded for him, whilst there was any hope of doing good. But now he having refused to hear both his own Church, and us, and having rejected us all, as no Churches of Christ before any conviction, we have now no more to say in his behalf, nor hope to prevail for him. We have told the Governor, and Magistrates before, that if our labour was in vain, we could not help it, but must sit down. And you know they are generally so much incensed against his course, that it is not your voice, nor the voices of two, or three more, that can suspend the Sentence. Some further speech I had with him of mine own marvel at the weakness, and slanderness of the grounds of his opinions, motions, and courses, and yet carried on with such vehemency, and impetuosity, and presidence of Spirit.*

To this purpose was my speech to him, nor can I call to mind that I spake so much as this to any man else; nor can I remember at all, that further than so, I gave him any grounds to prove the sentencing of him to Bahishment, to be just and warrantable to his Conscience. Nor would it infringe the truth of my speech if I had so done, seeing it is not one man's vote (nor two, if there had been two) that denominateth the sentence of the Court, or the act to be done by the Magistrates, much less done by the Magistrate with my counsel, and consent: but though I looked at the Sentence of the Court, as neither hastened nor done by my counsel, and consent, yet I did never intend to say, that I did not consent to the justice of the Sentence when it was past. Nor that I withdrew my self out of the Court (as he is pleased to construe it) *out of some reluctance; or that I meant it, I neither counselled nor consented in the very time of the sentence passing:* but that I did not before hand either give counsel, or consent to the body of the Magistrates, or Deputies, to pass that Sentence against him.

To

---

## TO CHAP. V.

I see I have been so large in answering the former four Chapters of this Examination of my Letter, that if I should proceed in the like sort in a particular search of the other twenty-four Chapters which remain, I should take up more time then were meet about the personal concernments of him, or my self. Who are we, that we should publicly invite the servants of Christ (who are employed in more weighty affairs of their Lord and ours) to attend unto personal Transactions between him, and me? Where any thing shall occur tending to more public edification, I shall insist with more attention thereupon, and pass over other lighter Discourses, with a lighter touch. Yet who so can spare so much time, and leisure, as to compare each Chapter of his, with each Chapter of this Discourse, he shall find (if I be not mistaken) no passage of weight passed over without returning due Answer to each particular. That Text in *Prov. 11. 26.* (*He that withholdeth the Corn, (which is the staff of life) from the people, the multitude shall curse him:)* I alledged to prove that the people had much more cause to separate such from amongst them, (whether by Civil, or Church-Censure, as do withhold, or separate them from the Ordinances, or the Ordinances from them, which are (in Christ) the bread of life. Let not the Reader be so far mis-led by the Examiner his mis-information, as to think, that this Scripture was produced against him, to justify either a false Ministry, or all, unfit people to chook and enjoy a true Ministry. The Ministry, and people are the Ministry and people of this Country: of which, the people he acknowledged to be Saints: and the Ministers of the Churches (chosen by them) not to be demure of such qualifications, as Christ requireth, save only that we do not forbid the people when they go over into *England*, to hear the word of God preached by godly Ministers in the Parish Churches. Now for this cause, because we do not separate there *English* hearers from us, he separated himself, and withdrew others from hearing the word in our Churches with us: which I accounted as great, and as unsufferable an injury to the souls of God's people, as it would be to their bodies to withhold the Corn from them, or them from the Corn: and for that end I produced this Scripture.

That

That I produced this Scripture alone to justify the Sentence of the Court, it was not for want of others, (if thou had been the Question;) but because the scope of my Letter was, not to confirm the equity of his Banishment, but to convince the iniquity of his Separation. The mention of the cause of his civil Banishment fell in only upon the by, to remove an objection out of the way, that because I denied the act of the Court to be done by my counsel, or consent, therefore it might seem I disallowed the sentence. To prevent that mistake I acknowledged the righteousness of the Sentence, and for that end produced that Scripture, as that which might give both some just reason before God of his Civil Banishment: and also make way for the discovery of his sin of groundless Separation. Let no man be so far mistaken, as to think, that his Separation from the Churches, was either the chief difference between the Court and him, (though it was the chief between him and me in my Letter;) or that it was the chiefest offence for which he suffered, though he so pretended.

*What though neither corporal nor spiritual food may lawfully be sold or bought, but with the good will, and consent, and authority of the owner? &c.*

Let him make it appear, that Christ hath not committed the Ministry of the Gospel to us; and we shall give place to others whom Christ shall send: Mean while, if the budding, and blossoming, and fruit-bearing of *Aaron's* rod was a witness from Heaven, that the Lord approved his Ministry against all the murmurings of the Children of *Israel*, Num. 17. 5. to 8. We must leave him, and others to their murmurings against us, and quiet our consciences in an humble blessing of the Lord for his gracious blessing upon our weak labours in that holy Ministry we have received from him.

*What though the Apostles were to turn away, and to shake off the dust of their feet, against scorers, contradictors, despisers, persecutors?*

It was not till they had sinned against the Holy Ghost, and scorned, and persecuted the convincing light of the Gospel, *Acts* 13. 45. to 51.

Otherwise the *Jews* were scorers, and persecuton of Christ: himself, and of all that confessed his Name, *Job.* 9. 22. yet still the Apostles ceased not to Preach to them, and pray with them,

*Acts 3. 1. &c. to wit, whilst their Persecutors sinned of ignorance, ver. 17.*

*What though the Apostles were forbidden to preach in some places?*

He wisely quoteth no Text for it, lest the quoting might be the confuting of himself. He knoweth, it was but for a time that others (according to the good pleasure of Christ's will) might be served before them.

*What if Mr. Cotton saw just cause to refuse to sell spiritual Corn in a mis-hallowed Surplice? Is it safe therefore for Mr. Williams to shut up his sack's mouth, and to refuse to sell corn in his ordinary apparel?*

*What if Mr. Cotton forebear to administer the Lord's Supper to all believers, or Baptism unto their children, until the believers profess their Faith, and Repentance before the Church? Is it safe therefore for Mr. Williams to refuse to Break the Bread of Life unto the Church of Salem, whereunto their Election, and Ordination of him, and his own voluntary acceptance thereof, had engaged him to stewardly office?*

*What though in all Civil Transactions, and in all the present disturbances of England, principal respect is had into a right Commission, and right Order? Let him show wherein our Commission, or Order is defective, and reason would we should hearken to him.*

But see the wariness, and slyness of the Examiner: *I judge it not* (saith he) *seasonable here, to entertain the Dispute of the true Power, and call of Christ's Ministry.* A handsome evasion. Now when the grounds of his separation are questioned, now when he standeth upon his open justification, now in Print before the eyes of all men, now he thinketh it not seasonable, to entertain any dispute of such things at all. Thus *Felix* would hear *Paul* when he had a more convenient time: and yet that was the very time and hour of his visitation, *Acts 24. 25.*

His evasion of this Text in *Prov. 11. 26.* (by comparing it with *Deut. 17. 12.*) doth but add a delusion to an evasion, [*Deut. 17. I suppose, he meaneth, though his printed copy say Deut. 15.*] For it is a delusion to make the capital punishment prescribed against the presumptuous rejection of the Sentence of the chiefest Court in *Israel*, a figure of Excommunication in the Church of Christ.

For

For first, no Scripture of old or New Testament giveth any intimation of any such figure in this Law. And to make a judicial Law a figure without some light from some Scripture, is to make a man's self, wise above that which is written.

2. That law is of moral equity, that is of universal and perpetual equity, in all Nations, in all Ages: He that shall presumptuously appeal from, or rise up against the sentence of the chiefest and highest Court in a free State, is guilty *Læsæ majestatis publicæ*, and therefore as a capital offender to be censured in any free Commonwealth.

3. This Law in *Deut. 17.* provided an effectual punishment against such presumptuous offenders, and an effectual remedy against all such like presumption in others, that *all Israel might hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously*, ver. 13. But so doth not Excommunication. For what if an Excommunicate person presume against the sentence of Christ in his Church, (as Mr. *Williams* doth against the Sentence of the Church in *Salem*?) doth the power of the Church provide, that all the *Israel* of God may hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously? Is the figure become more powerfull, and effectual, then the substance? the shadow, then the body? the type, then the Antitype?

From this mistaken figure, the Examiner would infer, *The withholding of the Corn presumptuously to be death in Isarel: but not so in every State of the world: much less the pleading against a false Ministry to be a capital crime: for as for Banishment never such a course was heard in Israel.*

*Answ.* That law in *Deut.* hath nothing to do with the withholding of Corn presumptuously, unless there had first passed some sentence of the Sovereign Court against the withholding of Corn. But otherwise ordinary sins of presumption, do fall under the Judicature of another Law. *Num. 15. 30, 31.*

Neither hath this Text in *Solomon's Proverbs* any thing to do with that Law in *Deut. 17.* nor with capital punishment. *Solomon* doth not say, that every man that withholdeth his corn, shall be put to death in *Israel*: nor do I say that he is to be put to death in any State of the world: least of all do I say that Pleading against a false Ministry is a capital crime: These are all but excursions, and evaporations of the superfluity of wit. But this I say, (and not

I but Solomon) *He that withholdeth the Corn, the people shall curse him*, Prov. 11. 26. And cursing implieth Separation. He therefore that shall withdraw, or separate, the Corn from the people, or the people from the Corn; the people have just cause to separate either him from themselves, or themselves from him. And this proportion will hold as well in spiritual Corn as bodily the Argument still standeth unshaken.

What though we never read of Banishment in *Israel*? We read of something proportionable: what else meaneth that Decree? *Let Judgement be executed to death, or to Banishment*, Ezra, 7. 27. And Ezra 10. 8? *Let all his substance be forfeited, and himself separated from the Congregation of those that had been carried away*. And in *Moses*, frequent mention is made of, *cutting off from the people*; which though in *Israel*, it may fometime signify, cutting of by God's hand, sometime by the sword of the Magistrate, and sometime cutting off from the fellowship of God's House: yet in *Abraham's* Family, The cutting off (in Gen. 17. 14.) may very well reach, cutting off from their civil Cohabitation: as for a like offence *Ishmael*, and his mother were cut off from cohabitation in the Tents of *Abraham's* people, Gen. 21. 9. to 14.

Also he that had unawares slain a man, was banished, though not out of all *Israel*, yet from his own House, and Town, and Tribe, till the death of the High Priest, and that was as much as Banishment out of any Society of Christ's people now, whether in Church, or Civil Fellowship. For though out of *Israel*, there was no full Banishment legally enjoined, because there was then no other Church extant in the world, (and so to banish a man out of *Israel*, was as much as to say, Go, and serve other Gods, 1 Sam. 26. 19) yet now when Church-fellowship in the true Religion may, be had in so many places, to banish a man out of his Country, is no more than it was then to banish an *Israelite* into a City of Refuge. But though banishment be now a lawful punishment in some case, yet I go not about to prove that every wilful withholding of corn, in every State is banishment, much less death. But he that shall withhold his own corn, and go about to persuade all others that have corn lying by them, to shut up their sacks' mouths, and not to bring forth their corn for the nourishment of the people, (which is, if we speak of spiritual corn, the very case of the  
Examiner)

Examiner) I do not see but such an one may be justly accounted as *Hostis Reipublicæ*, a public enemy of the Country, and, as such an one, in due order, to be cast out of it.

In due order I say; for if such an one be detained from bringing forth his corn by some scruple of Conscience, (as suppose a man able to Preach Christ, and so able to dispense spiritual corn, yet doubting of the true way of the Ministry since the Apostacy of Antichrist, dare not practice the Ministry.) Such an one should not be sodainly cast out of the Country, till he be first convinced, that the Apostacy of Antichrist, did never so far prevail against the Church of Christ, as to root it out from off the face of the earth. The woman (which is the Church of Christ) was still nourished in a Wilderness, even during all the Reign of Antichrist, *Rev.* 12. 14, 15, 16. The Temple of God, (which is his Church), together with the Altar, and them that worship therein, were still measured, and that by *John* (by Apostolic measure) all the time, when Antichrist trod down the outward Court of the holy City, *Rev.* 11. 1, 2. The Golden vessels of the Temple still continued in the midst of the Babylonish Captivity. And if spiritual Babylon have now so far preevailed against the Church of Christ, as that they have rooted it up from the face of the earth, then what is become of the promise of Christ; *The gates of Hell shall never prevail against it?* *Mat.* 16. 18. Surely the Promise is given to a particular Congregational Church, that it shall never fail, but shall always be extant in some Country, or other; for he speaks of such a Church, to whom the keys of the Kingdom are committed, *ver.* 19. It will be vain to look for new Apostles to replant Churches out of the ruins of the Antichristian Apostacy. For the new Testament acknowledgeth *Paul* and *Barnabas* to be the last Apostles, *1 Cor.* 4. 9. If any Apostles rise up after them, then *Paul* and *Barnabas* will not be the last. And when the New *Hierusalem* comes down from Heaven, yet she shall nor be builded by any new Apostles, but built upon that foundation which the Limbs twelve Apostles have already said, *Rev.* 21. 14.

*As for those many excellent, and worthy Gentlemen, Lawyers, Physicians, and others, whom the Examiner commendeth to be as well gifted in the knowledge of the Scripture, and furnished with gifts, of tongues, and utterance, as most that profess the Ministry, and yet are not persuaded*

*to*

*to sell spiritual Corn, as questioning their true calling, and Commission.*

In such a case I would first seek (by the help of Christ) to remove the scruples upon which they question their calling, and Commission.

Secondly, I would think it meet, to put a didderence between such as never received a lawful calling and commission to the Ministry, and them that have received it. But if any of them have received a lawful calling into the Ministry, and yet will neither Preach themselves, nor suffer them that would, I suppose that both Church, and Common-wealth, may justly account them unworthy of any Christian society; and as such unprofitable servants refuse to minister themselves, or to suffer others to minister spiritual things; so others should refuse to minister to them carnal things.

*But (saith he) the selling, or withholding of spiritual Corn, are both of a spiritual nature: and therefore must necessarily in a true Paralell bear Relation to a spiritual Curse.*

*Answ.* If they that minister spiritual good things may duly reap carnal good things, (1 Cor. 9. 11.) then they that hinder the ministring of spiritual good things, may justly reap the hinderance of enjoyment of carnal good things. What if spiritual, and carnal good things be not paralell? Are there no Arguments but *a Pari*? Is it not lawful reasoning *a majori ad minus*? If men hinder the enjoyment of spiritual good things, may they not be hindred from the enjoyment of that which is less, carnal good things? It would weary a sober mind to pursue such windy fancies; though I hope the Lord will help me not to count it wearisome, either to satisfy a tender Conscience, or to convince a Gainsayer.

---

## TO CHAP. VI.

THOUGH my Letter expresseth, *That it may be the Court passed that sentance against Mr. Williams, not upon that ground, (from Prov. 11. 26.) but for ought I know, for his other corrupt Doctrines (suitable to his Practises) tending to the disturbance of Civil, and holy Peace:* Yet I do not therefore question (as he saith I seem to do)

do) *the sandiness of such a ground (as that place of Scripture) to warrant such proceedings; nor do I therein confess that myself had no distinct knowledge of the causes of his Banishment.*

For I did not allege that place of Scripture, as a ground upon which the Court proceeded to his Banishment: and therefore I said in my Letter, it may be they passed Sentence not upon that ground. But I alleged it as a reason, which provoked the Lord, to move the Court to proceed against Mr. *Williams*, for such other offensive, and disturbant Doctrines, and Practises against the Patent, and against the oath of fidelity, and against the Magistrates delay of the Petition of *Salem*, which he himself knoweth, I had distinct knowledge of before, which maketh me the more to marvel at his wonder, *Where was my waking care in his behalf; Whereas he knoweth I spent a great part of the Summer in seeking by word and writing to satisfy his scruples in the former particulars: until he rejected both our callings and our Churches. And even then I ceased not to follow him still, with such means of conviction, and satisfaction in that Point also, as God brought to my hand: whereof this very Letter, (which he examineth, and answereth) is a pregnant, and evident demonstration.*

*What though in this Letter I did not name his other corrupt Doctrines and Practises, nor any Scriptures to prove them corrupt? His heart knoweth full well both the Points, and the Scriptures, that were charged upon him all that Summer. And to have rehearsed them again in this Letter, it had been but actunt agere, neither was it the work in hand. For having done it before, we looked for some satisfactory answer: but in stead thereof we received only a rejection of our callings, and Churches: so that there was nothing now left, but to endeavour to satisfy his Conscience in the sandiness of those grounds, upon which he rejected communion with us.*

---

## TO CHAP. VII.

IN the 7th Chapter Mr. *Williams* examineth those words of my Letter; wherein I say, *that were my soul in his souls stead, I should accept it as a mercy of God, to banish me from the Civil Society of such a Common-wealth, where I could not enjoy holy Fellowship with any Church of God amongst them without sin. For what should the daughter of Zion*

*Zion do in Babel? Why should she not hasten to flea from thence?*

To this the Examiner answereth, that *though his love bids him to hope, that Mr. Cotton herein intended him a Cordial, yet if the Ingredients be examined, there will appear no less than dishonour to the Name of God, danger to every Civil State, a miserable comfort to him, and a contradiction within it self.*

*Reply.* It is true, what I wrote was in love to his soul: but I intended not a cordial of consolation to him, (for I did not conceive his Spirit at the present prepared for it;) but I intended only a conviction, to abate the rigour of his indignation against the dispensation of divine Justice: And therefore presented before him the mercy of God in that Administration.

But he beginneth with the last, first, to shew me the evil of these Ingredients.

And first for the contradiction to my self, in *that I speak of the daughter of Zion in Babel: If he call (saith he) the Land Babel, how can it be Babel, and the Church of Christ also?*

As if *Zion* cannot be in *Babel*, but it must be *Babel*? or as if the Church cannot be in the world, but it must be the world? Or as if when I call the Land *Babel*, I spoke of it as it is in it self, and not rather as it is in his apprehension? the Churches (in his imagination) still holding communion with Antichristian *Babylon*.

Secondly, He maketh it a dangerous Doctrine to affirm it, *a misery to live in the State where a Christian cannot enjoy the fellowship of the public Churches of God without sin.*

*Reply.* 1. Though I do affirm it to be a mercy to be delivered out of such a State, yet I do not affirm it to be a misery to live in it. It is a mercy to be translated, not only from misery to happiness, but from a less good to a greater. It is a mercy to a faithful soul to be translated from a Saint to a Minister; and yet Saintship is no misery.

2. It is some degree of misery, and no small one to a spiritual mind, for a Christian to live where he cannot enjoy the fellowship of Churches: or else *David* complained without cause; *Woe is me, that I am constrained to dwell in Meshek*, Psal. 120. 5. & 42. 4.

*What if there be many famous States, wherein no Church of Jesus Christ is known?* Is it not a mercy to be dismissed from such a State to a Land of more liberty, and piety?

*What*

*What if God commanded his people to Pray for the Peace of material Babel, whilst they were forced to abide in it?*

Was it not therefore a mercy from God, for Cyrus to deliver them out of *Babel*?

*What if Sodom, Ægypt, Babel, be spiritually understood, Rev. 11:8. & 14.8.*

Is it not therefore a mercy when God calleth his People out of such Dungeons, and sinks of abomination?

*What if there were a true Church in material Babel? 1 Pet. 5. 13.*

Let him remember what he spake a little before; *That if I speak not of Babel mystically, I speak not to the Point*: Let him apply it to himself.

Wherefore doth he tell us again of his *being driven into the miseries of an howling Wilderness?*

1. It was no howling Wilderness when he came to it, as hath been said above.

2. He might have gone to other *English* Plantation. Eastward, *Pascatoq*; and *Agaminticus*.

3. Solomon telleth us, *It is better to live in a Wilderness, than with a contentious, and angry woman*, Prov. 21. 19. And such he accounteth all our Churches, and Courts to be.

Thirdly, saith he, *Mr. Cotton himself would have counted it a mercy, if he might have Practised in Old-England, what he doth in New-England, with the enjoyment of Civil Peace, &c.*

*Reply.* True; but what is that to the purpose? The Question is if I could not enjoy the Fellowship of public Churches without sin, (as in those days I could not) whether then I would account it a mercy to be removed? Verily, I do so account it, and bless the Lord from my soul for his abundant mercy in forcing me out thence, in so fit a season.

*But further, (saith he) what if Mr. Cotton should dissent from the new English Churchs, and join in worship with some other, (as some few years since, he was upon the Point to do, in a separation from the Churches there, as Legal) would he count it a mercy to be plucked up by the roots, him, and his, and to endure the losses, distractions, miseries, that do attend such a Condition?*

*Reply.* The Examiner is falsly, and foully mis-informed, when he saith, *I was about to separate some few years since from the new Eng-*

*lish Churches as Legal.* For I never counted them as Legal Churches; nor was I ever about to separate from them as Legal, or otherwise so unclean, that a good conscience might not hold communion with them without sin.

The truth is, There was a Generation of Familists in our own, and other Towns, who under pretence of holding forth, what I had caught, touching union with Christ, and evidencing of that union, did secretly vent sundry corrupt, and dangerous errors, and heresies, denying all inherent righteousness, and all evidencing of a good estate thereby in any sort, and some of them denying also the Immortality of the soul, and Resurrection of the body. When they were questioned by some Brethren about those things, they carried it as if they held forth nothing but what they had received from me. Whereof when I was advertised, to clear my self, I publicly Preached against these errors. Then said the Brethren to the erring party, See, your Teacher declares himself clearly to differ from you. No matter (say the other) what he saith in public, we understand him otherwise, and we know what he saith to us in private. Yea and I myself could not easily believe that those erring Brethren, and Sisters were so corrupt in their Judgements, as they were reported, they seeming to me forward Christians and utterly denying unto me any such Tenents, or any thing else but what they received from my self. All which bred in sundry of the Country a jealousy that I was in secret a Fomenter of the Spirit of Familism, if not leavened my self that way. Which I discerning, it wrought in me thoughts, (as it *did* in many other sincerely godly Brethren of our Church) not of a Separation from the Churches, as Legal, (whom we truly embraced, and honoured in the Lord) but of a Removal to *New Haven*, as being better known to the Pastor, and some others there, then to such as were at that time jealous of me here. The true Ground whereof was, an inward loathness to be troublesome to godly minds, and a fear of the unprofitableness of my Ministry there, where my way was suspected to be doubtful, and dangerous. I chose therefore rather to meditate a silent departure in Peace, then by tarrying here to make way for the breaking forth of Temptations. But when at the Synod I had discovered the corruption of the Judgement of the erring Brethren, and saw their fraudulent pretence of  
holding

holding forth no other, but what they received from me, (when as indeed they pleaded for gross errors, contrary to my judgement;) and thereupon bare witness against them; and when in a private conference with some chief Magistrates, and Elders, I perceived that my purpose of removal upon such differences was unwelcome to them, and that such Points needed not to occasion any distance (neither in place, nor in heart) amongst Brethren, I then rested satisfied in my abode amongst them, and so have continued by the Grace of Christ unto this day.

But now to return to Mr. *Williams* his Question; *In the time of this Difference, would I count it (saith he) a mercy to be plucked up by the roots, me, and mine, and to endure the losses, distractions, and miseries, that do attend such a condition?*

*Ans.* Yea truly, if those jealousies, and differences had still held, I should have accounted it, and then did account it a mercy to see a door open for remooval. And therefore in my heart chose it, and purposed it, all a way of wisdom, and mercy.

But whereas he talketh of plucking up by the roots, the Metaphor is too Catachretical. An old Tree plucked up by the roots is not like to grow again: but neither he, nor I, was deposed to such an Eradication: we might have removed (with our selves) whatsoever movables we had; and what we could not remove, we might put it off (sooner, or later) unto others for a valuable consideration. So that though we had been plucked up by the roots, our roots had not been dried up, but would have sprung forth again to our comfortable supportance.

It is a question altogether impertinent, which the Examiner putteth in the next place, *Whether if the Inhabitants in New-England were permitted to enjoy n Old-England their Congregational way, whether then Mr. Cotton himself (if he were seated in Old-England again) would count it a mercy to be banished from the Civil State?*

For that is not at all the Question in hand, but this: whether if there were no Congregational Churches in *Old-England*, unto which we might join without sin, whether then it were a mercy to be thrust out? And verily for my self (and I doubt not for many a thousand more) I should account is a mercy, to be hastened out, yea, (if I lingered) to be thrust out in such a case. If many thousand godly persons in this Country did not make the same

account, how came we to dwell here, as we do this day?

*Neither yet do I make God the Author of such cruel mercy, in them that were the causes of our casting out, as he calumniateth.*

For the Instruments of any unjust dealing with the servants of God may be cruel: when yet the hand of God in ordering such a work may be most merciful. The hand of God was most merciful, to *Joseph* in calling him out of his Fathers house into *Ægypt*, whm yet the hand of his brethren was defiled with blood-guilty cruelty.

When the Examiner concludeth, that *if I had been exposed to the miseries, poverties, necessities, wants, debts, hardships of Sea and Land, in a banished Condition, be presumeth I would reach forth a more merciful Cordial to the afflicted; and therefore looketh at himself afflicted, as a Lamp despised in the eyes of him that is at ease*, Job 12. 5,

I desire the Lord might be pleased to open his eyes by such afflictions, wisely to consider whether he be not out of his way, when he meeteth with such miseries, poverties, debts, hardships? Surely when God hedgeth in the way of his people with thorns, he calleth them to return to their first husband, for then it was better with them, than now, *Hos.* 2. 6. His banishment was doubtless no cause of such afflictions: Divers others have, been cast out of the Country, as well as he, and yet God hath generally rescued them from affliction, & prospered their estates before his eyes. But when he chooseth rather to betake himself to merchandise by Land and Sea, (unto which he was never brought up) than to serve the Lord, and his People in dispensing spiritual food to them in a Church-way, no marvel if the Lord do not shine upon his way, but expose him to debts, necessities, poverties, miseries, hardships by Sea and Land. It is far off from me to despise his afflicted condition: but the truest merciful cordial to his afflicted estate, would be to persuade him that he is out of his way, and still blesseth himself (though God both cross his estate, and blast his spirit) in such a way.

As for my being at ease, (as he calleth it) had he been a little longer acquainted with the faithful discharge of a Ministers office, he would not judge it such a state of ease. If I durst allow myself to seek, and take mine ease, I should sooner choose a private solitary condition in his Wilderness, then all the throng of employment in this numerous society.

To

---

## TO CHAP. VIII.

**I**N his 8th Chapter Mr. *Williams* rehearseth, and examineth those words of my Letter, wherein to help him to a serious sight of his sin, I said that *it pleased the Lord Jesus to fight against his corrupt ways with the sword of his mouth, in the mouths and testimonies of the Churches, and Brethren. Against whom, when Mr. Williams over-heated himself in reasoning, and disputing against the light of his Truth, it pleased the Lord to stop his mouth, by a sudden disease, and to threaten to take his breath from him. But he in stead of recoiling (as even Balaam offered to do in the like case) chose rather to persist in his way, and to protest against all the Churches, and Brethren that stood in his way, &c.*

In these lines, the Examiner telleth us, *an humble, and discerning Spirit may espy first, a glorious justification, and boasting of my self, and others concurring with me: secondly, an unrighteous, and uncharitable Censure of the afflicted.*

Reply. Whether is it a more glorious boasting, to challenge to a man's self, *an humble, and discerning Spirit*, (as the Examiner doth here, and elsewhere in this Treatise) or to ascribe the glory to Christ in lighting with the sword of his mouth, in the testimonies and labours of the Churches, and Brethren against his corrupt ways?

Surely when our glorying is not in ourselves; but in the Lord Jesus, we are allowed so to do by the Holy Ghost, *Isa. 45. 25. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.*

Object. *But is it not a glorious boasting of our selves, when as we make the sword in our mouths, and testimonies, to be the sword of the mouth of Christ; when as the holy Scripture putteth the sword of Christ in the mouths of such witnesses, as himself, and some others, who in meekness, and patience, testify the Truth of Jesus against Antichrist, and against all false callings of Ministers? And whether Mr. Cotton, swimming with the stream of outward credit, and profit, and smiting with the fist, and sword of Persecution: or himself, and such other the witnesses of Christ, most like unto Balaam?*

Reply. 1. The quickness of the Examiners wit over-runneeth his, judgement; for I did not compare him to *Balaam* as like, much less

as

as most like; but as unlike. For that which *Balaam* would have done, I said, he would not do.

2. Let the light of the holy word of God discover, and judge, whether the sword of the mouth of the Lord Jesus be found in his mouth, and his fellows, or in the mouths of the Churches, and Brethren here: and let the trial be upon this very Point, whether witnesseth for Christ, or for Antichrist?

1. We witness that Christ was never so far overthrown, and overcome by Antichrist, but that still the Lord Jesus hath preserved a Congregational Church, one or more, especially since the Reformation of Religion by the Ministry of *Luther*, and *Calvin*, and other Ministers of Christ in the days of our Fathers.

The Examiner witnesseth, that since the Apostacy of Antichrist, Antichrist hath so fme ptevdilrd against Christ, and his Kingdom: that he hath no Church, nor Church-Officers left upon the face of the earth to this day.

2. We witness the godly person, visible Saints, confessing their known sins, and professing their faith, are fit materials for Church-fellowship.

The Examiner witnesseth, that the Churches (which consist of such visible Saints) are nullities, unless they discern every spot, and pollution of Antichrist, and forsake it: (for Instance) unless they see the Antichristian pollution of the Ministry in *England*, and do refuse to hear the word from it.

3. We witness, that Persons qualified with a convenient measure of spiritual gifts, fit to lead God's people; and chosen, and elected by a Congregation of visible Saints, and ordained, and set apart unto the work of the Ministry, have received a lawful calling from Christ to that office.

The Examiner witnesseth against this as a false Calling, upon what pretence himself better knows than I.

4. We witness, that it is lawful for the King of *England*, to give a Patent to a certain number of his Subjects, to transplant themselves out of *England* into *America*, and to possess such Lands as the Providence of God layeth open before them, between such, and such Degrees of the Horizon. Provided that his Subjects adventure not upon such acts as the Patent never intended, as to murder the Natives, or to dispossess them by violence or fraud of their lawful

Pos-

Possessions: but either to plant themselves in a *vacuum Domicilium*, or if they sit down upon the Possession of the Natives, to receive the same from them by a reasonable Purchase, or free Assignment.

The Examiner witnesseth against all such Patents, and Preacheth it to be unlawful for Magistrates to execute Justice upon the *English* by them, and that it is necessary to repent of receiving such Patents, and to return them back again into the hands of those Princes, or of their Successors, from whom they received them.

5. We witness, that it is lawful for Magistrates (especially in time of danger) to offer to the Subjects under them an Oath of Fidelity, whether they be regenerate, or unregenerate.

Mr. *Williams* witnesseth it to be utterly unlawful so to do: an Oath for confirmation of Office being peculiar to Christ: and an Oath being a worship of God not meet for unregenerate Persons to take into their mouths.

6. We witness, that if a Church refuse to hearken to the voice of Magistrates in delaying the Election, or ordination of such an one to Office, whom they find to be troublesome to the State, then it may be lawful for Magistrates to delay the granting of the Petition of such a Church for Lands that lie convenient for them.

Mr. *Williams* witnesseth, that in such a case the Church, whose Petition is so delayed, may write Letters of Admonition to all the Churches, whereof such Magistrates are members, to require them to grant without delay such Petitions, or else to Proceed against them in a Church-way.

Now let the Churches of Jesus Christ, and all the Saints on earth judge, in whether sort of these witnesses, the word, and Spirit of Christ, or Antichrist breatheth: As sort he deciphering which the Examiner maketh of Mr. *Cotton*, as *swimming with the stream of outward credit, and profit, and smiting with the fist, and sword of Persecution of such as do not join in worship with him*. I cannot say that I have sworn, but I thank God I have waded through credit, and discredit, through evil report, and good report, as a deceiver, and yet true. And for profit, I have neither abounded in superfluities, nor (through mercy) have been long destitute of necessities: but whether this be a badge of Antichrist, and not compatible to the witnesses of Christ, I have not yet learned.

And

And for smiting with the fist, and sword of Persecution, if Persecution, be affliction for Righteousness sake, I would willingly learn of the Eximiner, whom of all the Righteous I have smitten with the fist, or wounded with the sword? I speak according to his own meaning, meaning (as I suppose himself doth) neither bodily fist, nor material sword; but let him then Instance in some one, or other, that hath felt the heaviness of my fist, or the keenness of my sword, or else let him remember what the Spirit of God hath said (*Psal. 31. 18.*) concerning such, as speak bitter things proudly, and contemptuously, (and I also add) injuriously, and falsely against those whom himself in the next line styleth *holy, and beloved.*

To the second, *the Censure which he calleth unrighteous, and uncharitable; He confesseth, it pleased God to bring him near unto death:* But his answer he returneth in two things. 1. *By deriving the cause of his sickness, not from his excessive heat in disputing against the testimonies, and writings of the Churches, and Elders, but from his excessive Labours on the Lord's days, and thrice a week at Salem, by labours day and night in the field with his own hands, by travels day and night also to go, and return from the Court.*

*Reply.* The Court being held within twelve or fourteen miles distance from *Salem*, travel to, and fro, was no likely cause of such distemper. And whatsoever his Labours were in Town or Field, on the Lord's Days, or week days, (I detract not from them;) but this is all I would say, That that sodain distemper fell not upon him, neither in the field at his labour, nor on the week days, or Lord's days in his Preaching: but in his vehement public arguing against the writings, and testimonies of the Churches, and Brethren sent to him, and to the Church of *Salem* against his corrupt ways. Wherein though I know, *All things fall alike to all:* yet if *Moses* himself (as well as *Balaam*) meet with a check in his journey from the hand of God, I believe it is a just call to consider; Is there not a lie in my right hand? Or is there not an Idol in my heart? or do I go about the work of God, in a way of God? Howsoever, it was far from me to upbraid your sickness, (as your marginal note taketh;) but rather to call you to consider of your unprofitable, and perverse use of it.

The second part of his Answer is a Recrimination of the *Officer*  
of

*of Justice, by whom in this time he was unmercifully driven from by Chamber to a winters flight.*

*Reply.* When he saith, *in this time*; if he mean (as the words foregoing express) the time wherein he was near unto death, it is a manifest untruth. For the Officer of Justice (who then was) is a man fearing God, and of a tender Conscience, and who dare not allow that liberty to his tongue, which the Examiner often useth in this Discourse: He testifieth, he then spake with Mr. *Williams*, and that he discerned no sign of sickness upon him, much less of nearness unto death. He testifieth further, that upon the mourning complaint of some of Mr. *Williams* his neighbours, who did adhere to him, he left only the Warrant with him, but left him in his house to take the time for his departure limited in his warrant, which was not that night, though he do not well remember how many days were set him. But this I have been given to understand, that the increase of concourse of people to him on the Lord's days in private, to the neglect or deserting of public Ordinances, and to the spreading of the Leaven of his corrupt imaginations, provoked the Magistrates rather then to breed a winters spiritual plague in the Country, to put upon him a winters journey out of the Country, *Gangrænam amoveas, né pars sincera trahatur.*

---

## TO CHAP. IX.

**T**o his 9th Chapter, I shall not need to return any large Reply. Let him read over my words again, which he examineth, and answereth in this Chapter, and they may serve for a just Reply unto his Answer so far as it is needful.

Only let me touch a Passage, or two, When he saith, *That after the first manifestation of the countenance of God, reconciled in the blood of Christ unto his soul, it hath been with him, as with one whom he saith, I told him off, his Questions, and Troubles have not been concerning his Reconciliation, and Peace with God, but concerning Sanctification. &c.*

I would it might please the Lord to persuade his heart, that, that one of whom I spake to him, was but one to whom the Lord

H h

dis-

dispensed himself in that manner; and he a man, though he suffered much, and wrote much, yet no where magnified his sufferings, nor vilified the Authors of his suffering: A man that cleaved to the Ordinances, and Saints of God, and not willing to manifest his dissent from his Brethren, no not there where he did dissent, as willing to attribute more, to the judgements of other servants of God, then to arrogate to himself.

But surely the ordinary manner of God's dispensation of himself to his servants, is otherwise; even to those that have been most precious in his sight. *Job* hath sometimes complained, that *God took him for his enemy*, *Job* 13. 24, 26. *David* sometimes complaineth, that *he will cut off from before God's eyes*, *Psal.* 31. 22. And that God sometimes *hid his face from him*, *Psal.* 30. 7. That his soul was also sore vexed with the sense of God's anger, and *hot displeasure*, *Psal.* 6. 1. 3. *Asaph* also complaineth of the same, in *Psal.* 77. and *Heman the Ezrahite* in *Psal.* 88. and *Hezekiah* in *Isai.* 38. If the Lord have dealt more indulgently with Mr. *Williams*, he hath the more cause to walk humbly, and circumspectly, and fruitfully before the Lord, which is the worst that I with him. And let him also consider, that whilst he liveth under the Sun, himself is not exempted from the dangerous Inmate of a deceitful heart. As for Master *Smith* he standeth, and falleth to his own Master: whilst he was Preacher to the City of *Lincoln*, he wrought with God then: what temptations befel him after, by the evil workings of evil men, and some good men too, I choose rather to tremble at, than discourse of. If I had made use of his Principles, and Arguments, (as this Examiner saith I have) it is more then my self know: for I have not been acquainted with sundry of his writings, as being discouraged with that one, wherein he maketh Original sin an idle name. Albeit, I refuse not to learn from any man, as being conscious to my self of mine own emptiness.

*But* (saith the Examiner) *whatsoever Mr. Smith's Temptations, and Falls have been: yet that opinion of Mr. Cotton, or any, is most grievous to God, and man, and not comparable to any that ever Mr. Smith could be charged withal: nor is any sin comparably so grievous in God's Davids, as a treacherous slaughter of the faithful, whom we are forced to call, Beloved in Christ.*

*Reply.* This is one of the Instances amongst many others, upon which

which I was moved to speak even now, that the Examiner alloweth more liberty to his tongue, then the Messenger of Justice, a man of a tender Conscience, (of whom I spake) durst use. But when a man is delivered up to Satan, and neither his mind, nor conscience, nor tongue, nor pen, are his own, no marvel if he cast forth firebrands, and arrows, and mortal things, which I suppose a Publican, or Pagan would hardly utter, without some more colourable pretence than the Examiner saith to say, *That Mr. Cotton is of opinion, that it is lawful to commit a treacherous slaughter of the Saints; whom we are forced to call, Beloved in Christ.*

To the accusation I shall (God helping) make further Answer in his Place: Mean while, let the Examiner know, that I was not forced to call him, *Beloved in Christ*. That I did so style him, it was out of indulgence of charide, not out of any necessity of duty.

## TO CHAP. X.

THE residue of my Lettter to Mr. *Williams* was taken up in removing two stumbling blocks out of his way, which turned him off from fellowship with us. The former was, the want of fit matter of our Churches. The latter, our disrespect to the separate Churches in *England*. Our want of fit matter he acknowledged stood, not in this, that *we wanted godly persons to be the visible members of our Churches, (for with joy, be ackowledged that:) but in this, that all godly persons are not matter fit to constitute a Church, no more when Trees, or Quarries are fit matter proportioned to a Building.*

This exception of his seemed to me to imply a contradiction: for if the matter of our Churches were (such as himself acknowledged) godly persons, they were not then as Trees unfeld, nor as stones in the Quarry unhewn: for godliness cutteth men down from their former root, and heweth them out of the Pit of corrupt Nature, and fitteth them for fellowship with Christ, and with his People.

The sum of his Answer is (though delivered in other words obscurely and confusedly, yet in sense) thus much; That he accounteth our members, as Trees or Quarries; not for that they are not yet cut out of the pit or root of natural corruption, but for that they are not yet removed and cleansed from actual and Anti-

christian pollution. *In which case, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Sampson, Job, David, Peter, in their drunkenness, lying, whoredoms, cursings, murders, Perjuries, though they were godly persons: yet not fit members for Church estate. And so our Church-members, howsoever godly Otherwise, yet through ignorance, and negligence, lying under Antichristian pollutions, ever since the Apostacy, are not fit members for Church-estate.*

*Reply, 1.* I do willingly allow him to be the Interpreter of his own meaning: and do easily grant him, that with that distinction, he salveth his contradiction. But yet let him remember, his words were very *Improper, to account godly Persons fallen into any actual Pollution, to be matter fitted for a Church, no more then Trees or Quarries are fit matter proportioned to a Building.*

We are not wont, neither in common speech, nor in proper speech, to account such persons, as have been already cut off from the root and pit of natural corruption, to be no more then Trees and Quarries, though they have since fallen into actual pollution; but we rather account them like Timber and Stones, cut out, and hewn, yet fallen into some mire by the breach of the Axeltree of their Carriage, and therefore fit to be washed before they be layed in the Building. But leave that, as it please him.

*Reply, 2.* He may do well to consider, that the most of those Saints he nameth, were not as rude Trees and Quarries unproportioned to the Building, but as Trees of Righteousness, and living Stones, layed by God himself in the Building of his Church. But I easily grant him, that according to the Discipline of the Churches of Christ in the days of the Gospel, it were meet that godly persons falling into any gross, and scandalous, and notorious pollution, they should first give satisfaction to the Church by profession of their Repentance, before they be received into holy fellowship with the Lord, and his People, in Church communion. In which respect, if Christ be considered as head of the visible Church, he who is a member of the Church, (and so a member of Christ:) may fall so foully into gross sin, and be so enthralled to it, as to be separate from the Church, yea and from Christ too, considered as the visible head of it. *And therefore the Examiner mistook himself, and me too, when he writeth, that I affirmed, that godly persons cannot be so enthralled to Antichrist, as to separate them from Christ.* For I never denied, that godly persons may fall, as into other gross  
and

and notorious sins; so also into gross and notorious Antichristian pollutions, so as to separate them from Church-Communion, yea and from Christ himself, as he is the Head of the visible Church.

*Reply.* 3. But to clear the point more fully and plainly; Put the case, that the Saints whom the Examiner setteth forth in their pollutions, (as *Noah, Abraham, Lot, Sampson, Job, David, Peter,*) suppose, I say, they had openly protested their Repentance: for their open scandals, of drunkenness, lying, incest, murder, &c. and all their other known scandals, but had neither discerned nor bewailed the sin of Polygamy: yea, suppose the Church with which they might join, did neither discern the necessity, nor duty of acknowledging that sin, whether such Saints were to be refused from Church-communion, (as rude Trees and Quarries?) or if they were received as members into the Church, whether was such a Church to be separated from? If yea, we must *look* for new Rules for it out of a new Gospel. If no, then will the Examiner want a Rule for his separation from all the Churches in *New-England*.

For this is the very state of the Question, as the Examiner himself rehearseth it, in this Chapter. For he having objected, that *a necessity lieth upon godly men, before they can be fit matter for Church fellowship, to see, bewail, repent, and come out of the false Churches, worship, Ministry, Government, according to Scriptures, Isai. 62. 11. 2 Cor. 6. 17.) And this is to be done, not by a local removal, but by a deliverance of the soul, understanding, will, judgement and affection, &c.*

He subjoineth my Answer out of my Letter in these words;

1. *We grant, that it is not local removal from former pollution, nor contrary practice, that fitteth us for fellowship with Christ, and his Church: but that it is necessary also, that we do repent of such former Pollutions, wherewith we have been defiled and enthralled.*

2. *We grant further, that it is necessary to Church-fellowship with Christ, that we should see and discern all such pollutions, as do so far enthrall us to Antichrist, as to separate us from Christ. But this we profess unto you, that wherein we have reformed our practice, therein we have endeavoured unfeignedly to humble our souls for our former contrary walking. If my hypocrisy are wanting herein, the hidden hypocrisy of some will not prejudice the sincerity, and faithfulness of others, nor the Church-estate of all.*

This though the Examiner do rehearse it here in this Chapter:  
yet.

yet here he answereth nothing to it, though it be the very hinge of the Controversy. If we meet with any Answer to it in the sequel, we shall (God wiiling) consider of it in its place.

Only let me add this third thing to clear the state of the controversy more fully, That to this day we do not see nor discern, that it is any Antichristian pollution at all, for a member of any of our Churches going over into *England*, to hear the word Preached by a well-gifted Minister in the Parish Assemblies,

## TO CHAP. XI.

IN this Chapter, the Examiner, propoundeth a second, third, fourth, and fifth Reason, to prove that, (which I deny not) to wit, *That a necessity lieth upon godly men, before they can be fit matter for Church-fellowship, truly to see and humbly to bewail their spiritual bondage under Antichristian pollution, and withal to obtain some power and strength from Jesus Christ to bring them out of it.*

This I say, I deny not, nor ever did. But this necessity I conceive to be *Necessitas præcepti*, (as they call it, or *officii*) as that which is the commandment of God, and the duty of godly men to do: But not *Necessitas medij ad finem*, such a necessity, as without which a godly person cannot be a member of the Church, unless the spiritual bondage under Antichristian pollution, do so far enthrall him to Antichrist, as to separate him from Christ as he is the Head of the visible Church. Which what it is, we shall have fitter occasion to speak of in the sequel.

To his second Argument I would therefore Answer, that as an holy Altar and Temple to God, could not have been built to God in the midn of *Babylon*, but the Builders must come locally out of *Babel* to build it in *Hierusalem*: So a Church of Christ cannot be built to God, but by such Builders as spiritually come out of Antichristian pollutions and inventions, at least out of such pollutions as keep them still in *Babel*, and detain them under Antichrist, and separate them from Christ.

To his third Argument, I would grant all that he saith in it to be true: But how he applieth it to infer his conclusion, he neither expressth, nor is it else for me to gather. If his meaning be,  
that

that Luther, and other *godly* persons, might not be received into Church-fellowship in those days, because they saw not the bottomless gulf of all those Antichristian corruptions, which the Lord hath since discovered; It is a conclusion that I durst not infer, nor will he be ever able to make good. It is not always full Moon in respect of spiritual light with every Church of God in all ages alike.

To his fourth Argument, taken from my own Practise; *In that I do not receive all Persons, eminent for Grace and godliness, forthwith to the fellowship of the Lord's Supper, till upon their entrance into Covenant, with a Confession of faith, &c,*

I would answer, it is not because I think such persons are not fit matter for Church estate; but because they yet want a fit Form, requisite to Church estate,

His last Argument, is taken from a *famous Passage* (as he calls it) *of a solemn Question put to me, and to the other New-English Elders, unto which I with the rest did answer Negatively, That if godly persons coming over hither did refuse to submit to our way of worship and Government, that then they could not only not enjoy Church-fellowship together, but not be permitted to breath and live in the same common air and Common-wealth together.*

To which I answer; I. That it is suitable to his wonted boldness, to affirm that of me which is more then he knoweth, and indeed more then is truth. For though he say, that Mr. *Cotton*, and the New English Elders returned that Answer: yet the answer to that Question, and to all the other thirty-two Questions, were drawn up by Mr. *Mader*, and neither drawn up nor sent by me, nor (for ought I know) by the other Elders here, though published by one of our Elders there. Howsoever, the substance of that Answer (not which Mr. *Williams* rehearseth, but which Mr. *Mader* returned) doth generally suit with all our minds, as I conceive.

2., In particular; The Answer which our reverend and beloved brother Mr. *Mader* did return unto that Question, I have read it, and did readily approve it (as I do the substance of all his Answers) to be judicious, and solid. But this I must needs profess, that his Answer to this Question is notoriously slandered, and abused by the Examiner.

For

For 1. There is no word at all in that Answer, *that denieth permission to such godly persons to live and breath in the same air of the Common-wealth.* Let the Answer be perused; It is too long for me to transcribe; the Book is publicly extant, and obvious: and see if there be a syllable founding that way.

2. In that Answer he distinguisheth (out of Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Parker) touching matters of Church Discipline, and maketh some to be the substantial and immutable, others of a more accidental and circumstantial nature.

In the former, *he doubteth not but that we and all the godly Ministers in England should accord (if they were here;) as believing, that either we should satisfy them in our way, or they us in theirs; so as there would never be Question, whether we should embrace one another at Sister-Churches.*

In the latter, to wit, in matters circumstantial, we are all taught of God, *Placide ferre aliud sentientes.*

3. When the Examiner maketh it his own case, *not to be permitted to live and breath in the same air and Common-wealth, though Mr. Cotton, and others, most incensed, gave him a testimony of godliness, &c.*

Let him be pleased to look back, to what hath been formerly laid open, and he will find this Instance of himself wholly impertinent. For the casting of him out of the Commonwealth, sprung not from his difference in matters of Church Discipline. It was well known that whilst he lived at *Salem*, he neither admitted, nor permitted any Church-members, but such as rejected all Communion with the Parish Assemblies, so much as in hearing of the Word amongst them. And this liberty he did use and might have used to this day, without any disturbance to his Civil or Church Peace, (save only in a way of brotherly disquisition;) but it was his Doctrines and Practices which tended to the Civil disturbance of the Common-wealth, together with his heady and busy pursuit of the same, even to the rejection of all Churches here. These they were that made him unfit for enjoying Communion either in the one state, or in the other. When he reckoneth me, and me only by name, (as one of the most incensed against him) I reckon it as one of his usual exorbitant Hyperboles: unless by *Incensed*, he mean one that with some others, were most kindled,

led, and stirred up to endeavour his satisfaction. And then his term *Incensed*, though it be not an Hyperbole, yet it is an Acurology.

Neither do I remember, that he hath any cause to say, that *I gave him a Testimony of godliness*.

For this godliness, I leave it to him who is the searcher of hearts: I neither attested it, nor denied it.

Every brother in the Church, though he may be called a brother in Christ, as Christ is the Head of the visible Church: and being cast out of the Church, though he may be admonished as a Brother, and so have some reference still to Christ, yet godliness requireth a Participation of the Divine Nature, (I speak in *Peter's* sence, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4.) by the power of the Spirit of Grace, conforming us to fellowship with Christ, and his Churches: the which things have not so evidently appeared to me, (I speak it with grief) either in his spirit, or in his way these many years. And yet I deny not, others may discern more Power of Godliness in him, then I do, and may speak of him accordingly. But it was no uncharitable speech of Paul, to tell the *Galatians*, and that before all the Churches, that he stood in fear of them, *Gal.* 4. 10. The life of faith (from whence springeth both the truth, and the Power of Godliness) is very repugnant to Self-fulness, ἀὐθάρδεια; Faith emptieth a man of self-confidence, and maketh him apt to acknowledge with *Agur*, *Truly I am more foolish than any man*, *Prov.* 30. 2. But the Lord help us to tremble before him: If he leave us (though but a while) to our selves, we can soon learn to reign as Kings, (like the *Corinthians*) without Church-Officers, or the Ordinances of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 4. 8.

---

## TO CHAP. XII.

**H**IS 12th Chapter is taken up in Examining and Answering a speech of mine, *That godly persons are not so enthralled to Antichrist, as to separate from Christ: Else they could not be godly persons*.

His Answer is, *That this cometh not near the Question, which is not concerning personal godliness, or Grace in Christ, but the godliness or Christianity of worship*.

Whereupon he distinguisheth of Christ, as considered two ways:  
 1. *Personally, as God-man, &c.* 2. *As Head of his Church. In the former sense (he acknowledgeth) they cannot be so enthralled to Antichrist, as to be separate from Christ: in the latter they may.*

*Reply.* This distinction of Christ is inconveniently expressed, as was the like once before. For the *membra dividenda*, the parts of the division are coincident. Christ as God-man is the Head of the visible Church. But his meaning I apprehend, and accept. Christ God-man is Head both of the invisible Church, and of the visible; As. he is Head of the invisible Church, fobe is received by faith: As he is head of the visible, so he is received by profession of the true faith, both of the grace of faith, and of the Doctrine of faith. The proper fruit whereof is holy worship, and professed subjection to the Rule of the Gospel.

Now for his application of his Distinction, in the general I do approve it, and do willingly acknowledge, that a godly, person may be (through ignorance, or negligence) so far enthralled to Antichrist, as to be separate from Christ, taking Christ as Head of the visible Church. For he may fall into such fundamental Antichristian corruption, in Doctrine, or Worship, or Government, as either may justly prevent his admission into the Church, or being in the Church, and yet (through pang of Temptation) continuing obstinate in his conuption after conviction, he may justly be excommunicate out of the Church. But lest I may seem to hover, (and so to vanish) in Generalities, whilst I only speak of Antichristian corruptions in general: I shall willingly Instance in some Particulars, which may give light to others of like nature. It is an Antichristian corruption in Doctrine, to accept any Propitiatory Sacrifices for our reconciliation, but the death of Christ only.

It is a like corruption, to look for Justification from sin in the sight of God by our own works.

It is an Antichristian corruption in worship, to worship Angels, or Saints, or Images.

It is an Antichristian corruption in Government, to take the Pope to be the Head of the Church: and such an Head as hath Power to make Laws to bind the Conscience, to authorize Scripture to be Canonical, to add other Books to Scripture with like Authority, to be himself the only Authentical Interpreter of Scripture, and Judge of Controversies.

These

These and the like corruptions are such as make Antichrist a Son of Perdition, and them that are led by him to fall into like Perdition with him. Of one of these Points *Paul* saith, They that hold it, hold not the Head, *Col.* 2. 18, 19. Of another of these *Paul* saith, They that hold it are abolished from Christ, *Gal.* 5. 4. The like we may say of all the rest. Yet in times of former darkness, some of the faithful members of Christ, might and were for a time entangled with a yoke of Bondage, in some, or most, or all of these Particulars: out of which the Lord at length rescued them by variety of Temptations, and by some breaking forth of light in the mouths of some of his witnesses in every age.

But whilst many of them walked in these, or like corruptions, they might justly be debarred from admission into Church fellowship: or standing fast in them after conviction, they might justly be cast forth out of Church-fellowship.

But there be other corruptions, and Antichristian corruptions too, which, because they do not subvert the foundation, neither of faith, nor of Church-order. I would not say that they separate from Christ, no not as he is he Head of the visible Church. For then if some whole Church were leavened with them, they might soon cease to be a Church. But we see the contrary in Scripture, the High Places were tolerated in *Judah*, and yet *Judah* ceased not to be a Church: And by like proportion some more high and eminent Power may be given by some Churches to their Officers, (according to an Antichristian Pattern in some measure) and yet they not cease to be a Church. *David* and all the Congregation of *Israel* might bring up the Ark of God in a Cart, (after the manner of the *Philistines*) and yet not disanul their Church-estate: And by like proportion, (O may a Church of Christ take up some orders, (as the carting of some part of their worship upon a Book) after the manner of Antichrist, and yet not forthwith evacuate their Church-estate,

But this let me further add, that a godly person may have some kind of communion, so far as hearing the word from a Minister well gifted by Christ, to whose calling some corruption may cleave, both in his Church-estate, and in his Ordination: And yet nevertheless, no Antichristian Pollution at all may cleave or redound to the hearer by his hearing of him. And this being the

Principal Exception which the Examiner taketh against some of the members of our churches, & against all the churches for their sakes, we shall further (God willing) clear when the Examiner putteth it upon us in the sequel. Meanwhile, we profess as we do believe, that such an action is not any Church-communion with Ancichrist, nor doth so enthrall the People of God unto Antichrist, as to separate them from Christ, no not as he is Head of the visible Church,

The Answer which (upon occasion of this Point) the Examiner giveth to the Papists Question, (*Where was your Church before Luther?*) though it seem to him well and good: yet it gratifieth the Papists, and straineth the holy Counsel of God in Scripture. *The Question, saith he, is thus well answered, to wit, That since the Apostacy of Antichrist, Truth, and the holy City, (according to the Prophecy, Rev. 11. & 13,) have been trodden under-foot, and the whole Earth hath wandered after the Beast; yet God hath stirred up witnesses to Prophecy in sackcloth against the Beast, during his 42 months' Reign. Nevertheless, these witnesses have in their times more or less submitted to Antichrist, and his Church, Worship, Ministry, &c. And so consequently have been ignorant of the true Church, that is, Christ taken for the Church in the true Profession of that holy way of worship, which he himself at first appointed.* This Answer giveth away the cause to the Papists. They demand, *Where was your Church before Luther?* This Answer giveth it for granted, that since the Apostacy there was no particular church extant in the world. This fully satisfieth their desire, and expectation: for if there were no Church of Christ in the world, for so many Centuries of years till *Luther*, then they readily conclude, That their Church of *Rome* was (before *Luther*) the only Church in the world. For they urge it, (and I know not how we can fairly deny it) that the Church of Christ, even that Church to which the keys of the kingdom are committed, (which is the visible Church) is that against which the *Gates of Hell shall not be able to prevail*, and so not all the Power of Antichrist. If then the visble Church of Christ shall never cease, and yet during all that time of the Apostacy of Antichrist, no Church was extant in the world, but the Church of *Rome*, then during all that time (which is not yet expired) the Church of *Rome* is, and hath been the only Church of Christ these many ages. Besides, as this Answerer gratifieth the Papist, and maketh the promise of Christ (*Mal. 16. 18, 19,*) of none effect: so it straitneth

straitneth the Counsel of God in the very Texts of Scripture alledged by himself. For in that Text (*Rev.* 11.) where the outward Court is given to the Gentiles, (that is, Ecclesiastical Courts, given to Antichrist & his Clergy) *v.* 2. There also a rod or reed is given by the Angel unto *John*, to measure the Temple of God, and the Altar, and them that worship therein, *v.* 1. Which evidently holdeth forth that even then there was somewhere extant the Temple, that is, the visible Church of Christ, which had communion with Christ as Head of the Church, there called *The Altar, and the Temple*, was furnished with true worshippers, and all measured according to the Pattern of Apostolical Rule. What if Ecclesiastical Stories be deficient in telling us the time and places of their Church Assemblies? Is therefore the Word of God deficient, or the Church deficient; because humane Stories are deficient? Great hath been the industry and vigilancy of Satan and Antichrist, to blot out (as much as in them lay) all Monuments and Records of such holy Assemblies: but yet sometimes their own Inquisitors confess that the Churches of the *Waldenses*, or men of that way, have been extant *a tempore Apostolorum*.

Furthermore, evident it is, that when the Dragon persecuted the woman, (that is, the Church) the Church fled into the Wilderness, *and was there nourished for a time, and times, and half a time*, (*Rev.* 12. 14.) which is all the time, wherein the Beast reigned, *Rev.* 13. 5. And wherein the Gentiles, having obtained Rule in the Court, *trod down the holy City under-foot*, *Rev.* 11. 2.

Moreover, evident also it is, that all the Angels (or Ministers) of God's wrath that poured out their Vials upon the Antichristian State, did all of them issue forth out of the Temple, and out of the Temple as then opened, *Rev.* 15. 5, 6 Which argueth that the Temple or Church was not only then visible, but openly visible: not visible only to the secret Assembly of the true worshippers, but openly conspicuous to them that had not seen it before. Now how all those seven Angels should come out of the Temple, and it openly visible, and all of them pour out their Vials upon the Antichristian State by seven Degrees, to the utter desolation of it: and yet no Church extant, either before *Luther*, or since *Luther*, till the utter extirpation of Antichrist, passeth all my comprehension.

To

---

### TO CHAP. XIII.

**H**IS 13th Chapter is taken up in Examining and Answering a second Answer, which I gave to his Objection propounded above in Chap. 10. The Answer was this, as he setteth it down.

*Secondly, we deny that it is necessary to Church-fellowship, (that is so necessary, that without it a Church cannot be) That the members admitted thereunto, should all of them see, and expressly bewail all the pollutions which they have been defiled with in their former Church-fellowship, Ministry, worship, Government, &c. If they see and bewail so much of their former pollutions, as did enthrall them to Antichrist, so, as to separate them from Christ: and withal be ready in preparation of heart, as they shall see more light, so to hate more and more every false way. This we conceive to be as much, as is necessarily required to separate them from Antichrist unto fellowship with Christ, and his Churches, &c.*

For Answer hereunto, the Examiner desireth three things to be observed:

1. Mr. Cotton's own Confession of that two-fold Church-estate, worship, &c. The former false: or else why to be so bewailed and forsaken? The second true, to be embraced and submitted to.

*Reply.* This observation is more than is intended, or can justly be gathered from my words: For even a true Estate of a Church, Worship, Ministry, &c. may be bewailed, though not in regard of the falshood of the estate, yet in regard of the pollutions that cleaved to it, which were as so many false ways in the Administration of it.

2. The second thing, which he would have to be observed, is my own confession of that which a little before I would make so odious in him to hold. to wit, *That God's People may be so far enthrall'd to Antichrist, as to separate them from Christ.* For there were my words; *If they see and bewail, so much of their former pollutions, as did enthrall them to Antichrist, so as to separate them from Christ.*

*Reply.* 1. His expressions of himself in that Point were so incommodious. as that a plain Reader, (such as my self, unwonted to hear such language, in his eence) could not easily conceive, *that he speaking of godly persons, no less unfit for Church-fellowship, than Trees and Quarries unfit for a Building.*

I say,

I say, I could, not easily conceive, that by Trees and Quarries should be meant any other persons then unregenerate: and it seemed to me, to imply a contradiction, to call them ungodly, who were unregenerate.

*Reply.* 2. The Examiner wrongeth himself and me, to say, *That I would have made it odious in him, to say that godly persons cannot be so enthralled to Antichrist, as to separate them from Christ.* The odiousness he speaketh of is a contradiction: And it was himself, not I, that forged that contradiction, as hath been shewed above.

*Reply.* 3. My words out of which he gathereth this observation, are misreported and the contradiction ariseth from his misreport, not from my words. For God's People, and godly persons are not all one. Any Church-members may be called God's People, as being in external Covenant with him, (*Psal.* 81. 11.) and yet they are not always godly persons, God's People may be so enthralled to Antichrist, as to separate them utterly from Christ, both as Head of the visible, and invisible Church also. But godly persons cannot be so enthralled to Antichrist, as to separate them from Christ, as the Head of the invisible Church: though, as said before, they may be separated from him, as the Head of the visible Church.

3. The third thing which the Examinee would have to be observed in my words, is, *How easily a soul may wander in his generals: for thus I write, though they see not all the pollutions, wherewith they have been defiled in their former Church-fellowship: Again, if they did see so much as did enthrall them to Antichrist, and separate them from Christ. And yet (saith he) he expresseth nothing of that, all the pollutions, nor what so much is, as will separate them from Christ.*

*Reply.* 1. Though these words might seem general to a stranger, who knew nothing of the occasion of them: yet to the Examiner himself, (to whom in private I writ them) it was easy and obvious to point with the finger, at the particular I intended in these. He knoweth the Question was; *Whether the hearing of the Ministers of the Parishes in England, was such an Antichristian pollution, as either to cut off such persons from Church-fellowship, or the Churches themselves from Christ.* Our Answer was; 1. That it was no Antichristian pollution at all: 2. If it were, it was more than either our members, or our Churches yet saw, or were convinced of: and then general confessions, and general repentance would serve for unknown

known sins. To the same purpose, is this general Answer framed here: which himself well knoweth upon what particular occasion it grew, and to what particular case it had reference.

*Reply. 2.* Besides, why should we count the Answer as wandering in Generalities when it was fitted to his general Objection? His Objection was *Chapt. 10. That a necessity lay upon godly men, before they can be fit matter for Church fellowship, to see, bewail, repent, come out of the false Churches, Worship, Ministry, Government.*

Now here are only general words: no particular mention of the falsehoods that lie in the Churches, Worship, Ministry, Government. Why should he blame wandring in Generality in the Answer, when his own Objection wandereth in the like Generalities.

*Reply. 3.* If he please to look back to the Reply given in his 12. Chapter, he may find me plain and punctual in Instancing in particulars. But thus having passed over his Observations upon my former Answer, he now cometh to return Answer to me, by demanding a Question or two, to wit, 1. *Whether if a godly person remain a member of a falsely constituted Church, and so consequently (in that respect) of a false Christ, whether in visible worship he be not separate from the true Christ?*

*Answ.* That I may not delude neither him, nor my self, by answering to obscure and ambiguous terms. I would know (by some that understand his speech) what he meaneth *by a falsely constituted Church*: or else give me leave to explain the terms my self. There be but two things intrinsically necessary to the constitution of any thing, & so of a Church, to wit, a fit matter, and a fit form. The matter of a Church are visible Saints, Professors of the faith of Christ. The form, is an holy Covenant, or Agreement, (either explicit or implicit) to join together in one Congregation, to worship the Lord, and to edify one another in the Administration of his holy Ordinances. Now if in stead of visible Saints professing the Name of Christ, there be a company of profane persons, Idolaters, Heretics, that shall covenant, or agree together to join in a Congregation to worship Idols, and to build up one another in Heresy, and Apostacy; This is *Ecclesia Malignantum*, a false constituted Church: And consequently, the Head of this Church is a false Christ, and every member of this Church, who joineth  
with

with them in this way, is in visible worship, separate from the true Christ.

In this sense, I would answer to the Examiners first Question, Affirmatively.

His second Question then is, *Whether it be not absolutely necessary to a godly persons uniting with the true Church, (that is, with Christ in true Christian worship) that he see and bewail, and absolutely come out from that former false Church, or Christ, and his Ministry, Worship, &c. before he can be united to the true Israel?*

*Answ.* I would readily answer this Question, Affirmatively also, unless there be a fallacy in the latter absolutely. For his Question is, *Whether it be not absolutely necessary unto uniting with a true Church, to see, and bewail, and come out absolutely from the false Church, or Christ, or Ministry, or Worship, &c.* This latter absolutely, if it imply no more then coming out altogether from all that separateth from true Christ, I grant it absolutely: but if he mean coming out from every thing of theirs, say from every good gift, yea from every error amongst them, which doth not separate from Christ, and then I deny that it is absolutely necessary, either to see or bewail all, or in that sense absolutely to come out of all.

His similitudes brought to the contrary, may persuade a self-pleasing fancy, but will not convince nor satisfy any solid Judgement. Might not the *Israelites* that came out of *Ægypt*, borrow Jewels of silver and gold from the *Ægyptians*, yea and carry up also a mixed multitude of People, and yet build a Tabernacle to the Lord in the Wilderness? *Exod.* 12. 35. to 38. Might not the *Jewel* come out of *Babel*, and accept from all the People, where they had sojourned, vessels of silver, and gold, with goods and beasts, and other precious things, and yet build a Temple at *Hierusalem*? *Ezra* 1. 4, 5, 6. May not a soul be married to Christ, and yet his former husband (his corrupt nature) not be so absolutely dead, as the husband of a wife must be, beforeshe can be lawfully married to another?

The Graft Cut off from one tree, may be engrafted to another: and yet carry forth his old leaves with him. The kingdom of Christ that is cut off from the Roman Monarchy, may yet for a time have some intercourse with the Roman Monarchy.

The *Corinthians*, though united with Christ:, and washed from

K k

their

their former Idolatry, as well as from other sins: yet still were defiled with communion in Idols' Temples, and with Fornication,

The *Thessalonians* turned from their former Idols, to serve the living and true God: yet they had some amongst them, that walked inordinately after their entrance into Church estate, as well as before, 2 *Thes.* 3. 6. besides, for a further answer to his similitudes the Examiner may remember, that though *Israel* came out of *Egypt* locally, before they could sacrifice to God in the Wilderness, yet in their hearts and souls they were still for *Ægypt*, *Exod.* 14. 11, 12. Yea and for *Ægyptian* Idols, *Act.* 7. 39. *Ezek.* 20. 7, 8. which is more than we do allow to our selves.

---

### TO CHAP. XIV.

**H**IS 4th Chapter is spent in Examining and answering a Reason that I gave of my second Answer to his Objection, which was propounded and cleared in the former Chapter. The Reason was this. *The Church of Christ received many thousand Jews, who believed on the Name of Christ, although they were still zealous of the Law, and saw not the beggarly emptiness of Moses his Ceremonies, Act. 21. 20. And the Apostle Paul directeth the Romans to receive such unto them, as were weak in the faith, and saw not their liberty from the service difference of Meats and Days, but still lay under the bondage of the Law. Yea he wished them to receive such upon this ground, because Christ had received them, Rom. 14. 1. to 6. And lest it should be objected, there was not the like danger of lying under bondage to Moses as to Antichrist; It was said, even the bondage under Moses was such, as that if it were continued in, after instruction and conviction, it would separate them from Christ, (Gal. 5. 2.) and bondage under Antichrist could do no more.*

For Answer hereto, the Examiner would have two things to be carefully minded:

1. *That the Ordinances of Moses were sometimes the Ordinances of God: and when they were to vanish, they were to be taken away with solemnity. The Ordinances of Antichrist were the Inventions of Satan, and from first to last never to be received, nor submitted to, no not for a moment.*

2. *He*

2. *He have the difference of times to be observed, (which saith he, Mr. Cotton himself confesseth) after instruction and conviction, Moses Law was deadly, and would separate from Christ. Therefore there was a time, when they were not deadly, and did not separate from Christ, to wit, until Moses was honourably fallen asleep, &c. To apply then, Paul observed a vow, and the Ceremonies of it, Circumcised Timothy, &c. May therefore a Messenger of Christ now (as Paul) go to Mass, Pray to Saints, perform Penance, keep Christmas, and other Popish Feasts, and Fasts? &c.*

*Reply.* 1. I never heard or read till now, that *Paul* ever went to Mass, Prayed to Saints, kept Christmas, or the like: nor did I ever imagine, that any ingenuous mind would think that ever it came into my heart to plead for such things now, or for the retaining of any Popish Rite at all. But the wit and lip of man being let loose, and left to it self, may infer *quodlibet ex quolibet*.

If it be said, his Parenthesis (as *Paul*) had reference only to a Messenger of Christ, (as *Paul*) not to any such like act of *Paul*, then his Argument is no more conclusive than *Baculo ad Angulum*. What colour were there that any man now should plead *Paul's* example, to do that now, which *Paul* never did, nor any thing like it?

*Reply* 2. The Examiner requireth two things here to be carefully minded: In answer whereto, I desire but one thing to be carefully minded: to wit, to what end, I alledged the ignorance of the *Jews* in the Primitive times, and the indulgence of the Christian Churches, for receiving them into Church-fellowship, notwithstanding such ignorance: And then see, if it do not infer that which I brought it for.

If in the Primitive times, the ignorance of the *Jews* in many weighty Points of Religion, and some of them fundamental, did not hinder their receiving into Christian Church-fellowship, nor disannul their Church-estate (who so received them) then it is not so necessary to Church-fellowship, as that without it a Church cannot be, that the Members admitted thereunto, should all of them see and expressly bewail, all the pollutions, wherewith they have been defiled in their former Church-fellowship, Ministry, Worship, Government, &c. But the former is true, as hath been opened from *Acts* 21. 20. *Rom.* 14. 1. to 6. *Gal.* 5. 2. To which

may be added, Acts 15. 5. with 24. Where it appeareth some of the members of the Church and of the Synod, held forth such Doctrine and Worship, couching the necessity of Circumcision, and observation of the Law, as tended to the subversion of souls: and yet neither their membership, nor the Estate of the Church was thereby disannulled.

The Conclusion is evident from these Premises.

*It is a vain thing now to allege, that the Ordinances of Moses were sometimes the Ordinances of God, but so the inventions of Antichrist never were: and there is not the like honourable respect and tenderness to be shewed to the inventions of Antichrist, as to the vanishing Ordinances of God; For though this were of weight, in case I had pleaded for the practise of any Antichristian inventions, (which indeed was far off, both from my meaning and words:) yet in this case it is wholly impertinent. For that which I pleaded for, was, the capableness of godly Persons of Church-estate, notwithstanding their ignorance of soe weighty and necessary truths: and the soundness of their Church-estate, notwithstanding their admission and toleration of such ignorant members unto which the difference of the several objects of their ignorance maketh nothing at all. For the ignorance of weighty Truths (of one sort as well as another) necessary to salvation, is a sin of like destructive nature, of what kind soever the Truths be.*

Besides, there is no need, either for the clearing of our members, or of our Church-estate, to plead for the capableness of godly persons of Church-estate, notwithstanding their ignorance of the Truths of God, whether more or less necessary: For we do not look at it as any point of ignorance at all, for our members to believe, they may partake in the gifts of the godly Ministers in *England*, in hearing the word of God from them. I know the Examiner is vehement and peremptory in pleading for an *absolute necessity, that godly persons before they do join to a true Church, and Ministry, should see and bewail so much as may amount to cut off the soul from a false Church; (whether National, Parishional, or any other falsly constituted Church) Ministry, Worship, and Government of it.*

But the voice of God is not always in every vehement and mighty wind, that rendeth mountains, and breaketh rocks, 1 Kings 19. 11. The Examiner is not ignorant, that we have seen,  
and

and bewailed National, and Parishional Church-estate, and have cut off our selves (by the Grace of Christ) from any invented worship or government of it: yea and from such entrance into the Ministry or Administration of it, as was corrupt either by National or Parishional Relation. But this is that which he requireth further, (He I say, but not the Lord) that we should cut off our selves from hearing the Ministry of the Parishes in *England*, as being the Ministry of a National, or Parishional Church, whereof both the Church-estate is falsely constituted, and all the Ministry, Worship, and Government thereof false also.

But two things here may suffice to answer this clamour.

1. Suppose all this were true, that he clamoureth, but proveth not: yet this would I fain learn, wherein lieth the sin of our members in hearing the godly Ministers in the Parishes? *Why*, saith he, *in that they do not cut off themselves from a false Ministry.*

Now by the Ministry may be meant, either the office of the Ministry, or the exercise of the office, and gifts of the Ministry. From the office, and from the exercise of the office, our members have cut off themselves, partly by submitting themselves to a Ministry of their own Election in these Churches, and partly by submitting themselves to no act of their Ministerial office in *England*, but what an Indian, or any Pagan might partake in, who yet is cut off far enough from fellowship in their office.

Cutting off, is an act of disunion, and somewhat more violent, and keen, then (it may be) the Examiner requireth, The sin he chargeth upon our members in hearing such Ministers, is union, or communion with them. And what shall we say, is there no Communion between our members, and the Ministers in *England*, whom they do hear?

Yes doubtless: For 1. There is a natural communion between the speaker and the hearer: the one giveth counsel or instruction, or reproof, or comfort; and the other receiveth it.

2. There is a moral Communion between a Teacher and a learner: and doubtless, our hearers may learn many precious Truths from them.

3. What shall say further; Is there not also a spiritual Communion between the Preacher and the Hearer, when the Preacher communicateth many spiritual and heavenly Points, and the Hearer receiveth them?

*Answ. 1.*

*Answ.* 1. Some would say; It is not necessary, that this should breed a spiritual Communion between the Preacher and the Hearer: No more than it maketh a Mathematical Communion between a reader of the Mathematics, and the learner of some Principles, or Conclusions from him.

But 2. I would rather answer otherwise. For suppose a member of our Churches, though a visible Saint here, yet indeed an hypocrite, should occasionally hear a Minister in *England*, and by the Power of the Spirit of Grace breathing in his Ministry, be effectually brought home to Christ, and by lively faith united to him: Here is a spiritual Relation and Communion wrought between them: the one is a spiritual Father; the other a natural Son in the Faith.

Nevertheless, this I would say, that this spiritual Communion is not between this hearer and this Minister, in respect of his Office, but in respect of his Gifts, and of the Power of the Spirit of Grace breathing in the dispensation of his gifts. In which respect this Communion doth not amount to Church-communion: Any stranger might enjoy as much. Any Pagan *Corinthian* might come in, and hear in the Church of *Corinth*, 1 Cor. 14. 24, 25. and reap a blessing thereby, who yet had not Ecclesiastical Communion with their Office. Also the Prophet *Jeremy* heard the false prophet *Hanani*, yea (and in some sense) said Amen to his Prophecy: yet had he no communion with his false Office, *Jer.* 28. 1. to 6. If he still urge, that we have not yet cut off ourselves from communion, no not with the false office of the Ministry of *England*, and with their false Church-estate, in as much as we still retain their Baptism, wherein we subjected our selves to their Office, and to their Church-estate, (which are both false:) as well as their Worship, and their Governor.

*Answ.* This is a further Objection, than he held forth whilst he continued with us: and therefore no marvel, if my Letter spake nothing to it. But therefore let me now propound another Point, which may suffice both for an Answer to this Objection, as also for a second Answer unto the former clamour, and exception against hearing of the godly Ministers in *England*. The Point is this; That I do not see, how the Examiner can justify his grievous charge, that their Church is falsely constituted, (whether National or Parishio-

rishional) and accordingly, that their, Ministry; Worship, and Government are all of them false. Four things he chargeth to be false. 1. Their Church constitution, Parishional and National, 2. Their Ministers. 3. Their Worship. 4. Their Government.

For the first, touching the constitution of their Parishional Churches, let it be considered what I said before, that where there be visible Saints, there is the true matter of the Church; and where there is a Covenant or Agreement (whether explicit or implicit) to assemble together in one Congregation, to worship the Lord, and to edify one another in the Ordinances of Christ, there is (for substance) the true form of a Church. And where there is the true matter, and true form of a Church, it cannot be truly said, that such a Church is falsely constituted. For there being but two causes of which a thing is constituted, matter and form: whatsoever hath true matter, and true form, is truly constituted.

Against this, what he will accept I do not know: and therefore know not how to prevent him with a fit and just defence. But by others, two things are wont to be objected.

*Object.* 1. From the matter of the Church. *Object.* 2. From the efficient cause of the Church.

From the matter of the Church, it is objected, that there be not only visible Saints in the English Parishes, but with them are mingled many ignorant, and scandalous persons, drunkards, whoremongers, despisers and persecutors of them that are good, Profane swearers, that have not so much as a form of godliness, but do utterly deny and deride the power of it.

*Answ.* This is indeed just matter of mourning and lamentation to all the Saints of Christ, and may be also (in due order) just warrant of some degree of separation from them, as from a corrupt Church. It cannot but offend and deeply grieve the spirit of a Christian, to sit down at the Lord's Table, and drink the blood of the Lord with such, who may be ready the next day to spill the blood of sincere Communicants as Puritan Round-Heads.

But whilst the Saints of Christ continue aamongst them, the mixed fellowship of ignorant and profane persons doth not evacuate or disanul their Church estate, The store of malignant and noisome humours in the body, yea the deadness and rottenness of many members in the body, though they may make the body  
an

an unfound and corrupt body, yet they do not make the body no body. When the Prophet *Isaiah* complained, that in the Church of *Judah*, from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head, there was no soundness in it, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores; yet whilst there was a Remnant amongst them of faithfull Saints, they were not yet no Church, they were not yet *Sodom* and *Gomarrah*, though but for that Remnant, they had been as *Sodom*, and like unto *Gomorrhah*, *Isa.* 1. 6. with 9. Say not though *Hierusalem* and *Judah* were at that time degenerate, yet they had been at first an holy Nation, a faithful City, (*Isa.* 1. 21.) and so had a true constitution: which the Churches of *England* never had.

For 1. I might answer, That though in regard of some prime members, *Hierusalem* was counted a faithful City, and the Nation Holy, by Privilege of their Covenant: yet for the body of the people, *Hierusalem* was always a City of the provocation of God's wrath from the day they built it, *Jer.* 32. 31, 32. And for the body of the Nation, *Moses* charged them; *Ye have always been rebellious against the Lord, since the day that I knew you*, *Deut.* 9. 7. 24. And *Stephen* professeth against them; *They had always wont to resist the Holy Ghost, they and their fathers*, *Act.* 7. 51.

2. I do not understand, but that (according to Scripture) thore corruptions which do not destroy a Church constituted, the same do not destroy the constitution of a Church. The Church is constituted, and continued by the same Grace.

3. The estate of the Churches of *England* was not corrupt in their first constitution. *Baronius* himself confesseth, that *England* received the Gospel ten years before *Rome*; and that from the Ministry of the Apostles, and Apostolic men: who doubtless constituted the *English* Churches:) not after the manner of *Rome*, (which was then Pagan;) but after the Apostolic Rules and Patterns.

This may suffice touching the matter of the *English* Churches. Now touching the second thing objected, which was from the efficient cause of their constitution; It is said, they were gathered not by the preaching of the Gospel, (by which Churches should be planted and constituted) but by the Proclamation of Princes.

*Ans.* 1. The efficient cause of a Church is a thing without the Church,

Church, and so no essential cause of the constitution of a Church. The Proclamation of King *Hezekiah*, and of the Princes, drew on multitudes of Apostate *Israelites* to the Communion of the Church at *Hierusalem*, and many of them in much pollution: yet neither their own pollution, nor the Proclamation of the King and Princes did evacuate their Church-estate, but encourage them rather in their Church-work, 2 *Chron.* 30. 5 to 9. and verses 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20. It was no pollution to the second Temple at *Hierusalem*. that it was built by the encouragement of the Proclamation of *Cyrus*, *Ezra* 1.

*Answ.* 2. Wheresoever there be visible Saints gathered into a Church, they were first gathered by the Ministry of the Gospel. For Proclamations cannot make Saints, but the word of the Gospel only. If any hypocrites, or time-servers, do for fear join themselves with the Saints in such a work; though their fellowship may weaken and blemish the work, yet it doth not destroy it.

Thus much touching the constitution of their Parishional Churches: Now touching their National Constitution, it standeth partly in their National Officers, Archbishops, Bishops, and their Servitors; partly, in their National Synods and convocations; and partly also in their National Ecclesiastical Courts.

The Examiner is not ignorant, that (by the Grace of Christ) we have withdrawen our selves, and our Churches also from this National Constitution, and from all Communion with them.

If it be said; But we still keep Communion with the Parish Churches, (in hearing the Word there) who do subject themselves to these National Officers, Convocations, and Courts.

*Answ.* 1. Though the Parish-Churches were lately subject to them, it was a burden (which as they did discern the iniquity thereof) they groaned under, and now by the mighty Power of the gracious Redemption of the Lord Jesus, they have shaken off through the help of the Honorable, and Religious Prudence and Piety of the Parliament.

2. Though those National Courts in their Officers, did for many years tread down the Parish-Churches, yet they did not extinguish their Church-estate. The Text is plain, *The Gentiles* (that is, men of Gentile-like profaneness, and malignity, and

iniquity, who had the keeping of the Church-Courts) *they did tread down the Holy City*, Rev. 11. 2. Tread down (I say) but not destroy the Holy City. Yea though the Translation read it, *They did tread it down*, or, *Tread it under-foot*: yet the Original word may be rendered somewhat more mildly: *πατήσουση*, may express their walking upon it; or else the Peripatetics were a more violent sect then either their Principles, or their Practice did declare them.

I come now to speak of the second Falsehood I which the Examiner chargeth upon the *English Churches*, which was the falseness of their Ministry: which wherein it lieth, he should have done, well to have told us: *for himself disliketh it in me, to wander in Generalities*.

But for our selves, we are far from that supercilious, and Pharisaiical arrogancy, as to condemn such for false Ministers, in whom we find Truth of Godliness, Truth of Ministerial Gifts, Truth of Election and acceptance unto Office by true Churches of Christ, Truth of sound, & wholesome, and soul-saving Doctrine, and Truth of holy and exemplary Conversation. And such are all the Ministers whom either the members of our Churches affect to Hear, or our Churches do allow them ordinarily for to Hear. And when I say Truth, I speak it not in opposition to Eminency, (for sundry of them excel in Eminency of sundry of these things:) but in opposition to that falsehood which the Examiner objecteth,

I know not what exception lieth against their Ministry, to argue it of falsehood, (save what hath been excepted and answered already touching the constitution of their Parishional Churches) but only the falseness of the Power from whence their Ministry is derived, to wit, from Episcopal Ordination.

But the Examiner is much mistaken, if he take us to conceive, of he himself conceive, that the Power of the Ministerial calling is derived from Ordination, whether Episcopal or Presbyterial, or congregational. The Power of the Ministerial Calling is derived chiefly from Christ, furnishing his servants with Gifts fit for the Calling; and nextly, from the Church, (or Congregation) who observing such whom the Lord hath gifted, do elect and call them forth to come and help them. For from that ground, *Paul* and *Silas* (to use the words of the Text) assuredly gathered that the,

the Lord had called them to preach the Gospel to the *Macedonians*, Acts 16. 9, 10. to wit, because a man of *Macedonia* (in the name of the rest) had called unto them to come into *Macedonia* and help them. Pastor and flock are Relatives: and Relatives do consist *ex mutuâ alterius affectione*, Their mutual acceptance of one another in the essential cause of their Relation. Ordination is but *adjunctum consummans* (as Dr. Ames rightly observeth) of the Minister's Calling: the Relation between him and the people was truly wrought before. As the Coronation of the Prince is not that which giveth the Essency of his Princely Calling, but Election by the People, (where the Government is Elective;) so neither is Ordination that which giveth Essence to the Minister's Calling, but the people's choice. Ordination by Imposition of Episcopal hands, doth pollute an Adjunct of the Minister's calling, (to wit, the solemnity of it:) but doth not destroy the essence, or nature of it, much less derive a false power to it, to evacuate the true.

The third Falsehood, which the Examiner chargeth upon the *English-Parish-Churches*, is the False worship. And truly whatsoever hath been corrupt in their worship, whether Prescript, Liturgies, or undue Honour put upon Saints, or Angels, in denominating Days or Temples after them, and such times and places dedicated to God, which he never required, and what ever other Devices of like nature, I had rather bewail before the Lord, then excuse or justify before men. And I should think it had been a better service to God, and his Churches, and a greater comfort to the soul of the Examiner, to have expressed particularly what the false worship had been which he beareth witness against, and to have cleared wherein their falsehood lieth, rather than to have rested in condemning all false worships in overly Generalities: and especially at such a time when (through mercy) the State is set upon Reformation, and calleth for light. He that shall cry out against all false ways in Travels by Land, and exclaim against all Rocks and Quick-sands by Sea, and give no particular notice where they lie, what help doth he afford to the careful Passenger or Mariner, either by Land or Sea? When Trumpets give such an uncertain and obscure sound, who shall prepare themselves to avoid the danger on the one hand, or on the other?

But for the present, two things would I say, touching the point in hand.

1. It is not every corruption in worship that denominateth the worship to be false worship. It was doubtless a corrupt worship to Sacrifice in the High Places: yet God doth not call it a false worship, but rather seemeth to accept it, as done to himself, 2 *Kings* 33. 17. False worship (to speak properly) is as good as no worship: nor is the God of Truth wont to accept that which is false. But there may be many aberrations in the manner of worship, when yet both the object of the worship is the true God, and the substance of the worship is true worship: and God may accept that which is Truth, from an honest and true heart, and pass by many aberrations, (as infirmities) and not reject all as falsities.

The second thing I would say, is, That whatsoever we have discerned to be corrupt, or irregular in the worship of God, we have believed it to be our duty, both to judge our selves for it before the Lord, and to reform it in our practise. If any man discover any further faillings in our worship, or in the worship of those Churches whom we communicate with, I hope the Lord will not shut our eyes against the light.

The fourth Falsehood, which the Examiner chargeth upon the English Churches, is false Government, which if he mean the Government of the Parishes, by the godly Ministers, (with whom our people communicate in hearing;) that Government is chiefly administred by the public Preaching of the Gospel, and by private admonition. Which he that shall challenge it to be a false Government, (though it may be defective in some Directions;) verily the spirit of Truth and Grace in those who are governed and led by it, from darkness to light, from the Power of Satan unto God, from a state of Grace to assured hopes of eternal Glory in Christ Jesus, will convince all such slanderous tongues of notorious falsehood.

But if he speak of the National-Church-Government, we must confess the Truth, there indeed Truth is fallen, and falsehood hath prevailed much. For whether we speak of the Hands, by which that Government hath been administred, or of the Ecclesiastical Courts, in which it is administred, or of the Rule, according to which it is administred, or of the End for which it is administred; All of them are forsaken of Truth, and can challenge no warrant of Truth but falsely.

The

The Hands by which that Government hath been administred, are the Prelacy, and their Servitors: who though they have of late challenged Institution by Divine Right: yet the claim is utterly false. The Divine Authority hath none to attend upon Rule and Government in the Church, but such as are inferior to Pastors and Teachers in Congregations, who labour in Word and Doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. Diocesan Bishops in the days of the Gospel, are like Kings in *Israel* in the days of the Judges, both of them wanting Divine Institution. What a pity is it, that some men eminent for Piety and Preaching, and others for learning and moderation, should come to be (as *Jotham's* Parable speaketh) advanced over their Brethren, and so leave their fatness, and sweetness, and fruitfulness, wherewith they had been wont to serve both God and man?

The Ecclesiastical Courts in which that Government is administred, are like the Courts of the High Priests, and Pharisees; which *Solomon* (by a spirit of Prophecy) styleth, *Dens of Lyons, Mountains of Leopards*, (Cant. 4. 8.) And those who have had to do with them, have found them Markets of the sins of the People, the Cages of uncleanness, the forgers of Extortion, the Tabernacles of Bribery.

The Rule according to which the Government is administred, is not the word of God, (which alone is able to make a Church-Governor perfect to every good work, 2 *Tim.* 1. 17.) but in stead thereof the Canon Law, the Decretals of Antichrist, and most unworthily and falsely applied to the Government of the Spouse of Christ.

The End also for which this Government now for many years hath been administred, hath not only been contrary to the ends of Church-Government, (which is to order the people in holiness, and love) but even contrary to the end of Civil Government, which is the punishment of evil doers. and the praise of them that do well, *Rom.* 9. 4. But here the very edge of Government, hath been bent and sharpened chiefly against holiness and purity. No malefactors so heinous, (drunkards, whoremongers, profane persons) but might expect the approach of Courts with less terror, and pass from under their hands, with more favourable Censure than the sheep of Christ, and the faithful Shepherds of them.

This

This Government therefore being administered with false Hands, on false Thrones, by false Rules, for false Ends, I blame not the Examiner, though he style it, (as justly he may) a false Government.

But to conclude therefore this 14th Chapter, the Examiner telleth us, *He believeth it is absolutely necessary to see and bewail so much as may amount to cut off the soul from a false Church, (whether National, or Parishional, or any other falsely constituted Church) together with the Ministry, Worship, and Government of it.*

Now in that which hath been spoken, we have given account, how far we have seen any of these things to be false in the Churches, which his charge hath respect unto. And so far as we have seen, the Lord knoweth how far we have bewailed, and cut off our selves from the Fellowship thereof. Yea not only from the fellowship of that which we discern to be false, but also from what we have discerned to be unsound and corrupt. If we do not discern all those things to be false, which he accounteth to be false; we have given the grounds thereof from the Scriptures of Truth. If we do not follow him in all his imaginations, it is no marvel: The sheep of Christ know the voice of their Shepherd: a stranger they will not follow. His charges of Falsehood upon Churches have been vehement, and peremptory, and in a manner sorbonical, without any touch of Scripture-grounds, as if he had learned not only from them, but from the Conclave of Antichrist, to obtrude upon the Churches of Christ, his unwritten imaginations and censorious Decrees, as the very Oracles of God.

Proceed we now therefore to his next Chapter, wherein there is some mention of some Texts of Scripture, and let us see whether they will speak more to his purpose in that which remaineth.

## TO CHAP. XV.

THE Texts of Scripture which Mr. *Williams* alledged, not to prove the Churches of *England* to be false in their Constitution, Ministry, Worship, Government, (for to that end he alledged no Scriptures at all) but to urge upon us a separation from them, (even from hearing in their Assemblies) were three, *Isai.* 52.

11. 1 Cor. 6. 17. Rev. 18. 4. Whereof I certified him in my Letter, *That two of them* (to wit, the first and last) *made nothing to his purpose. For that of Isaiah, and the other of the Revelation speak of local separation, which he knew we had made: and which neither he, nor indeed our selves apprehend to be sufficient, though sufficient to answer, in part, the literal sense of those Places.*

To which he answereth, *That he could not well have believed that Mr. Cotton, or any other, would have made that coming forth of Babel in the Antitype, Rev. 18. 4. to be local and material also. For what Civil State, or Nation, or Country in the world, in the Antitype could now be called Babel? If any, then surely Babel it self properly so called: but there we find a true Church of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 5. Secondly, If Babel be local now, whence God's People are called, then must there be a local Judea, a Land of Canaan also, into which they are called, &c.*

Reply. If the Examiner had been pleased to have read Mr. Brightman on Rev. 18. 4. He might find, I was not the first that Interpreted, either that place in *Isaiah*, or this in *Revelation*, of a local separation. For as there was in old *Babel*, sundry of God's *Israel*, Inhabitants than when the *Medes* and *Persians* were about to take it, and destroy it: so will there be in new *Babel* sundry of God's chosen people still inhabiting amongst them, even then when the ten Kings will be ready to take the City, and to burn it with fire. Unto whom as the Lord sent his Angels to hasten *Lot* out of *Sodom*, when he was about to destroy it: so he hath sent and will send the voice of his Messengers to hasten his people, as well out of new *Babel*, (as he did out of old) before that sudden destruction fall upon the City, and upon them in it.

He need not make it so strange, *What Civil State, or Nation, or Country in the world shall be called Babel now?* As if the very express letter of the Text had not clearly enough decipherd the City of *Rome*, the great City, which in *John's* time reigned over the Kings of the Earth; to be the *Babylon*, (the Antitype of *Babel* in *Chaldea*,) whom the Lord would destroy, and out of whom he calleth his people to depart? Why doth he tell us of *Babel* in *Peter*, (*Babel* in *Chaldea*,) as if the Type and the Antitype were literally the same place? Or as if he were altogether a stranger in the Book of the *Revelation*, and never understood *Rome* to be called *Babylon*?

But

*But secondly, saith he, If Babel be local now, then there must be a local Judea, a Land of Canaan also, into which the Saints are called.*

*Reply.* 1. It followeth not; for the Angel that calleth them out of *Babel*, doth not call them into *Judea*, or *Canaan*. There is no mention of such places in that call at all.

2. There be, and will be, when *Rome* is destroyed, and before it be destroyed, visible Churches of Christ, (as was *Judea* and *Canaan* of old;) into which these Saints who are called to depart out of *Rome*, have a just calling to come and to join themselves, For it is out of the Temple, and out of the Temple open in Heaven, out of which those Angels come, who pour out the vials of God's wrath, both upon the Antichristian State, and upon the City of *Babylon* it self, *Rev.* 15. 5, 6. with *Chap.* 16. 19.

The Examiner need not here ask, *Whether Mr. Cotton can satisfy his own soul, or the souls of other men, in making a local departure from old England to New, as if therein we had obeyed that voice of the Angel, Come out of Babylon my People, partake not of her sins, &c.*

For 1. I do not count *England*, literally to be *Babel*, nor mystically neither. I believe a man may live and die in *England*, and yet obey that Commandment of the Angel in all the parts of it. Some other godly men might find more favour and exemption from Babylonish corruptions in the midst of *England*, then I was suffered to do, without local departure.

2. Though I think, that in those words, *Come out of Babel my People*, local separation be intended, yet whm he addeth, *Lest ye be partakers of her sins*, I believe, spiritual separation is much more required: and local reparation as a means the better to attain that end of spiritual separation from partaking in her sins,

Which may also clear The meaning of the Text, and the fraud of the Examiner. For the words are not (as he alledgeth them) *Come out of Babel, my people, Partake not of her sins*: For so the latter part might be an ἐξήγησις, or explanation of the former; Coming out of *Babel*, might be all one with, *Partake not of her sins*. But the words of the Text be, *Come out of her, my People, that ye be not partakers of her sins*. Which plainly argueth, that coming out  
of

of *Babel* locally, is a means to prevent partaking in her sins spiritually.

It is true which he saith, *The Lord Jesus hath broken down all difference of Places*, (Joh. 4.) *and all difference of Persons*, Acts 10. To wit, in regard of ceremonial pollution, or ceremonial holiness. But if be think, there is no difference between one City, or Country more then another in moral pollutions of Idolatry, & superstition, unrighteousness and uncleanness, he maketh himself a greater stranger both to the Word and to the world, then I did think he had been.

The two causes of God's Indignation against *England*, which he suggesteth, are worthy due consideration and attention. I would rather say Amen to them, than weaken the weight of them. Only I should so assent to the latter, as not to move for a Toleration of all Dissenters, Dissenters in Fundamentals, and that out of obstinacy against conscience, and Seducers, to the perdition of souls, and to the disturbance of Civil and Church-Peace: but only of such Dissenters, as vary either in matters of less weight, or of fundamental, yet not out of wilful obstinacy, but out of tenderness of Conscience.

As for the Controversy, which the Examiner saith, *He hath with me, Whether false worship be not only local, but a spiritual Guilt, and not only a Guilt, but also an Habit, &c.*

I do acknowledge no such controversy between us: I wholly consent with him in the Point. Only I do not believe, all that to be either a Guilt, or an Habit of false worship, which he doth imagine: but in his terms I accord.

---

## TO CHAP. XVI.

**H**IS 16th Chapter is taken up in Examining and Answering the Exposition which my Letter gave of that Text formerly alleged, 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15, 16. Of which I said,

*That the Text only requireth Coming out from Idolaters in the fellowship of their Idolatry: No Marriages were they to make with them: No Feasts were they to hold with them in the Idols Temples: No intimate Familiarity were they to maintain with them: Nor any Fellowship*

M m

were

were they to keep with them in the unfruitful works of Darkness.

*And this is all which the place requireth. But what maketh all this to prove, that we may not receive such Persons to Church-fellowship as our selves confess to be godly, and who do professedly bewail and renounce all known sin, and would renounce more, if they knew more? Although, it may be, they do not see the utmost skirts of all that pollution they have sometimes been defiled with: as the Patriarchs saw not the pollution of their Polygamy?*

In Answer to this, the Examiner telleth us;

1. *That if the regenerate and repenting English did come thus far forth, it would avail much to the sanctifying of the Name of the Lord Jesus, to the pacifying of his jealousy, &c.*

Reply. But this is no Answer at all, unless he did assume that our repenting English did not come thus far forth. Therefore he giveth for another Answer, (that which is indeed but a part of this) *That according to the former Distinction of Godly Persons, who possibly may live in ungodly practices (especially of false worship:) And then according to Mr. Cotton's Interpretation, they come not forth.*

Reply. That former Distinction hath been considered above and weighed; but hath been found impertinent to the case in hand. The Examiner neither doth, nor ever will make it good; That the Godly persons amongst us do live in any ungodly practices of false worship. Nor do they take his Affirmation (without any mention of Scripture-ground) for a sufficient conviction.

*But (saith he) if there be any voice of Christ in the mouths of his witnesses against these sins, they are not then of ignorance, but negligence, and spiritual hardness against the ways of God's fear, Isai. 63. &c.*

Reply. *If there be (saith he) any voice of Christ in the mouths of his witnesses against these sin, &c.* If there be: he doth not say, there be. And if there were, how doth it appear, that their voice is the voice of Christ, or that they be the witness of Christ, in whose mouths this voice is? How easy had it been for the Examiner, if he himself knew any such voice of Christ in the mouths of any of his witnesses against these sins of false worship which our godly Brethren do live in, to have alledged the same, and the word of Christ, which might have been witness to the voice of those witness? But these Ifs and Overtures will neither convince nor edify others, nor justify himself.

Besides,

Besides, what if there be some witnesses have testified against the false worship in *England*, and against the hearing of those Ministers, by reason of that false worship? What if the Godly Persons (of whom he speaketh) here, are not so ignorant, but they know what those witnesses have said, not so negligent, but they have duly considered, and pondered the same, and weighing it in the Balance of the Scriptures, have found it too light? Is it spiritual hardness to choose, rather to fear God, and his Word, than to fear the false Interpretations and Applications of it by the spirit of Error? The word of the Lord we reverence and acknowledge, *Come not to Gilgal, neither go ye up to Bethaven*: But do we come to *Gilgal*, or go up to *Bethaven*, when we hear the word of the Lord from the godly Preachers in the Parishes in *England*? If such alledgements of Scripture may go from the voice of Christ in the mouths of his witnesses, we shall soon forget the Counsel of Solomon; *Cease my Son to hear the Instruction, which causeth to err from the words of knowledge*, Pro. 19. 27. The Apostle John hath long since directed us, *Hereby we know the spirit of Truth, and the spirit of Error: He that knoweth God, heareth us*, (that is, the Apostles, and those that preach their Doctrines) *He that is not of God, heareth us not*, 1 Joh. 4. 6.

But for another Answer, the Examiner proceedeth; *Moreover*, (saith he *the Question is not of the utmost skirts of pollution, but the substance of a true and false Bed of worship*, Cant. 1. 16. *In respect of coming out of the false, before the entrance into the true.*

*Reply*. I said indeed, that, *Godly persons repenting of all known sins, may be received to Church-fellowship, although they do not see the utmost skirts of all the pollution they have sometimes been defiled with.*

*But*, saith he, *the Question is not of utmost skirts, but of the substance of true and false Bed of worship.*

What he meaneth by the *Bed of worship*, I know not if he mean the Church to be the Bed of worship; and the Churches of *England* to be false Churches, that Point hath been cleared above: that no voice of Christ hath declared the Churches of *England* to be false Churches.

But yet further, the Examiner answereth, *That if there were but filthiness in the skirts of an Harlot, he believeth Mr. Cotton would*

*not receive an Harlot, infamous for corporal whoredom, without sound repentance, not only for her actual whoredoms, but also for her whorish speeches, gestures, appearances, provocations. And why should there be a greater strictness for the skirts of common whoredom, than for spiritual and soul-whoredom, against the charity of God's worship?*

*Reply.* 1. There may be the greater strictness about the skirts of bodily whoredom, not because it is a greater sin, but because it is more easily discernable, and convinceable by ordinary light.

2. Where any speeches, gestures, appearances, provocations of spiritual whoredom shall discover themselves, we believe there ought to be as great strictness about them, as about the like whorish appearances of bodily whoredom. But when will the Examiner discover to us, what those spiritual whorish gestures or speeches be, wherein we shew less strictness, than the chastity of God's holy worship requireth?

Touching the Polygamy of the Fathers, the Examiner answereth, three ways.

1. *By observing what great sins Godly Persons may be subject to, notwithstanding Godliness in the Root.*

We consent to that, especially in case of ignorance,

2. He demandeth, *If any godly Persons should now believe, and maintain, that he ought to have many wives, and accordingly did so Practise, whether Mr. Cotton would receive such a godly Person to Church fellowship?*

*Yea whether the Church of the Jews (if they had seen the evil of it) would ever have received such a Proselyte into fellowship with them?*

The same Answers may serve to both the Demands.

1. Neither would I receive them, nor do I think the Church. of the *Jews*, would, in case the sin had appeared so plain and palpable, as by the light of the Gospel it hath been discovered.

2. This is not the case in hand, what my self or a Church ought to do, about receiving a member living in known sin: but when, he that liveth in no known sin, (none known either to himself, or the Church) whether the Church if they receive him, doth thereby evacuate their Church-estate? Or whether the Church, and every member thereof, be so far bound to a distinct knowledge of all appearances of spiritual whoredom, that if they  
be

be ignorant or any one or two of them, they art utterly incapable of Church-estate?

For a third Answer to the case of Polygamy, the Examiner demandeth *what was this personal sin of Polygamy in the godly Patriarchs? Was it any matter of God's worship, any joining with a false Church, Ministry, Worship, Government, from whence they were to come, before they could constitute his true Church, and enjoy his Worship, Ministry, Government, &c.*

Reply. 1. Polygamy if it had been known to be as great a sin amongst the *Israelites*, as it is now known to be by the Doctrine of the Lord Jesus, it is of so heinous a nature now, that every godly person guilty of it, must come out of it, before he could lawfully be received into a pure Church of Christ.

2. If a Church were now ignorant of such a known case, and should in their ignorance admit sundry members living in that sin, into fellowship with them, though it would much defile them: yet I do not conceive it would evacuate their Church-estate.

3. The Examiner will never prove, that the estate of the Churches in *England* is false, their Ministry false, nor their worship false. And as for their Episcopal Government, he is not ignorant we have come out of it both in place and heart. Neither will he ever be able to prove, that any of our Churches partake in the communion of any such known sin, either in Church-estate, worship, Ministry, Government, as Polygamy is.

But touching this place in 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 15, 16. urged by the Examiner, that I might give a farther Answer than before, I add further in my Letter; *That the place was wrested besides the Apostle's scope, when Mr. Williams argued from it, That such Persons are not fit matter for Church-fellowship, as are defiled with any remnants of Antichristian Pollution: nor such Churches any more to be counted Churches, as do receive such amongst them: For were there not at that time in the Church of Corinth, such as partaked with Idolaters in their Idols' Temples? And was not this the touching of an unclean thing? and did this sin reject members from Church-fellowship before Conviction? Or did it evacuate their Church-estate for not casting out such members?*

To this Argument the Examiner giveth (as he calleth it) an Answer in four Paragraphs: whereof the three former hold not forth so much as the face; or shape, or colour of an Answer.

For

Form the first Paragraph, saith he, *This was indeed an unclean thing, from which God calleth his People: and Mr. Cotton confesseth, that after conviction any member obstinate in these unclean Touches ought to be rejected.*

But what is this to the Argument?

Again, In the next Paragraph, *Upon the same ground, (saith he) that one obstinate Person ought to be rejected out of Church-estate, upon the same ground, if a greater company or a Church were obstinate in such unclean touches, ought every sound Christian Church to reject them, and every sound member to withdraw from them.*

But is this any more to the Argument?

In the third Paragraph, *Further (saith he) it is clear, that if such unclean Touches obstinately maintained, (as Mr. Cotton professeth and practiseth) be a ground of a rejection of a Person in a Church, questionless, it is a ground of rejection when such Persons are to join unto the Church. And if obstinacy in the whole Church after Conviction be a ground for such a Churches rejection, questionless, such a Church or number of persons obstinate in such evils, cannot congregate, nor become a true constituted Church of Christ.*

But still the Argument is where it was, opt only unshaken, but untouched. Neither is the Text in 2 Cor. 16. any whit at all cleared by these discourses, to argue them to be no true constituted Churches who live in such unclean touches; without conviction, without obstinacy. For the Text speaketh nothing of obstinacy, nor conviction; but only implieth, that such unclean Touches were found in the Church of *Corinth*, and yet that did not evacuate, their Church-estate.

His last Paragraph holdeth forth some more shape of an Answer, but as little substance.

*The greatest Question here (saith he) would be whether the Corinthians in their first Constitution were separate or no from such Idols' Temples? And this Mr. Cotton neither doth nor can deny; A Church estate being a state of marriage unto Christ Jesus; and so Paul professedly saith, He had espoused them as a chaste Virgin unto Christ, 2 Cor. 11.*

*Reply.* 1. To put any substance into this Answer, or any force pertinent to the cause in hand, it must be no great Question, but clear out of Question, that there *Corinthians* in their first constitution were clean, and absolutely separate from, such Idols' Temples:

ples: and that not only locally, but in their soul and judgement, mind and heart, utterly cut off from such unclean touches, so that they both undoubtedly saw the evil thereof, and from their hearts abhorred it, and foresook it. For all these Acts of coming off in a way of separation from the Churches of *England*, he requirereth from us, as absolutely necessary to enter into a true Church-estate. *Now if he think that Mr. Cotton (to use his words) neither doth nor can deny, that in their first constitution they were thus separate from Idols' Temples.*

I must profess, though not to him, yet to all that love and seek the Truth without prejudice, that I both can and do deny it, that in their first constitution, they were locally separate from Idols' Temples, it is likely enough; or else I suppose the Apostle would have admonished them thereof in their first Planation. But that in their mind and judgement, they saw the evil thereof, and did in heart and soul bewail it, and confess it before the Apostle and their Brethren, and so enter into solemn Covenant, expressly against it; this is altogether incredible to me: For would not the Apostle then (out of his faithfulness) have reprov'd them as well for their Apostacy, as for their Fellowship in Idolatry? Would he not as well have rebuked the prevarication of their Covenant, as their pollution of their communion with Pagans?

What though a Church-estate be a state of Marriage unto Jesus Christ? May not a married Spouse of Christ be ignorant of some part of her marriage-duty towards him? And what though *Paul* profess, *He had espoused them as a chaste Virgin to Jesus Christ*? May not he call them a chaste Virgin, who had seen and bewailed their former worship of Idols, though they neither bewailed nor saw the evil of feasting with their neighbours in Idols' Temples?

*Reply.* 2. Though the Examiner make it a great Question whether a Church can be truly constituted, that in her first constitution is not separate from all unclean Touches, so as both to see them, and come out of them, howsoever they may fall into such sins afterwards: yet I look at it as an ungrounded distinction, to require more purity to the being of a Church in her first constitution, then is necessary to the being of it, after it is constituted. I should think the longer a Church hath enjoyed communion with the Lord Jesus Christ, the more she ought to grow both in knowledge

knowledge and purity. Where more hath been given, the more will be required of the Lord. Yea I conceive it more agreeable to the word of Truth, that God will sooner separate from a Church constituted, for their whorish pollutions, then deny them Church-estate for the like pollutions in their first constitution. The people of *Israel* were not constituted a National Church till the Lord gave them National Ordinances, and National Officers, and entered them together into a National Covenant, *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. Their Church estate before, was rather domestical, dispersed into several Families. When they were thus constituted a National Church, and afterwards fell into an Idolatrous crime, the Lord directed *Moses* to break the Tables of his Covenant between them, and did also separte his Tabernacle from them, till upon their repentance he renewed communion with them, *Exod.* 32. 19. with *Exod.* 33. 3. to 7. But yet the like Idolatry (if not worse) being found in the same People, when they dwelt in *Ægypt*, it did not hinder the Lord from accepting them unto a National Constitution of a Church-estate.

---

### TO CHAP. XVII. XVIII. XIX.

**H**IS 17, 18, 19 Chapters are taken up, in Examining and Answering my Answers to his second Objection, which he made to prove, a *Necessity lying upon Godly men, before they can be fit matter for Church fellowship, to see, bewail, repent, and come out of false Churches, Ministry, Worship, and Government.* To prove which, his first Objection, or Argument was taken from *Isaiah* 52. 11. 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. 15. 16. Where to we have returned a Reply in the former Chapters. His second Objection was taken from the *Confession made by John's Disciples, and the Proselyte Gentiles before admission into Church-fellowship*, *Mat.* 3. 6. *Act.* 19. 18. *Whence he gathered, That Christian Churches are constituted of such members, as make open and plain confession of their sins: and if any sins be to be confessed and lamented (Jewish or Paganish) then Antichristian drunkenness and whoredom much more, &c. Yea, every sipping of the Whore's Cup.*

To which Objection of his, (to pass by all verbal velitations, for I love not to take up time about words) the the substance of my Answer was two-fold.

1. *That*

1. *That it was not necessary to the Admission of members, that they should see, and bewail the sinfulness of every sipping of the whores Cup, (as he called it) though the Whores cup do more intoxicate the mind, than the drunkard's Cup doth the Body:) because bodily drunkenness and whoredom are such notorious and gross sins, that no man having true Repentance in him, cannot but be convinced of the sinfulness of them, and of the necessity of repentance of them in particular, it he do remember them. But the whores Cup being a mystery of Iniquity, the sinfulness of ever, sipping of it, is nothing so evident and notorious, as that every repentant soul doth at first discern it. And therefore as the 3000. Converts, Acts 2. 37, to 47. were admitted into the first Christian Church, upon the Profession of their repentance of the murder of Christ, though they neither saw nor confessed all the superstitions leavenings wherewith the Pharisees had bewitched them: so here, &c. Yea and the Disciples of John (whom he instanceth in) though they did confess their sins, (the Publicans theirs, the Soldiers theirs, the People theirs:) to wit, the notorious sins incident to their callings: yet it doth not appear that they confessed their Pharisaical pollutions. And the Gentiles in Act. 19. 18, 19. Though they confessed their curious Arts, and burnt their, conjuring Boasts, yet it doth not appear, that they confessed all their deeds.*

Whereunto the Examiner returneth a two-fold Answer.

1. *That spiritual whoredom and drunkenness is not indeed so easily discerned as corporal: but yet not the less sinful, but infinitely transcendent, as much as spiritual sobriety exceedeth corporal; and the bed of the most High God exceedeth the beds of men, who are but dust and ashes.*

*Reply.* 1. It is an exorbitant Hyperbole to make every passage of spiritual whoredom, a sin infinitely transcendent above bodily whoredom. For spiritual whoredom is not infinite in the act of it, but only in respect of the object of it, to wit, in respect of the infinite God, against whom it is committed. And is not bodily whoredom infinite in that respect also? Can a man defile himself with bodily whoredom, and not sin against the infinite God? What saith *Joseph*? Gen. 39. 9.

2. What if spiritual whoredom (though less evident) be more sinful than bodily? The nature of true Evangelical Repentance standeth not in seeing and bewailing every sin, no nor always of the greatest, but of those which are most evident and notorious.

A Christian man may more safely omit repentance of greater sins, if unknown, than of less sins known, I suppose the *Israelites* were guilty of many Idolatries, and superstitions in the days of *Samuel*, yet their repentance was chiefly fastened upon their asking of a King, of which they were then principally convinced, 1 *Sam.* 12. 19. And such Repentance was then accepted of the Lord, and of *Samuel*, ver. 22, 23

The very truth is, the ground and root of the Examiner's Error in this case is, That he maketh Church-Covenant to be no better then a Covenant of works: whereas indeed if Church Covenant be not a branch of the Covenant of grace, the Churches of Christ: are not built upon Christ. In a Covenant of works, all sins must be avoided: or if not avoided, yet repented of expressly, and the greatest sins most. But in Evangelical Repentance, God *dealeth not with us after our sins, nor rewardeth us according to our Iniquities*, Psal. 103. 10. The Grace of Christ is not given either to his Church, or to any Christian, upon the perfection of our Repentance, nor upon our Repentance of our greatest sins, in the greatest measure. But if the heart be truly humbled for any known sin, as sin, though the sin known be often less heinous, than others unknown, yet God accepteth his own work, and putteth away all sin in the acknowledgement of one. Yea in sins that be known, the compunction of the heart is sometimes more expressed for the occasions and inducements of the sin, which are less heinous; than for the greater sins, which are more grievous and dangerous. *Solomon* in his solemn Repentance in the Book of *Ecclesiastes*, doth more expressly bewail his entanglement with lewd woman, *Eccles.* 7. 27, 28. then all his Idolatrous Temples and worship, which were erected, and maintained at his charge. By the Examiners Doctrine, *Solomon* had never been received, and restored to the Church upon that Repentance.

His second Answer is, *That though the converted Jews did not see, all the leavenings of the Pharisees, yet they mourned for killing of Christ, and embraced him in his Worship, Ministers, Government, &c. and thereupon necessarily followeth a withdrawing from the Church, Ministry, and Worship of the false Christ, &c.*

*Reply.* This answer doth not reach the defence of his cause, to wit, *That it is absolutely necessary unto Church-fellowship, to see and bewail*

wail, not only actual whoredoms, but also whorish speeches, gestures, appearances, provocations. Yet here he granteth, that the converted Jews did not see all the leavenings of the Pharisees, which yet were such, as in the end of that Paragraph, he implyeth they had detained them under a false Christ.

But whereas he saith, that *they by embracing Christ in his Worship and Ministry, there necessarily followed a withdrawing from the Church, Ministry, and worship of the false Christ.*

It may truly be Replied, 1. That he will not grant us that liberty, that upon our embracing of Christ: in his worship & Ministry, there necessarily followeth our withdrawing from the Church, Ministry, and Worship; wherein we had been formerly polluted in any sort. Is not this to detain the glorious Truth of our Lord Jesus with respect of Persons?

2. It is evident by the Story, that some of those members of the Church of *Hierusalem*, who had been leavened by the sect of the *Pharisees*, they did neither see nor bewail, nor did come off from fellowship with the *Pharisees* in their Ministry, and false Doctrine, which taught the necessity of Circumcision, and of the whole Law of *Moses* to justification and salvation, *Acts* 15. 1, 5.

As for the confession of sin by the Disciples unto *John Baptist*, (*Mat.* 3.) and by the Gentiles unto *Paul*, (*Act.* 19.) though it be not said, that the one sort confessed their Pharisaical pollutions, nor the other all their Deeds:

*Yet (saith he) if both these confessed their notorious sins, (as Mr. Cotton confesseth) why not as well their notorious sins against God, their Idolatries superstitions, worships, &c? Surely throughout the whole Scripture, the matters of God, and his worship, are first and most tenderly handled, &c.*

*Answ.* It is not true, that the matters of God's worship and defects there, are always most tenderly acknowledged throughout the Confessions of the Saints in Scripture. *Solomon* in his Repentance was most sparing of confession of his Idolatrous Temples and worships. And the People in *Samuel* did more repent of asking a King, than of all their other sins, and yet their Idolatries were then flagrant, *1 Sam.* 12. 9, 10, 11. Besides, we never read of such deep Humiliation of *David* for carting the Ark after the manner of the *Philistines*, as of his bodily adultery with *Bathsheba*, and murder of *Uriah*.

The substance of my other Answer to his former Objection, which was to prove a necessary lying upon godly men to see and bewail their pollutions a former Church-fellowship, before they can be fit matter for a new.

It was to this purpose, that we have not been wanting (through the guidance of the grace of Christ), to performe that which he pleadeth for, so far as God hath called us to it: the which I expressed in my Letter in two particulars:

1. *That the body of our members do in general profess, that the reason of their coming over to us, was that they might be freed from the bondage of humane Inventions and Ordinances, under which as their soul groaned there, so they have professed their sorrow, so far as through ignorance or infirmity they have been defiled there.*

2. *That in our daily meetings, especially in the times of our solemn Humiliation, we do generally all of us bewail, all our former Pollutions, wherewith we have defiled our selves, and the holy things of God in our former Administrations, and Communion; the which we have rather chosen to do, than to talk of, and therefore do marvel, that he should so resolutely renounce us for that, which he knew not whether we had neglected or no, and before he had admonished us of our sinfulness in such neglect, if it had been found amongst us.*

Whereto his Answer is; *That we make no mention, what such Inventions, and Ordinances, what such Administrations and Communion were, which we confessed and bewailed.*

Reply. And yet lest he should too much wound his own Conscience with such a general charge, he acknowledgeth; *That we have born witness against Bishops, and Ceremonies, and do constitute only particular and Independent Churches, and have therefore so far at least feme the,viII of a National Church.* But I do say further, that his own Conscience beareth him witness, that we have witnessed also both in Profession and Practise, against Prescript Liturgies and mixed Communion, both in Church-fellowship, and at the Lord's Table.

What hath been then wanting to us? *That we do not fully see the will of a National Church;* How doth he make it to appear?

By two Instances.

*By our constant Practise in still joining with such Churches and Ministry in the Ordinances of the Word and Prayer: and by our Persecuting*  
of

*of him for his humble, faithful, and constant admonishing of us for such an unclean walking, between a particular Church, and a National.*

*Reply.* Our joining with the Ministers of England in hearing of the Word and Prayer, doth not argue our Church-Communion with the Parish-Churches in England, much less with the National Church: as hath been shewed above in Chap. 14.

Besides, when Jerboam heard the word from the young Prophet of Judah, and joined with him in Prayer, I demand whether in so doing, he joined in Church-Communion with the National Church of Judah? If yea, then was the Church of Judah pollutedly the unclean Communion of Idolatrous Jeroboam: If not, then the Examiner may easily discern, how weak an Argument it is to argue our Communion with the National Church of England, from our members joining in the Hearing of the Word, and Prayer in the Parish-Churches of England.

His second Instance to make it appear, *That we see not the evil of a National Church, from our Persecuting of him, &c.*

In this I choose rather to blame his memory than his conscience. But the one of them is much to blame, in that it maketh him so far forget himself and the Truth, as boldly to avouch a notorious falsehood; *That we Persecuted him for his humble, and faithful, and constant admonishing of us of such unclean walking, between a particular Church and a National.*

It is one notable falsehood to say, that he did constantly admonish, either our Elders or Churches of such an offence; much less, humbly, and faithfully. If he did so admonish us, where are his witness? His Letters? his Messengers sent to us?

Besides, It is another falshood, and no less papable, that we did persecute him for such admonishing of us. It hath been declared, above, upon what grounds the sentence of his Banishment did Proceed: whereof this Admonition (which he pretendeth) was none of them; neither did they persecute him at all, who did so proceed against him.

Now whereas in that Passage of the Letter even now recited I said, *He knew not what professions we had made in our Churches of our Humiliations for fomer Pollutions, nor had he admonished us of our defects therein: He demandeth how he could possibly be ignorant of our estate, who had been from first to last in fellowship with us, and Officer amongst*

*amongst us, had private and public agitations concerning our estate and condition, and at last suffered for such Admonition to us, the misery of a Winter's Banishment amongst the Barbariam?*

*Reply.* As if every man in fellowship with us, an Officer amongst us, one that had private and public agitations with us, must needs know what our members professed in their admissions to the Church, or what our Elders confessed in their days of solemn Humiliation, when himself was generally absent, both on the Lord's days, and on the days of solemn fasting? Or as if the private and public agitations that he had with us, were taken up about our Communion with a National Church? I am yet to learn, what Arguments he did propound to us in that cause: what convictions he left upon us. When he is still so full of the miseries of his winters banishment amongst the *Barbarians*, it maketh me call to mind a grave and godly speech of a blessed Saint, now with God, (reverend Mr: *Dod*) *Where sin lieth heavy, afflictions lieth light: where affliction lieth heavy, sin lieth light.*

---

### TO CHAP. XX.

THE main Objection which Mr. *Williams* made against the Estate of our Church-members, was chiefly this; That though he acknowledgeth them so be godly, yet not sufficiently separate from Antichrist. And that he endeavoured to prove, 1. From the Texts that call for seperation from *Babylon*, Isa. 52. 2 Cor. 6. Rev. 18. 2. From the confession of sins made by *John's* Disciples, *Mat.* 3 and the Proselyte Gentiles, *Acts* 19. To both these we have returned Answer already.

His third Objection followeth from *Haggai* 2. 13, 14, 15. where the Prophet calleth the Church of the *Jews*, *That if a Person unclean by a dead body, do touch holy things, those holy things become unclean to him. And so* (saith he) *is this Nation, and so is every work of their hands, and that which they offer here is unclean.* And from hence he argueth; *That even Church-Covevants made and Ordinances practised by persons polluted through spiritual deadness, and filthiness of Communion, they become unclean to them, and are profaned by them: which he solemnly desireth might be advisedly weighed.*

Whereto

Whereto my Answer was; *That if he had well weighed this place himself, he would never have alledged it to his purpose. His purpose was to prove, that Churches cannot be constituted of such members, as are unclean by Antichristian pollutions: or if they be so constituted, they are not to be Communicated with, but seperated from, to prove this, you alledge (said I) this place, where the Prophet acknowledgeth the whole Church to be unclean, and yet neither denieth them to be a Church truely constituted, nor stirreth up himself, or others to separate from them. If you say, why, but they were unclean.*

I answered; *Be it so. But were they therefore no Church truely Constituted? Or to be separated from? Did not Haggai, and Zachary, themselves Communicate with them? And did they not call others also to come out of Babel to Communicate with them, even whilst Joshua the High Priest was still polluted with his unclean Garments Zach. 2. 6, 7. with Chapt. 3. 8.*

Whereupon I took occasion to clear up to him the occasion, and scope, and true sense of the words at large, as may appear in the Letter, which having gathered up I said, *That if he did apply it to the Point in hand, it would reach nothing near to his purpose. Hypocrites in the Church, yea and godly sincere Christians themselves, whilst they attend to the world more than to the things of God, (as at that time the Jews did) both their persons, and their labours, and their Civil Oblations are unclean in the sight of God:*

*Therefore the Church of Christ cannot be constituted of such: or if it do consist of such, the People of God must separate from them. You might well have gathered.*

*Therefore the Church of Christ, and the members thereof must separate themselves from their hypocrisy and inordinate love of this world, or else they and their duties will still be unclean in the sight of God, notwithstanding their Church-Estate.*

*This Collection tendeth to edification; the other to dissipation, and destruction of the Church, and wresteth Blood in stead of Milk from the Breasts of holy Scripture.*

This Text is so evident, and pregnant, and full against himself, that I could not but marvel, why he should alledge it, and especially why he should *desire it might be thoroughly weighed, and the Lord: to hold the scales himself.* How do you then think, that he will hence inferre, his Conclusion; That Godly persons, if unclean, cannot

cannot constitute a true Church? or if thy do, they are to be separated from? Surely not from the words of the Text, nor from the sense, which I make of it: nor from any sense, which himself can give of it. How then? Only from his mistake of my words, and that surely either through a drowsy Oscitancy, or a sleighty Precipitancy.

*What (saith he) have I spoken more than Mr. Cotton himself hath uttered in his Explication and Application of this Scripture; As,*

1. *That Godly persons may become defiled, and unclean, by hypocrisy and worldliness.*

2. *While they lie in such a condition of uncleanness, all their offerings, persons, labours are unclean in the sight of God, notwithstanding their Church-estate.*

3. *The Church cannot be constituted of such worldly Persons (though otherwise godly and Christian.)*

Or 4. *If they do, the People of God must separate from them. These be (saith he) Mr. Cotton's own express words.*

Reply. He might as well say, these be the express words of Christ, *Hang all the Law, and the Prophets*, because Christ saith, (*Mat. 19. 40.*) upon these two Commandments, *Hung all the Law and the Prophets*. So these be my express words; *The true and genuine meaning of the place, if you do apply to the point in hand, it will reach nothing near to your purpose. Hypocrites in the Church and godly Christians themselves, whilst they attend to the world more than to the things of God, their persons, their labours, their Civil Oblations are all unclean in the sight of God. Ergo. The Church of Christ cannot be constituted of such: or if it do consist of such, the People of God must separate from them.*

Who seeth not that attendeth to what he seeth, that in these words I express not mine own meaning or reasoning, but his: and that I expressly say, the true meaning of the Text will nothing near reach to his purpose, and so bring in his reason, in form of an Enthymeme, which he draws from it? But if I had made that Euthymeme the expression of mine own meaning, and of the meaning of the Text, it had fully and closely reached his own purpose.

The next words following might also plainly have cleared my meaning to him: when in stead of that false collection which he gathered,

gathered, I tell him, you might well have gathered: *therefore the Church of Christ, and the members thereof must separate, themselves from heir hypocrisy, and their inordinate love of this world: Or else they and their duties will be still unclean in the sight of God, notwithstanding their Church-estate.*

*This Collection tendeth to edification: the other to the dissipation, and destruction of the Flock, and wresteth blood instead of milk from the Breasts of holy Scripture.*

Do I not here plainly express two several, and contrary Collections from the Text, the one hit, the other mine own; the one tending to edification, the other to destruction? And yet this false collention, and misapplication of the Text, which is his own, and a manifest Perverting both of the Text, and of my words, he will needs force upon me, contrary to my meaning, and contrary also to my express words above in the entrance of mine Answer to this Text. Where I say,

*Your purpose was to prove, That Churches cannot be constituted by such persons as are unclean by Antichristian pollutions: or if they be so constituted, they are not to be communicated with, but separated from. To prove this, you alledge this place where the Prophet acknowledgeth the whole Church of the Jews to be unclean: and yet neither denieth them to be a Church truly constituted, nor stirreth up himself or others to separate from them.*

What by the way he discourseth of the Excommunication in the National Church of the *Jews*, somewhat hath been spoken to it above. When he saith, *That their Ceremonial Excommunication was either putting to death in Canaan, or Captivity out of Canaan,* If he mean this was all their Excommunication, I cannot assent to it. *King Uzziiah* was neither put to death in *Canaan*, nor carried captive out of *Canaan*, and yet he was Excommunicated both from Temple-worship, Synagogue-worship, and all familiar communion of the Saints.

Again, when he maketh it an Excommnnication from God, in case God sell his Church into spiritual Captivity, to confused Babylonish Lords, and worship, and that so he driveth them out of his sight: He might remember, that God sometime sold his people under the Bondage of Babylonish Lords, even in the Land of *Canaan*, (Jer. 40. 9. & 42. 10, 11, 12.) And yet he had not straight way driven them out of his sight.

---

## TO CHAP. XXI.

**I**T was my serious and unfeigned endeavour, in my Letter which the Examiner hath answered, to have removed those two stumbling blucks out of his way, which I perceived had turned him off, from holding fellowship with these Churches. The former was, *The want of fit matter of our Churches*: The latter, *Our dis-respect to ths separate Churches in England, under affliction, when nevertheless our selves practise separation in peace.*

From the beginning of his tenth Chapter, he hath endeavoured to fasten the former of there stumbling blocks, that it may still lie in his way, and stand (as an everlasting wall of partition) between us. Which nevertheless I have (as you see) through the help of Christ endeavoured to dig through the sandiness thereof; that if it were the holy will of God, it might fall down (like the walls of *Jericho*) before the Ark of the Lord, and neither detain him, nor others, from Communion with us.

The latter stumbling block, he goeth about to re-establish in this, and the following Chapters to the end of his Book; Come we therefore to consider, whether there may be any hope, of removing this stumbling block also, and the establishment thereof by the same help. The stumbling block lieth somewhat broader, then at first was propounded. The Examiner takes it as a great offence; *That we walk between Christ and Antichrist.*

1. *In practising separation here, and not repenting of our preaching, and printing against it in our own country.*

2. *In reproaching himself at Salem, and others, for separation.*

3. *In particular, that my self have conceived and spoken, That separation is a way, which God hath not prospered: as if (saith he) the truth of the Churches depended upon the countenance of men, or upon outward peace and liberty.*

To the first of these I answered in my Letter, that *in stead of halting betwixt Christ, and Antichrist, the Lord hath guided us to walk with an even foot between two extremes: so that we neither defile our selves with the remnants of pollution in other Churches; nor do we for the remnants of pollution, renounce the Churches themselves, nor the holy things of God amongst them, which our selves have found powerful to salvation.*

*salvation. This moderation so far as we have kept it in preaching or printing, we have seen no cause to repent of it; But if any shall show us cause, why we should repent of it, we shall desire to repent of it, yea and to repent, that we repented no sooner.*

The Examiner here undertaketh to prove this *middle walking* to be no less than *halting*, of which we have cause to repent. And this he endeavours to prove to me, out of mine own Confessions.

*First, saith he; Mr. Cotton himself confesseth, that no National, Provincial, Diocesan, or Parish Church, wherein some truly godly are not, are true Churches.*

*Secondly, He practiseth no Church-estate, but such as is constituted only of godly persons nor admitteth any unregenerate, or ungodly persons.*

*Thirdly, He confesseth, that a Church of Christ cannot be constituted of such godly persons, who are in bondage to be inordinate love of the world.*

*Fourthly, That if a Church consist of such, God's people ought to separate from them.*

*Reply.* If these (which he calleth confessions of Mr. Cotton) have been stumblings to him, I shall (by the help of Christ) soon remove them out of his way. For I do profess that I never made any such Confessions, but look at them all as contrary to my judgement, both in former times and to this day,

For the first. Though there were no truly godly persons in a Church, yet if there be such as profess godliness (such as they call visible Saints) to meet together in a Congregation to worship the Lord, and to edify one another in the administration of his holy Ordinances, I do believe there is truth of Church-estate.

It is true, I do believe, and confess, that God requireth more then profession of godliness, even sincerity of holiness in Church-members, and it is no small sin in them, if it be wanting; But what if some, if most, if all believe not? *Shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect? God forbid?* Rom. 3. 3, 4. If I am hypocritical Church were no Church, than an hypocritical Minister were no Minister, and his administrations nullities. *Culius institutus*, in the whole latitude of it, as Churches, Ministries, Seals, Censures, &c. they are all ordained for the Elect's sake, And the

Elect God would have them to be ἀμερίμους without careful scruples and distractions. If truth of Churches, and Ministries, and Ordinances, depended upon the personal sincerity of the godliness of the dispensers, the Elect of God would ever be intangled with inextricable scruples, touching their communion here or there, with this or that Church, or the administrations of the Officers thereof. But God hath called us in peace.

For the second part (which he maketh) of my Confessions, he had said true, if he had said, I endeavour such a thing, that our Church should be constitute of godly persons: but I do not say, I have attained it; for God seeth not as man seeth: man looketh at the outward appearance, but the Lord regardeth the heart, 1 Sam. 16. 7. And sure I am, we look at Infants as members of our Church, (as being fœdurally holy) but I am slow to believe that all of them are regenerate, or truly godly.

As for the third and fourth point (which he maketh), of my Confession; *That a Church of Christ cannot be constituted of godly persons, taken with the inordinate love of the world: or that a Church consisting of such, ought to be separated from:* These are only his own palpable mistakes of those words of mine, which I expressed as the sum of his words, which he (through hast) conceived to be mine, whereof we have spoken in the 20th Chapter.

Let him not say (as he doth) that when I would not have *Parish Churches, to be separated from, for the remnants of pollutions, I mean only, Ceremonies, and Bishops: neither let him say, that I do extenuate and mince the root, mass, and substance of the mother of National Churches, (though for the greater part unregenerate) by naming only a remnant of pollutions.*

For he knoweth we wholly avoid National, Provincial, and Diocesan, Government of the Churches by Episcopal Authority: He knoweth also, we avoid their prescript Liturgies, and Communion, with openly scandalous persons in any Church-order; He knoweth likewise, (or at least may know) that it is a continual sorrow of heart, and a mourning of our souls, that there is yet so, much of those notorious evils (which he nameth) still continuing in the Parishes, worldliness, ignorance, superstition, scoffing, swearing, cursing, whoredom, drunkenness, theft, lying, I may, add also number, and malignity against the godly, suffered

to

to thrust themselves into the fellowship of the Churches, and to sit down with the Saints at the Lord's Table.

But yet I count all these but remnants of pollution, when as the substance of the true estate of Churches abideth (as I opened above) in their Congregational Assemblies. And in so speaking, I follow the holy pattern of the Prophet *Isaiah*, who acknowledging a great forsaking (or Apostacy) in the midst of the Land, yet resembleth the estate of the Church to an Oak, whose substance is in it, (when the leaves fall off) and maketh the holy seed, to be that substance, *Isai.* 6. 12, 13.

---

### TO CHAP. XXII.

**T**He recond offence which the Examiner took at our neglect of the Churches of the separation, *Was the reproach of himself and others at Salem, for their separation.*

To which I answered in my Letter, *That I knew no man who reproached Salem for their separation, nor did I believe, that they did separate. Howsoever, if an, did reproach them for it, I did think it a sin meet to be Censured, but not with so deep a Censure, as to excommunicate all the Churches, or to separate from them, before it doth appear that they do tolerate their members in such their causeless reproachings. The errors of men are to be contended against, not with reproaches, but with the sword of the Spirit. But on the other side, the failings of the Churches are not forthwith to be healed by separation. It is not Chirurgery, but Butchery, to heal every sore in a member, with no other but Abscission from the body.*

Whereto the Examiner answereth, *That the Church of Salem was known to profess separation, and publicly reproached (yea he could mention a Case wherein she was punished) for it, implicitly.*

*Reply.* This answer is so implicit, that I cannot make an explicit answer to it. That which I said, was, *I knew no man that reproached Salem for their separation: nor did I believe, that they did separate.* His answer is, *That the Church of Salem, was known to profess separation:* which crosseth not what I said; for it might be so, and yet I knew not of it, unless the profession had been more public. Nor did I ever perceive, that they refused communion with

us,

us, when any of them came over to us. If they were publicly reproached for separation, it was more then I heard of, till I read it in his Book. And for any public punishment that *Salem* suffered for it, I may well say, it was implicitly, if at all; for surely there is no Law of the Country, that punisheth such an offence, either explicitly, or implicitly. But since he is pleased to conceal it, I see no cause of giving account of it.

Nextly, He takes up from me a Confession of two things, which he leaveth to me to reconcile: 1. *That I say, if any reproach them for Separation, it is a sin meet to be Censured.* 2. *That Churches themselves may be separated from, who tolerate their members in such causeless reproachings.*

*Reply.* It is true, that I do not account reproaches, (which are a work of the flesh) a meet remedy to heal an error: And therefore the reproacher meet to be delt withal, either by private admonition, (if his reproach were private;) or with a public admonition, if it were public. But the latter of the two things which he saith I confess, I am far from either confessing it, or believing it; to wit, *That the Churches themselves may be searated from, who tolerate their members in such causeless reproachings.*

I said indeed, *that a causeless reproach is a sin meet to be censured; But I said withal, it is not to be censured with so deep a Censure, as excommunication, especially of all the Churches, and that too, before that it do appear, that they do tolerate their members in such their causeless reproachings.*

But it may be, he will say, doth it not imply, that if it doth appear, that they do tolerate their members in such causeless reproaches, that then I think they are to be separated from?

*Answ.* No verily: Put it in a like case: Suppose a child should miscall and revile his Mother's Sister, I might say, it it a fault mere to be corrected, yet not with so deep a correction, as to be disinherited: or that his Mother should be dispossessed of her inheritance, before it do appear, that she do tolerate her child in such revilings. Would such a speech infer, that in case it did appear, his Mother did tolerate him, that then his Mother were to be dispossessed of her inheritance? The true meaning of my speech, was to express, that such a sin, as approaching of a Church for a sin, might deserve a Censure: yet not forthwith excommunication:  
much

much less the Church to be excommunicated, whereof such an one is a member, and least of all, before it did appear, that the Church knew of it, or did tolerate it: The scope of my speech was, not to hold forth the grievous desert of a reproach, but the groundless proceeding, unto separation for a reproach, both against a member, and against the Church that tolerated him, without any further conviction, or obstinacy, which was the case in hand of Mr. *Williams*. Somebody, he saith, reproached the Church of *Salem* for separation, some member of some Church. But what member of what Church, he saith not? And yet this is one of the stumbling blocks that turned him out of the way, of communion with all the Churches in the Country, who (for ought I know) never heard of it unto this day. Let him now say, that mine own confessions are sufficient Answers to my self, as if I granted, that in case the member had been known, who so reproached *Salem*, and the Church known whereof he was a member, *That then there were a lawfull separation from the Church that doth but tolerate her member in a causeless reproach, yea and from all other Churches too, that hold Communion with that Church.*,

For he is not ignorant, more goeth to a separation then so, unless he hath forgotten the principles and rudiments of Church-Government.

He confesseth that to be true which I said, *That it is not Chirurgery but Butchery, to heal every sore with no other medicine, but with Abscission from the body*: But yet as if he could make mine own expressions, confutations of my self, he saith that I have confessed (that which indeed is not my confession, but, my collection of his Argument;) *That Churches of godly persons must be separated from, for inordinate worldliness.*

If this be a Contradiction, it is his, and not mine, as I shewed above; neither do I own any such confession, as mine, which he subjoineth; *That Churches may be separated from, when they tolerate their members in their causeless reproaches.*

It seemeth, he thinketh, I neither remember mine own words, nor know any Church-Censure, but excommunication.

He proceedeth to tell us his judgement in so weighty a case as excommunication or separation is: *It is not* (saith he) *every sore of infirmity, or ignorance, but an Ulcer or Gangreme of obstinacy, for which*

*which I maintained, that a person ought to be cut off, or a Church separated from.*

I know not how this judgement of his may satisfy his neighbours; but a good Conscience willing to walk by rule, would still inquire, (where it was meet) First, whether every obstinacy, even before conviction, and that in a sinless heinous, be such an ulcer, or Gangrene, for which either a person ought to be cut off, or a Church separated from? For there is an obstinacy against good way, as there is a scorning of a good way, which is before conviction, even of ignorance: and to these Wisdom communicateth good Counsel, *Prov. 1. 20. 22.* But there is a scorning, and so an obstinacy, after conviction, and to such, Wisdom refuseth to communicate any wholesome words, *Prov. 9, 8, 9.*

If he mean the former, why did he refuse communion with us upon such an obstinacy of ignorance? By what rule did he proceed?

If he mean the latter, let him produce his cause, and bring forth all his strong reasons, whereby he did so much as offer to convince us of our obstinacy in any crime, and we will acknowledge his reparation to be just, and our sin to be great in not hearkening to him.

If he tell us again, (as he doth in the next words, as indeed the mouth is most full of the abundance of the heart) if he tell us again of our guiltiness of cruelty, both against consciences and bodies, in persecuting of them, we must needs tell him again, that neither himself, nor any others, (that I can hear of) did ever suffer any Censure, (which he calleth cruelty to consciences and bodies) till after his reparation from all the Churches in the Country. And though he saith in the next words, *He separated Conscientiously and peaceably:* Yet did ever peaceable Conscience (before him) separate from Churches for an offence before it was committed?

If he tell us, he separated, for our communion with the Churches of *England*, in hearing the word in the Parishes there, let all that fear God (whose hearts are not forestalled with prejudice or partiality) judge whether his reasons alledged to convince us of such a sin, (the strongest whereof were answered in my Letter to him, and have been again refuted in this Reply) have been of such

such convincing power, as that we for not hearkening to him must needs lie under the guilt of an ulcer, or Gangrene of obstinacy, and that after conviction. I may therefore well call it, not Chirurgery but Butchery, to cut off not only so many members of Christ, but also so many Churches of Christ from fellowship with Christ, before any ulcer or Gangrene of obstinacy was discovered to us; Nay, I fear I might speak a further word, (and yet I would be loath to speak any doubtful thing;) but surely (my memory much faileth me or else) he broke forth into this separation, before he gave us any grounds of his separation at all, or of our conviction of any such sin, as might deserve such a Censure. And whether that be Butchery or Chirurgery, let the upright judge.

*But, saith he, if it be Butchery to separate conscientiously and peaceably from the spiritual communion of a Church, or Saints, what shall it be called by the Lord Jesus, to cut off persons, them, and theirs, branch, and root, from any Civil being in their Territories, &c. Because their Consciences dare not bow down to any worship, but what the Lord Jesus hath appointed, and being also otherwise subject to the Civil estate, and Laws thereof?*

Here be many extenuations, and mincings of his own carriage, and as many false aggravations of Guilt upon his sentence of Banishment, and the Authors of it.

As, 1. In that he was cut off, he and his, branch and root, from any Civil being in these Territories, because their Consciences durst not bow down to any worship, but what they believe the Lord had appointed: Whereas the truth is, his Banishment proceeded not against him, or his, for his own refusal of any worship, but for seditious opposition against the Patent, and against the Oath of fidelity offered to the people.

2. That he was subject to the Civil estate, and Laws thereof, when yet he vehemently opposed the Civil foundation of the Civil estate, which was the Patent: And earnestly also opposed the Law of the general Court, by which the tender of that Oath was enjoined: and also wrote Letters of Admonition to all the Churches, whereof the Magistrates were members, for deferring to give present Answer to a Petition of *Salem*, who had refused to hearken to a lawful motion of theirs.

3. That he did but separate from the spiritual society of a Church, or Saints: whereas he both drew away many others also, and as much as in him lay, separated all the Churches from Christ.

4. In that he maketh the cutting off of persons, them and theirs, branch and rush, from civil Territories, a far more heinous and odious offence in the eyes of the Lord Jesus, then himself to cut off, not only himself and his, branch and rush, but many of his neighbours (by sedition), from spiritual Communion with the Churches, and all the Churches from Communion with Christ. As if the cutting off persons, them and theirs, branch and rush, from the Covenant, and spiritual Ordinances in the Church; were a matter of no account in respect of cutting off from Civil Liberties in the Territories of the Common-wealth.

5. In that, what himself did, he predicateth as done conscientiously and peaceably, as if what the Court had done against him, they had not done conscientiously also, and with regard to public peace, which they saw he disturbed, and stood stiffly in his own course, though he was openly convinced in open Court (as I shewed before) that he could not maintain his way, but by sinning against the light of his own Conscience. As for his Marginal note, *wherein he chargeth Mr. Cotton to be deeply guilty of Cruelty, both against Conscience and bodies, in persecuting of them.*

I will only Answer thus much, (partly from *David*, partly from *Job*,) If the Lord have stirred him up thus to reproach me, (as *Shimei* did him) I hope the Lord will look upon mine affliction, and requite me good for all his slander, this day, or this year, 2 *Sam.* 16. 12. But if he himself (who without cause is mine adversary) hath whet his tongue like a sword, and his bow to shoot out his arrows, even bitter words, (*Psal.* 64. 3. as he frequently doth in his Book) surely shall take his book upon my shoulder, and bind it as a Crown to me, *Job* 31. 36.

---

### TO CHAP. XXIII.

**H**Is 23. Chapter examineth a speech of mine which might tend to the dishonour of the Separation, as the reproach against  
Salem

*Salem had done before. My Speech was That God had not prospered the way of Separation: which least it should be mistaken, I interpreted, not in respect of outward prosperity: for they found more favour in our native Country, then those who walked in the way of Reformation, which is commonly reproached by the name of Puritanism. The meetings of the Separatists might be known to the Officers in the Courts, and winked at, when the Conventicles of the Puritans (as they call them) are hunted out with all diligence, and pursued with more violence, than any Law can justify. But I said, that God had not prospered the way of Separation, in that he had not blessed it, either with peace amongst themselves, or with growth of grace, such as erring through simplicity, and tenderness of Conscience, have grown in grace, have grown also to discern their lawful liberty, to return to the hearing of the Word from English Preachers.*

To give Answer to this, the Examiner bestoweth many Chapters. His first Answer is, (that which is not unworthy to be attended to, by all whom it concerneth,) *That doubtless the Lord hath a great Controversy with the Land for their such violent pursuit and persecution of both. For both of them have borne witness to sever all truths of the Lord Jesus. Albeit, I deny not, the one party might have borne witness to more points of Truth: the other might have borne witness to fewer, and so have less exceeded bounds of Truth. To make the English Churches, and their Ministries, and their Worship, and their Professors, either nullities, or Antichristian, is a witness not only beyond the truth, but against the Truth of the Lord Jesus, and his word of Truth.*

But for their sufferings, *The Puritans (saith he) have not suffered comparatively to the other, (as but seldom Congregating in separate Assemblies from the common:) And none of them suffering unto death for the way of Non-Conformity. Indeed (saith he) the worthy witness Mr. Udall was near unto death for his witness against Bishops, and Ceremonies; But Mr. Penry, Mr. Barrow, Mr. Greenwood followed the Lord Jesus, with their Gibbets, and were hanged with him, and for him, in the way of separation. Many more have been condemned to die, banished, and choked in Prisons, whom I could produce upon occasion.*

*Reply.* Paul accounteth it a folly to make boasts in comparisons, even of sufferings: And therefore I choose to be sparing and brief in this Argument: wherein otherwise I could be copious, there be-

ing another Volume of the Book of Martyrs (as I hear) extant in the Country, (though not in print) of the sufferings of the godly Ministers and people, beginning where Mt. *Fix* left. When he saith, *Their witnesses against Bishops and Ceremonies, (whom he calleth Puritans) have seldom met in separate Assemblies from the common:* It seemeth he never read the story of the Classes in *Northamptonshire, Suffolk, Essex, London, Cambridge*, discovered by a false brother to Doctor *Bancroft* (Chaplain then to Lord Chancellor *Hatton*, afterwards Bishop of *London*, and after that Archbishop of *Canterbury*,) nor that he ever took notice of Doctor *Bancroft's* Book against them, entituled, *Dangerous Positions and practies against religion and State*; neither doth it seem, that he doth acknowledge their frequent and continual meetings to duties of humiliation, as any separate meetings from the common. But I doubt not, the Lord took notice of both, and hath now rewarded their sighs and groans, prayers and tears in private with an open recompence and deliverance in the view of all men.

Besides, though he pleased to confine the witness of these he calleth Puritans, unto Testimony against Bishops and Ceremonies: yet I did not think, he had been such a stranger in *Israel*, (if by his leave I may call it *Israel*) as to be ignorant, how far both the Admonitions to the Parliament have reached to bear witness beyond Bishops and Ceremonies. To say nothing of Mr. *Deerings* Sermon before the Queen, or Mr. *Chadertons* at *Paul's Cross*, or Mr. *Parker's Ecclesiastica Politica*, or Mr. *Baines* his Diocesans Trial.

Though he say. *None of them suffered unto death*, only Mr. *Udall* was near it: Yet the trtlth is; he died by the annoyance of the Prison, which he might as well have acknowledged as he doth of some of the Separatists in this very Paragraph, that they were choked in Prison, This I have understood by faithful witness, that when the Coroners Jury (according to the Law of *England*) came (as the manner is in such cases) to survey the dead body of Mr. *Udall* in Prison, he bled freshly (though cold before) as a testimony against the murderous illegal proceedings of the State against him: for so the godly did apprehend it; judicious *Perkins* acknowledgeth such a kind of bleeding to be a part of the accomplishment of that Scripture in *Heb. 11. That the blood of Abel still speaketh.*

In

In like sort, for the same cause (choked in the prison) suffered Mr. *Randall Bates* (an heavenly Saint) nor could he be released, though Doctor *Hering* (a learned and beloved Physician) earnestly solicited Bishop *Neale* for his enlargement as he tendered his life, but the suit of the Physician was repulsed with reproaches: And the life of his patient spilt by that rigour. He is therefore much mistaken, when he saith, *None of them suffered unto death*. And it is alike mistake, when he maketh Mr. *Penry* one of his witness unto the death for Separation. I have received it from Mr. *Hildersham* (a man of a thousand) that Mr. *Penry* did ingenuously acknowledge before his death, That though he had not deserved death for any dishonour put upon the Queen, by that Book (which was found in his study, and intended by himself to be presented to her own hand:) nor by the compiling of *Martin Marprelate*, (of both which he was falsely charged;) yet he confessed, he *deserved death at the Queen's hand, for for that he had seduced many of her loyal Subjects to a separation from hearing the Word of life in the Parish Churches. Which though himself had learned to discern the evil thereof, yet he could never prevail to recover divers of her Subjects, whom he had seduced: and therefore the blood of their souls, was now justly required at his hands.*

Let the Examier consider, whether he will own this. Mr. *Penry* for one of his faithful witnesses hereafter; If he do, let him endeavour to do as he did, seek to reduce those souls whom he hath seduced from hearing the word of life: or else, let him confess (as Mr. *Penry* did) the blood of those souls may justly be required at his hands, if Mr. *Penry's* witness be of weight with him.

Touching his other witness, to the death of Mr. *Barrow*, this I can say, from the testimony of holy and blessed Mr. *Dod*, who speaking of this Mr. *Barrow*, *God is not wont* (saith he) *to make choice of men, infamous for gross vices before their calling to make them any notable instruments of Reformation after their Calling*. Mr. *Barrow* whilst he lived in Court, was wont to be a great Gamster, and Dicer, and often getting much by play, would boast, *Vivo de die, in spem noctis, nothing ashamed to boast of his hopes of his nights lodgings in the bosoms of his Courtizens. As his spirit was high and rough before his reformation, so was it after, even to his death. When he stood under the Gibbet, he lift up his eyes, and Lord* (saith he) *if I be deceived, thou hast deceived-*

*ved me: And so being stopped by the hand of God, he was not able to proceed to speak any thing to purpose more, either to the glory of God, or to the edification of the people.*

Mr. Greenwood (the Examiners last witness unto death) he indeed of all the rest was the more to be lamented, as being of a more tender, and conscientious spirit: but this have I heard reported of him by the same credible hands, That if he could have been sundred from Mr. Barrow, he was tractable to have been gained to the truth. But when the Examiner goeth on to make comparisons between the Sufferings of the Separatists, and of (those he styleth) Puritans, in his Margent, and in his Book. No comparison will hold from the Separatists to them, but a *Minori*. What compulsory banishments have been put upon those blessed and glorious lights, Mr. Cartwright, Parker, Ames? To say nothing of those in Scotland, or New-England: When have the Prisons been vacant of some or other godly Ministers, and Professors? When will the Examiner shew forth alike company, of his witnesses, to these 300. Ministers (whom Mr. Parker compareth to the 300. Soldiers of Gideon) who in one form of persecution, were some suspended, some excommunicated, some imprisoned, all of them deprived of their Ministry, and of their maintenance? And provision made, that none might practise Physic, or teach School, unless they would accept a Licence with subscription? So that of necessity (had not the Lord been wiser, and stronger than men) they must in remediless misery, they and theirs, have either begged, Or starved; But that with the Lord there be bowels of mercy, and fatherly compassions, and with him are plenteous redemptions, and provisions, and protections, when men fail.

The Examiner proceedeth (in his Answer) to tell us further, *That he believeth there hath hardly ever been a conscientious Separatist, who was not first a Puritan. For (as Mr. Can hath unanswerably proved) the grounds and principles of the Puritans against the Bishops, and Ceremonies, and profaness of people professing CHrist: and the necessity of Christ's flock and discipline, must necessarily (if truly followed) lead on to, and enforce a separation.*

*Reply.* 1. If there were hardly ever any conscientious Separatist, who was not first a Puritan, then it seemeth, that if there be any Conscience in the Separatists, it was first wrought in them by the Ministers of those whom he calleth Puritans.

2. Say

2. Say it were true, that he pretendeth, That the principles and grounds of Puritanism, did enforce separation:) yet I do not understand, what it maketh to the point in hand.

3. Neither do I understand; how it suiteth with the Examiners profession who is wont to renounce all communion with Antichristian inventions, so frequently to take up into his mouth and Pen the Nickname of Puritans: which was at first devised by *Sanders* the Jesuit, to call a reproach upon the persons and way of reformers, to render them suspicious and odious to the State. The righteous hand of the Lord struck him with madness who invented the name: nor doth he delight in them that delight to take up a reproach against the innocent.

4. How unanswerably Mr. *Can* hath proved the necessity of Separation from their grounds and principles, I will not judge, because I have not seen his Book. But to separate from the Churches of *England*, as no Churches, or false Churches, from their Ministry, as a false Ministry, from their Sermons as false worship, from their professors as no visible Saints. And to prove all this out of the Principles and grounds of those holy Saints of God, whom he misnameth Puritans, will require a strong efficacy of delusions, to make it appear probable to a sad and judicious spirit, that is, not forestalled with prejudice, or partiality.

But the Examiner proceedeth in his Answer to enquire, *What should be the Reason, why the Separatist (who witnesseth against the Root of the Constitution it self) should find more favour than the Puritan, or Non-conformist?*

And he telleth us,

*Doubtless the reasons are evident: 1. Because most of the Separatists have been poor and low, and not such gainful Customers to the Bishops, their Courts, and Officers. Mr. Ainsworth himself (though a worthy instrument of God's praise) lived upon nine pence in the week with roots boiled, &c.*

*Reply.* In part I will not deny some truth and weight in this reason; But take it for granted, and it doth but confirm what I said, that the Separatist found more favour then the Non-conformist, whatsoever the reason was.

The second reason that he giveth is, *There is a principle in nature to prefer a professed enemy, before a pretended friend. The Separatists*

*tists have been looked at by the Bishops, and their adherents, as known and professed enemies: whereas the Puritans have, professed subjection, and submitted to the Bishops, their Courts, their Officers, their Common Prayer, and worships: And yet (the Bishops have well known) with no greater affection, than the Israelites bore the Ægyptians cruel task-masters.*

*Reply, 1.* What the Non-conformists did bear, it was no more then they thought they might bear with a good Conscience, according to the light they had received. If they did bear more, then what in Conscience they judged lawful to be borne, they had no reason to bear with themselves in so doing.

But if the Bishops bore the less with them in such their subjection, it was because they looked, at them not as pretended friends, but as more dangerous enemies: as knowing both that the Lord was with them, (which made Saul the more afraid of *David*, 1 *Sam*, 18. 28, 29.) as also that the grounds which they gave of their judgement and practice, were more agreeable to Scripture, and to the judgement of all reformed Churches, and therefore more likely in time to prevail, to the utter overthrow, of their usurped Hierarchy. But as for the Separatists, the Bishops did not discern, either the Lord going forth in like sort with them, or, their grounds so likely, to subvert their freehold. Though the Separatists struck at the root of the Constitutions of their Churches, (which was indeed a greater blow than to strike at the root of Episcopacy:) yet because the Episcopacy saw that the Separatists struck at the things of Christ, together with themselves, they knew such strokes would not much hurt their standing.

The next word which the Examiner answereth, is unto that I said; *God hath not prospered the way of Separation, neither with peace amongst themselves, nor with growth of grace.*

His answer is; 1. *That want of peace may befall, the truest Churches of the Lord Jesus, as them at Antioch, Corinth, Galatia.*

*Reply.* The distraction at *Antioch* was soon healed by the Counsel of the Synod at *Hierusalem*, which is a way of peace which the Churches of the rigid Separation have not known, nor will condescend unto: which makes their dissensions destitute of hopes of reconciliuion without separation one from another. The like may be said of the Churches of *Galatia* and *Corinth*. I do

do not read their differences were healed by Separation, but by listening to Apostolical Counsel.

2. His second Answer is, *that it is a common Character of a false Church (maintained by the Smiths and Cutlers shop) to enjoy peace, none daring for fear of civil punishment to question, or differ, &c.*

*Reply.* Though it be a common Character of a false Church, to enjoy a forced and violent peace: yet it is a peculiar Character of a true Church, to enjoy holy peace with God, and one with another, which where it is wanting, there is something else wanting, either in their Faith or Order.

3. His third Answer is, *That God's people in that way have sometimes long enjoyed sweet peace, and soul contentment, in England, Holland, New-England, and other places, &c.*

*Reply.* The Answer had been more clear and evident, if he had named those Churches, who have long enjoyed such peace in that way: in that way I say, of rigid Separation, separating from the Churches of *England*, as altogether false, in their Constitution, Ministry, worship and therefore refusing to hear the word in the best of the Parish Assemblies. It is a wise Proverb of a wiser then *Solomon*, *The back slider in heart (from any Truth or way of God) shall be filled with his own ways.* They that separate from their brethren further than they have just cause, shall at length find cause (or at least think they have found cause) just enough to separate one from another, I never yet heard of any instance to the contrary, either in *England*, or *Holland*. And for *New-England*, there is no such Church of the Separation at all that I know of. That separate Church (if it may be called a Church) which separated with Mr. *Williams*, first broke into a division about a small occasion (as I have heard) and then broke forth into *Anabaptism*, and then into *Antibaptism*, and *Familism*, and now finally into no Church at all.

But whereas I said, God had not prospered the way of the Separation, *as not with peace amongst themselves, so neither with growth of Grace,*

He answereth, for growth of Grace, though some false brethren have crept in, yet Satan himself cannot but confess this multitudes of God's witnesses (reproached with the name of Brownists, and Anabaptists) have kept themselves from the errors of the wicked, and do

*grow in Grace, and knowledge of our Lord Jesus, &c.*

*Repry.* It is an unwelcome Subjelt to ge about to convince others of want of growth in Grace, especially, when we speak of Churches, and that before we have in a more private manner dealt with them. I look at it as more seasonable to provoke our own Churches to more growth of Grace at home. For even true Churches (as that of *Ephesus*, *Revel.* 2.) may decay in their first love.

Only thus much I would say, the first Inventor of that way which is called *Brownism*, from whom the Sea took its name, it is well known that he did not grow in Grace, but fell back first from his own way; to take a Parsonage of a Parish-Church in *England* in *Northamptonshire*, called a Church: God so in a strange (yet wise) providence ordering, that he who had utterly renounced all the Churches in *England*, as no Church should afterwards accept of one Parish-Church amongst them, and it called a Church, and from thence he fell to Organs, in the Temple of his own Church (as I have been credibly Informed) and from, thence to discord with his best hearers, and bitter persecution of them at the last. It is not God's usual manner of dealing to leave any of the first publishers or restorers of any Truth of his to such feareful Apostacy from his Grace, though I Judge not his small Estate.

I will not rehearse what I read in printed Books of the unkind, and ungracious; and unbrotherly dealings of some of note in that way, whilst they maintained the rigor of it. That which the Examiner himself hath rehearsed in this very chapter, may suffice to shew what growth of Godliness was found in that Church, the Officer whereof himself styleth a worthy Instrument of God's praise: and surely he was a man that deserved well of the Church, for sundry of his Learned, and painful, and profitable labours. One would hope, that where the Lord blesseth a people with growth of godliness, the people would grow best under the best Ministers of that way, Mr. *Ainsworths* name is of best esteem (without all exception) in that way, who refuted Communion with hearing in *England*. And if his people suffered him to live upon nine-pence a week with roots boiled (as the Examiner told us) surely either the people were grown to a very extreme, low

Estate,

Estate, or else the growth of their godliness was grown to a very low ebb.

---

### TO CHAP. XXIII.

IN his 24. and 25. Chapters, the Examiner giveth Answer to that speech in my Letter, *That such (of the Separation) as erring through simplicity and tenderness, have grown in Grace, have grown also to discern their lawful Liberty for the hearing of the word from the English Preachers.* This I speak with respect to Mr. Robinson, and to his Church, who as he grew to many excellent gifts both of Grace and nature: so he grew to acknowledge, and in a Judicious, and godly discourse to approve and defend the lawful Liberty of hearing the word from the godly Preachers of the Parishes in England.

But in this 24. Chapter the Examiner answereth nothing against the truth of my speech. Only he telleth of *four sorts of Backsliders from sundry Truths of God, whom he hath observed to be left of God to sad and exemplary spiritual Judgements.*

But because he speaketh of such as have decayed in grace, and I speak of such as grow in grace, his instances come not near the point in hand. I easily believe that Hypocrites may grow from evil to worse deceiving and being deceived: 2 Tim. 3. 13. But a sincere humble Christian, though he may start aside for a season, yet Christ is not wont to leave him so: but seeketh up every stray-sheep of his, and bringeth them to hear and know his voice in the mouths of his Shepherds.

---

### TO CHAP. XXV.

IN this 25. chapter, because I had said, as they *have grown in Grace, they have grown in discerning their lawful Liberty to hear the word from the English Preachers.*

He tells us, *he might here engage himself in a controversy with me, but that neither the greatest will permit: nor is there need, since it hath pleased the Father of Lights to stir up the spirit of a faithful*

*witness of his Truth, in this particular, Mr. Canne, to make a large and faithful Reply to a Book printed in Mr. Robinson's name, tending to prove such a lawful Liberty.*

*Reply.* Mr. Cann is unknown unto me, and his Book also: which I have not had the Liberty to get, in these remote Ends of the world, I shall willingly bestow the reading of them if they come to my hands, and God give opportunity, especially if I see the spirit of a faithful witness in them, which the Examiner extolleth. Only I am apt to think, as young men grow in years, and gifts, they will also grow up to the mellow-mildness, and softness and moderation of riper age as Mr. Robinson, in many things did.

Now from the name of *English Preachers* (which I need in my, speech) the Examiner though he seem to decline the engaging of himself in a controversy about hearing of them, yet he taketh occasion to enter into a threefold discourse about them.

*The first in (this chapter) concerning this title, English Preachers.*

*Secondly, concerning hearing them in chapter 26. Thirdly concerning their calling in chap, 27.*

The sum of his discourse about the title of these Preachers, standeth in there particulars.

*First, that Mr. Cotton acknowledgeth, the ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, to Pastors, Teachers, Bishops, Overseers, Elders: and that their proper work is to feed and govern, a truly converted, holy, and godly people, gathered into a flock or Church-Estate.*

*And not properly Preachers, to convert, beget, make Disciples, which the Apostles, and Evangelist; properly were: so that according to Mr. Cotton's confessions, English Preachers are not Pastors, Teachers, Bishops, Elders, but Preachers of glad news (Evangelism) men sent to convert and gather Churches, (Apostles,) &c.*

*Secondly, yet the Examiner confesseth, that at the Pastors seeing his flock, and at the Prophets prophesying in the Church, an unbeliever coming in may be convinced, &c. but this is accidental, &c.*

*Thirdly, the Examiner acknowledgeth that it pleased God to work personal Repentance in the hearts of thousands in Germany, England, Low-Countries, France, Scotland, Ireland, &c. Yea, and who knoweth, but in Italy, Spain, and Rome, also, &c. but all this hath been under the notion of Ministers feeding their flocks,*  
not

*not of Preachers sent to convert the unconverted, and unbelieving.*

*Reply*, 1. Though I acknowledge the ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, to be Pastors and Teachers: yet it is far from me to think (howsoever the Examiner against my mind reporteth my mind otherwise) that they are not properly Preachers, to converts beget, or make Disciples, &c.

For first though the work of ordinary Ministers were not to convert, but to feed souls: yet their act of feeding is properly exercised by preaching the word. *Timothy* (as a Minister) is taught of *Paul* how to behave himself in the house of God which is the Church of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15.

And this he gave him in charge (as one great part of his work) to preach the word *in season and out of season*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. Besides they were neither Evangelist, nor Apostles, surely (for then they could not have been so miscarried) but the ordinary Ministry of the Gospel, (Pastors, and Teachers of Churches) of whom *Paul* speaketh, (*Phil.* 1. 15, 16.) Some preach Christ saith he, even of envy, and strife, and some of good will: The one preach Christ of contention not sincerely: the other of Love.

Again, *Paul* saith *the Lord hath ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. Speaketh he that only of Apostles, and Evangelists only, and not of ordinary Church Officers? of all doubtless, according *Gal.* 6. 6.

Moreover, what are Preachers but publishers of the Gospel, or glad tidings of the word of God? for so saith the Apostle, *preach the word*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 2. And what is preaching the word, but explication and application of it? and is not the explication and application of the word, as fit to feed souls, as to convert them?

Secondly, when he makes it to be not the proper work of *Pastors, and Teachers, to preach for conversion, but accidental only, and counteth and calleth it a most preposterous work for ordinary Ministers to preach for conversion, &c.*

He must needs give me leave to dissent from him, my Reasons be 1. from the institution and work of the Ministry to the worlds end, whereof one is, to make Disciples, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20.

Say not, that is a peculiar Act of the Apostolic Office: for the Lord Jesus speaketh of three Acts: making Disciples, Baptizing, Teaching:

Teaching: and in the exercise of these he promiseth to be with his Apostles, and their successors unto the end of the world, *ver.* 20. Successors I say, for the Apostles themselves were not to continue themselves in the exercise of those Acts to the end of the world, in their own persons, but in their successors, the ordinary Ministers of the Gospel.

Secondly, from the end why Christ gave Pastors, and Teachers, as well as Apostles and Evangelists: which was for the work of the Ministry, for the gathering together of the Saints, as well as for the building of them up to a perfect man, *Ephes.* 4. 11, 12, 13.

Thirdly from the Estate of the Church, wherein it seldom or never falleth out, but some Hypocrites are found: and besides them, many Infants, and these had need of converting Grace.

Fourthly, from the ordinary way of Conversion, which is by hearing the word, and the word preached by a Minister sent, *Rom.* 10. 14. to 17. either therefore there must be no conversion of souls after the decease of the Apostles and Evangelists: or those who are to be converted, must be converted by private Christians, or by the ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, the succession of the Apostles; but surely not the first: for God will have in every age some or other converted to his Grace to praise his name throughout all Generations.

Not the second: for they shall not be ordinarily converted by private Christians, for the Apostle saith, *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by a Preacher, and him sent.* Therefore the third way remaineth, that Faith is intended of God to be wrought from age to age by the ordinary Ministry of the Gospel.

If the Conversion of souls were accidental to the work of the Minister, it were then *præter scopum efficientis*, besides the intent of the worker. But it is neither beside the intention of the principal worker, God (*for he worketh all things according to the Counsel of his own will, Ephes.* 1. 11.) nor besides the intention of the Minister, for as hath been said, it is one main intent and end of his Office, to make Disciples, and gather Saints; and *Solomon* maketh it an act of wisdom, and therefore not an act of accidental casualty to win souls, *Prov.* 11. 30.

If it be said why are they called Pastors, if they be also Fathers? Pastors are for feeding, not for begetting.

*Answ.*

*Answ.* Pastors are also Fathers: and though they be called Pastors, yet the ordinary Ministers of the Gospel have other Titles also, which imply more then feeding: as they are called Teachers, and Teachers of the ignorant, *Rom.* 2. 20. (to minister saving knowledge to them) as well as of men of understanding. And Elders in the greek Language have their name from Embassadors, *πρεσβυτερος* an Elder, from *πρεσβυς* an Embassador, and it is one work of heavenly Embassadors to beseech men to be reconciled unto God, *2 Cor.* 5. 20. yea and Pastors themselves (whose work is properly to feed) their feeding is with the word of Life, which is able to quicken dead souls to life, as to nourish living souls to growth in Christ Jesus. The whole work of *Peter's* Apostolical calling was wrapped up in a Pastoral name, and work, *John* 21. 15, 16, 17.

Those two Reasons therefore are void of true and sound reason, which moved the Examiner to enter upon this *passage*. *First, because* (saith he) *so many excellent and worthy persons mainly preach for Conversion, and yet account themselves fixed and constant Ministers to particular Congregations, &c.*

*Secondly, that in these great Earth-quakes of an Estate; civil and spiritual, such a Ministry might be sought after, whose proper work might be preaching for converting of souls to Christ.*

For by this which hath been said may plainly appear that those constant Ministers who mainly preach for Conversion (so be it they attend, not to that only, but to building up also) they do herein attend to a proper work of their calling: and now to look for another new Ministry (say of Apostles or Evangelists) to attend conversion of souls only, is to look for a blessing which the Lord hath not promised: and besides himself hath ordained sufficient ordinary means for that end, as hath been shewed both here, and in some former passages of this Treatise.

---

## TO CHAP. XXVI.

IN this Chapter the Examiner falleth upon the second part of discourse, about English Preachers, to wit, about the lawfulness of hearing of them, and though he said before in the former chapter.

chapter, *he would not engage himself in this Controversy*: yet here he giveth a double Argument against it.

His first Argument is, from my testimony, which how much he weigheth, is better known to himself than to me.

*Mr. Cotton (saith he) himself maintaineth, that the dispensing of the word in a Church-state, is Christ's feeding of his flock, Cant. 1. 8. Christ's kissing of his Spouse, Cant. 1. 2. Christ's embracing of his Spouse in the marriage bed, Cant. 1. 16. Christ's nursing of his Children at his wife's breasts, Cant. 4. And is there no communion between the Shepherd and his sheep? the Husband and the wife in chaste kisses and embraces? the Mother and the child at the breasts?*

*Answer. 1.* The dispensing of the word in a Church-State (that is by Church-Officers to Church members, united together in Church-State) it is indeed an expression of familiar and dear Communion between Christ and his Church, as between the husband and his spouse, between the nursing mother and the child, and between the shepherd and his flock: But suppose Pagans and Indians should ordinarily frequent our Church. Assemblies (as they are wont to do in hearing the word) doth he think, I would maintain, that these is the like spiritual and familiar Communion between Christ, and them, as between Christ, and his Church?

*Answer, 2.* Besides, the question is not what communion Christ may have with a stranger in the hearing of the word in the Assembly of his Church: but what communion there is between the Officer of the Church, who preacheth the word and the stranger. Christ out of his sovereign grace may dispense himself to the stranger in what relation he pleaseth; he may make the word both as spiritual seed, and as food to him, and so may declare himself both a father, and a Pastor, and husband, and a mother to him; and yet no such Church-relation pass between the Church-Officer, and the stranger.

*Answer. 3.* Suppose there did grow some spiritual relation between the Church-Officer, and the stranger, (as God might so bless his Ministry, as to make him a spiritual Father, and feeder to the stranger:) yet this relation is not between the Preacher and the stranger in respect of his Office, but in respect of his gift, as I declared above.

The

The reason of the difference is evident:

1. Church-relations between a Church-Officer; and Church-member, is constant, and permanent, and not to be dissolved, but by consent of the Church: but this relation between the Preacher and stranger is transient, and the intercourse of the exercise of their relation easily changeable, at the discretion of the stranger, without the consent, or cognizance of the Church.

2. Church relation between an Officer and a member, carrieth on the duties of Church-work between them unto full accomplishment. If any offence grow between an Officer, and a member, the one hath power to deal with the other in a Church-way unto a perfect healing: but there is not the like power or liberty, either in preacher, or stranger, so to proceed one with another, in case of any such offence.

The Examiners second Argument is taken also from mine own confession, as if there were no weighty Argument to be found in this case, but what might be gathered up from the weakness, or unwariness of my expressions. But thanks be to God, that hath so guided my words, that no such advantage can justly be taken from them, as to countenance so ungodly an error.

*Mr. Cotton (saith he) confesseth that the fellowship in the Gospel, (Phil. 1. 5.) is a fellowship or Communion in the Apostles doctrine, Community, breaking of bread, and prayer, in which the first Church continued, Acts 2. 46. All which overthroweth the doctrine of lawful participation of the word and prayer in a Church-state, where it is not lawful to communicate, in the breaking of bread, or seals.*

*Answ.* If this be all the Conclusion that he striveth for, that participation of the word and prayer, is not lawful in a Church-estate, where it is not lawful to communicate in the seals, I shall never contend with him about it. I should never think it lawful there to enter into a Church-estate, where I thought it lawful only to partake in hearing, and prayer, and not in the seals also. But this is that I deny, A man to participate in a Church-estate, where he partaketh only in hearing and prayer, before and after Sermon; and joineth not with them, neither in their Covenant, nor in the seals of the Covenant,

R r

To

---

## TO CHAP. XXVII.

THE third part of the Examiners discourse touching *English-Preachers*, taketh up this 27 Chapter: and it is concerning the calling and commission of the *English Preachers*.

Mr. Cotton *himself* (saith he) *and others most eminent in New-England, have freely confessed.*

First, *That notwithstanding their profession of Ministry in Old England: yet in New-England (till they received a Calling from a particular Church) that they are but private Christians.*

Secondly, *That Christ Jesus hath appointed no other Calling to the Ministry, but such as they practice in New-England, and therefore consequently, that all other, which if not from a particular Congregation of godly Persons, is none of Christs.*

*As first, a Calling and Commission from the Bishops.*

Secondly, *From a Parish of natural and unregenerate persons.* Thirdly, *From some few godly perons, yet remaining in Church-fellowship after the Parish way.*

Fourthly, *That eminent gifts and abilities are but qualifications fitting or preparing for a call to an Office,* 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1.

*All which premises duly considered, he desireth that Mr. Cotton, and all that fear God, might try what will abide the fiery Trial in this particular, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed in flaming fire, &c.*

*Reply.* It is a weak cause that is maintained only by the testimonies of adversaries, and them either mistaken or falsified.

It is in him either a mistake, or a fraudulent expression of our minds, to say, *that notwithstanding our former profession of Ministry in Old England, yet (till we received a Calling from a particular Church) we were but private Christians.*

This speech may be so conceived, as if notwithstanding our former profession of Ministry in *Old England*: yet indeed we confessed, our Ministry there was no Ministry: and this in false expression of our minds.

It may be also conceived, that we confessed, we had no calling from a particular Church, till we came to *New-England*. And this is also a false expression of our minds likewise.

Or it may be conceived, that notwithstanding our former profession

fession

fession and exercise of Ministry in *Old England*: yet being cast out from thence by the usurping power of the Prelacy, and dismissed (though against their wills) by our Congregations, (save only such as came along with us) we looked at our selves as private members, and not Officers to any Church here, until one or other Church might call us unto Office. This sence of our profession is true, but nothing available to the Examiners intendment.

Secondly, It is in him another mistake, or else a fraudulent expression of our minds, when he saith, *We hold and freely confess, that Christ Jesus hath appointed no other Calling to the Ministry, but such as we practise in New-England: And that any other Calling to the Ministry, which is not from a particular Congregation of godly persons, is none of Christs.*

Though we do believe and profess the calling which we have received, to the Ministry in *New-England*, to be of Christ: yet

1. It is an insolent phrase that favoureth of more arrogance, then either we dare use, or allow in our selves or others, to seem to make our calling to the Ministry in *New-England*, a Rule, and pattern, and precedent to all the Churches of Christ through out the world. Did ever any man meet with such an expression in any of our writings? *That Christ Jesus hath appointed no other Calling to the Ministry, but such as we practise in New-England?* Such language doth neither become the lips of *Mr. Williams*, nor of any Minister in *New-England*.

2. Though we believe our calling to be of God, yet we do neither believe nor profess, that every difference from us which other Churches may life in the calling of their Ministers, doth straight way make their callings no callings, or no callings of Christ. Though it be our minister (and as we believe according to the word) that every Church chooseth and calleth their own Ministers, and ordaineth them by the Presbytery of the same Church: yet if the Presbytery of other Churches commend a Minister to a vacant Church, and upon the acceptance of the Church, if the presbyters of those Churches do ordain him with the consent of the Church, we do not profess that this is no calling of Christ, or that these are no Ministers of Christ. The free choice of the Church is preserved (for ought we know) in their free acceptance of a Minister commended to them. And whether the Minister be

ordained by imposition of hands, at all, or no, and if by imposition of hands, by the hands of fellow-Elders of other Churches with the consent of the Church: We neither put so much weight in such a Rite, though Apostolical; nor do we so far restrain the liberty of communion of Churches, that if they shall communicate such intercourse of Church-actions one to another, then all their callings and administrations to be of none effect. We are not so masterly and peremptory in our apprehensions: And yet (with submission) we conceive, the more plainly and exactly all Church-actions are carried on according to the letter of the rule, the more glory we shall give unto the Lord Jesus, and procure the more peace to our Consciences, and to our Churches, and reserve more purity and power to all our Administrations.

3. Though we do believe, and profess, that a Church (by rule) ought to be a Congregation of godly persons; or at least of such as profess godliness: yet if (through neglect of the power of doctrine) few godly persons be left in a Congregation, & (through neglect of discipline) few of those who profess godliness be found so blameless, as the purity of the Sanctuary requireth: yet we do not, straight way profess that such Congregations are no Churches, or that a Ministry chosen by such a Congregation, are none of Christs.

It is true, God's chiefest regard is of his chosen Saints, godly persons. To them, and for them, he hath given Church-estate, Church-Covenant, and seals, Church-Officers, with all the power of the administrations of the holy things, the ordinances of Christ, *Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13.* But yet that his holy Saints might be preserved, ἀμερέμνος, without scruples and distracting perplexities in their Church-Communion, the Lord is pleased for their sakes to tolerate much hypocrisy, and many aberrations in Church-matters, before he reject Churches as no Churches, Ministry as no Ministry of Christ, callings as no callings.

To speak then a word to the inferences, which the Examiner gathereth from the two former mistaken confessions of ours.

As, 1. *That a Calling or Commission received from the Bishops is none of Christs.*

Reply, 1. We do not believe nor profess, that the Ministers of England, who received Ordination from the Bishops, did receive their  
their

their calling from the Bishops; their Episcopal ordination is no part of their vocation to the Ministry. Their vocation or calling is from Christ by the Election or at least acceptation of the Congregation: The ordination is only *Adjunctum Consummans* of the solemnity of their calling, as hath been shewed above.

*Reply.* 2. Episcopal ordination, though it be an aberration from the institution: yet we do not conceive, that it maketh an abrogation of the calling of a Minister, Extrinsecal pollutions, though they defile the calling, yet they do not destroy it.

His second inference is; *that a Calling from a Parish of natural and unregenerate persons, is none of Christs.*

*Reply.* 1. It is an hard raying, to say that all of the Parish are natural and unregenerate Persons. Such as are swift to judge themselves, are slow to judge others.

*Reply.* 2. Suppose they were all-natural and unregenerate persons; yet they professing Christianity, and meeting together every Lord's day, for the worship of the Lord Jesus, and desiring to have a Minister to instruct them therein, their calling is not a nullity. I cannot say, that the worshippers of God at *Philippi*, (whereof *Lydia* was one) (who met together for prayer every Sabbath day) were any of them better than unregenerate persons, before *Paul* and *Silas* came amongst them. And yet if a man of *Macedonia* come and call *Paul* and *Silas*, to come and help them, they assuredly gather, that the Lord had called them to preach the Gospel to them, *Acts* 16. 9, 10.

His third inference is; *That a Calling from some few godly persons, yet remaining in Church fellowship after the Parish way, is not of Christ.*

*Reply.* Then it would follow, that a remnant of godly persons is not sufficient to constitute and denominate a Church, if the greater part be corrupt and unclean. But the Prophet *Isaiah* was of another mind, and hath taught us by the Holy Ghost to judge otherwise: *Except* (saith he, *Isai.* 1. 9.) *the Lord of Hosts had left us a very small Remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah;* In his judgement, it is not a multitude of hypocrites and profane persons, that maketh a Church (where a remnant of godly persons are found) to become as *Sodom* or *Gomorrah*: But it is a remnant, a very small remnant, that preserve the Church from becoming as *Sodom*, or *Gomorrah*.

His,

His fourth and last inference is; *That eminent gifts and abilities, are but qualifications fitting and preparing for a Call, or Office, according to 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1.*

*Reply* We readily acknowledge it: but yet if a few godly persons shall call for the employment of these gifts to their spiritual edification: The men who are qualified with these gifts, are not only fitted and prepared for a call, or office, but actually called unto office; at least, to preach the word unto them, though not to administer the Covenant, or seals of the Covenant, but only to them and their seed, who yeild professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ Jesus. If any through ignorance or infirmity proceed further in their administrations, I do believe the repentance of the Ministers, (for sins known and secret) and the faith of the godly party, is more able to sanctify the corrupt and unclean sort to their Communion; then the corruption of the unclean sort is able to corrupt the Minister, and Worship, and Church-estate of all.

---

### TO CHAP. XXVIII.

**I**N this last Chapter of his, though he do repeat some passages of the close of my Letter; yet I do not discern how his Answer is fitted at all to those passages. Nevertheless, because he is pleased to gather from those passages, *That I have not duly considered sundry particulars*: I am willing to take up the consideration of them, for a Conclusion: The first particular is, *The necessity of Separation between the garden of the Church, and the wilderness of the world: As the Church of the Jews under the old Testament was separate from the world; so ought the Church of the New Testament to be.*

*Reply.* 1. Of this particular I have considered, not in a confused generality (as he delivereth it) but in a distinct apprehension, thus; The world is taken in Scripture more ways then one, and so is separation: The world is taken sometimes for the frame of heaven and earth, and all the hosts of them, man and beast, &c. as when God is said to *have made the world*, Act. 17. 24. Sometimes for the state of the world; as when Christ is said to *have redeemed us from this present evil world*, Gal. 1. 4. Sometimes for the Civil Government;

vernment of this world; as when the Apostle exhorteth the *Romans*, not to conform their Church-bodies according to the platform of the Roman Monarchy, into Oecumenical, National, Provincial, Diocesan Bodies, *Rom.* 12. 2. Sometime for the wicked of the world; as when it is said, *The world loveth his own*, *Joh.* 15. 19. *And the whole world lieth in wickedness*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 19. Sometimes likewise, for the corruption that is in the world, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4, *The lusts of the world*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 16.

In like manner, there be more ways of Separation then one; As, first, there is a separation in affection, *Love not the world*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 16. *Jam.* 4. 4. Secondly, there is a separation in habitation, which is part of the meaning of *Isai.* 52. 11. *Revel.* 18. 4. Thirdly, there is separation of Communion, 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, to 17th, Besides, there be diversities likewise of Communion: for there is a Civil Communion; and there is a religious Communion. And of either sort, there is a confederate Communion: And there is a Communion without confederacy: And of confederate Communion, there is a confederacy in matters of common civility; and there is a confederacy in matters of more intimate friendship, society, and familiarity.

To apply these different considerations of the world, and of Separations, according to the due, and right apprehension thereof in the word of truth.

First, it is lawful to have civil peace, and loving correspondency with neighbours in the world, yea even with Idolaters, and Infidels, so as not only to trade with them, but to feast with them, yea and to succour them in their distresses, *Rom.* 12. 18. 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. *Luk.* 10. 34

Secondly, It is lawful to make leagues of peace with all men in the world, (even with Idolaters and Infidels) to wit, for free commerce, for trade, and inoffensive neighbourhood, *Gen.* 31. 44. to 53. *Judg.* 4. 17.

Thirdly, It is lawful for the Subject of the same State, to enter into confederacy amongst themselves, and with their Princes, to submit to the same Civil Government, and Laws, and to assist one another in mutual defence against a common enemy, 1 *Sam.* 5. 3. *Eccles.* 8. 3.

But on the other side, this consideration I have had of Separation  
tion

tion from the world: which the Examiner may consider, whether it be due or no.

First, That from the world (as taken for the creatures of the world) we are to separate in affection, to wit, from the inordinate love thereof, *Jam.* 4. 4.

Secondly, From the world, as taken for the carnal malignant estate of it, we are to separate both in our affection, and in our conversation, *Gal.* 1. 4, *Phil.* 3. 20.

Thirdly, From the world, as taken for the Civil Government of it, we are to separate our Church-bodies, and the government thereof in frame and constitution, *Rom.* 12. 1, 2.

Fourthly, From the world, as taken for the Citys and Countreies thereof, which are fit to pollute us with their prevalent pollutions, we are to separate in our habitations; which is part of the meaning of *Isai.* 52. 11. *Rev.* 18. 4.

Fifthly, From the world, as taken for the corruptions and lusts thereof, their evil examples, corrupt worship, Idolatries, superstitions, vain fashions, and the worldly persons addicted to these things, we are to separate, both in affection, and in Communion, whether we speak of religious Communion, or of Civill Confederate Communion in matters of intimate friendship, society, and familiarity. As we may nor partake in Idolatrous feasts, or worship, nor enter into marriage-Covenant with Idolaters, 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. to 17. Nor may we confederate with them in leagues of amity, to have friends and enemies in common, 1 *Kings* 20. 4. nor to have partnership in trade and commerce, 2 *Chron.* 20. 35, 36, 37.

Sixthly, There is yet another separation whereby the Church and people of God, do separate from the scandalous offenders of their own body, 2 *Thes.* 3. 6. 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. This, though it been a special manner aimed at here by the Examiner, yet is it by him most improperly and confusedly called separation from the world. The Apostle doth most expressly contradistinguish these, the one from the other: *I wrote unto you (saith he) in an Epistle, not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with Idolaters, for then must ye needs go out of the world. But if any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an Idolater, with such an one, no not to eat,* 1 *Cor.* 5. 9., 10, 11. As who should say, a fornicator or Idolatrous brother

brother of the Church is one thing; a fornicator and Idolater of the world is another, from a fornicator or Idolatrous brother, you are to be separate: from a fornicator or Idolater of the world, in some kind you need not to separate; In as much therefore as the Churches of *England* do not separate sundry notorious scandalous persons from their Church-Communion, though it be a leavening corruption: yet their sin is not want of Separation from the world, but want of purification of the Church. In the mean time, they are separated from the world of Pagans, and Infidels, as the Church of *Israel* notwithstanding their toleration of all sorts of offenders, Idolaters, murderers, adulterers, they were yet separated from Pagans by profession of a different Religion, and the ordinances thereof.

The second particular which the Examiner saith Mr. Cotton hath not duly considered, is, *That all the grounds and principles leading to oppose Bishops, Ceremonies, Common Prayer, prostitution of the Ordinances of Christ to the ungodly, and the true practise of Christs own Ordinances, do necessarily conclude a separation of holy from unholy, penitent from impenitent, godly from ungodly. And that to frame any other building upon such grounds and foundations, is no other than to raise the form of a square house upon the keel of a Ship, which will never prove a soul saving true Ark or Church of Christ Jesus according to the pattern.*

*Reply.* I cannot acknowledge what he saith, *that have not duly considered, that all the grounds and principles leading to oppose Bishops, and Ceremonies, &c. do necessarily conclude a separation of holy from unholy, &c.* For I have considered, and well weighed (after my slender measure) that they do indeed conclude a three-fold separation of holy from unholy.

1. Doctrinal, that the Minister of Christ, whilst he liveth amongst such dissolute and scandalous persons, he is to separate them in the application of his doctrine, between the holy and unholy, between the precious and the vile: so as to make sad the hearts of the wicked, whom God would have to be made sad, and to strengthen the heart and hands of the righteous, whom God would have to be comforted.

Secondly, A practical separation in a man's own person, that what a man findeth upon those grounds and principles to be un-

warrantable and sinful, he do forbear the same in his own practise, and dissuade others from the same by his doctrine and example.

Thirdly, An Ecclesiastical reparation, that when a man cannot continue in fellowship with such a Church, but that he shall be compelled to the practise of some sin, or of necessity to communicate with the sins of others, then (after all good means used, in vain, to redress those evils) meekly to separate and withdraw himself from fellowship with them in Church-Communion, as one that cannot enjoy the good which is found amongst them, without partaking in sundry evils that cleave to them.

Thus far I have considered the grounds and Principles of Reformation, (of which the Examiner speaketh) and do find that they due necessarily conclude, a reparation of holy from unholy thus far. But I confess, I have not considered, nor can I find out, by any further due consideration, that the principles and grounds of Reformation due necessarily conclude a separation from the *English Churches*, as false Churches, from their Ministry, as a false Ministry, from their worship as a false worship, from all their professors, as from no visible Saints. Nor can I find, that they do either necessarily or probably conclude, a separation from hearing the word preached by godly Ministers in the Parish-Churches in *England*: Nor can I find, that the building of our Churches in these ends of the world, *is the raising up of a square house upon the keel of a Ship*, unless it be the Ark of Noah: for as the souls in the Ark were saved from water; so we find by experience, and good evidence from the word, that the Lord blesseth our Church Communion and administrations with soul-saving efficacy, through his grace in Christ.

Thirdly, The third particular, which the Examiner saith, I have not duely considered, is, *The multitudes of holy and faithful men and women, who have witnessed the truth from Queen Mary's days, by writing, disputing, and suffering, far above what the Non-conformists have done, &c.*

*Reply.* This particular hath been considered above in Answer to Chapter 23.

Fourthly, The fourth particular, which he desireth, might be better considered, *Is our own practise, and profession. Our practise, in constituting*

*constituting our Churches of none but godly persons, and uniting them into a body by voluntary mutual Covenant, and adding none to them, but, persons carefully examined and approved, and entering by way of confession, both of their sins, and of their faith. Our practice also, in suppressing other English, who have attempted to set up a Congregation in a Parishional way. Our profession in the late Answer we gave to many worthy persons, (whom yet we account godly Minsters and people) that we could not permit them to live in the same Commonwealth together with us, if they should set up any other Church and Worship, then what our selves practice.*

*Reply.* 1. Our practise in the constituting and ordering our own Churches here, holdeth forth, what matter, and form, and order of the Church, we do believe to be most agreeable to the pattern set before us in the Gospel of Christ. And our not receiving all comers unto the Communion of the Lord's Table, and other parts of Church-fellowship, (saving only, unto the public hearing of the Word, and presence at other duties) it argueth indeed, that such persons, either think themselves unfit materials for Church-fellowship, (and so they never offer themselves to us) or else that we our selves conceive them to be as stones standing in need of a little more hewing and squaring, before they be layed, as living stones in the walls of the Lord's house. All which amounteth only to this, That we do consider and bewail the defects of the Churches of *England*, in receiving ignorant and scandalous persons to all the liberties of the Lord's Table, and of his house, as other ways. But it doth not at all, argue (neither is it our mind it should argue) their Churches, and worship, and Ministry, and members should all of them be separated from as false, or none at all.

Our practise in suppressing such as have attempted to set up a Parishional way, I never heard at such a thing here to this day. And if any such thing were done, betore my coming into the Country, I do not think it was done by forcible compulsion, but by rational conviction.

But as for our profession, that we should *answer many worthy Ministers and people in England, that we could not permit them to live in the same Common-wealth with us, if we varied from us.*

I have cleared it above (in Answer to Chapt. 11.) to be a noto-

rious falsehood: and but that I know the Devil is able to create slanner of nothing, (as God is able to create truths of nothing) I should think it incredible, that any man who hath been in *New-Englalid* should be able to say, (as the Examiner here doth) *that we persecute the Parishes in New England, and yet frequent the Parishes in Old England.*

Fiftly, The first particular which he thinks I have not duely considered is, *That in the Parishes (which Mr. Cotton holdeth but inventions of men) however they would have liberty to frequent the worship of the Word,) flhry fepar'>lefrom lb. Sacraments: And yet (according to our own Principles.) there is as true Communion in the ministration of the Word, as in the Seals. What mystery (saith he) should be in this, but that here, (to wit, in Old England) the Cross of Christ may be avoided, if persons come to Church?*

*Reply. 1.* It is an untruth, that Mr. Cotton holdeth the Parishes to be but inventions of men; for though I hold that the receiving of all the Inhabitants in the Parish, into the full fellowship of the Church, and the admitting of them all unto the liberty of all the Ordinances, is an human corruption, (and so if he will, an humane invention;) yet I do not hold, nor ever did, that their Parishes were only an human invention. For I believe, the Lord Jesus hath the truth of his Churches, and Ministry, and worship in them, notwithstanding the inventions of men superadded to them.

*Reply 2.* Though I do believe, there *is as true Communion in the ministration of the Word in a Church-estate (to wit, to such as are in Church estate) with the Minister of the Word, as in the Seals.* Yet it is far from me to hold, and from any principle of mine to infer, that there is as true Communion in the ministration of the Word to every hearer, as in the Seals; for then we might as easily admit our *Indians* to the Seals, as we do admit them daily to the ministration of the Word.

*Reply 3.* It is a malignant and Satanical misconstruction of the intentions of such godly persons, who (out of sincere affection to spiritual growth) do hear the Ministry of the Word from godly Preachers in *England*, to accuse them before God, and Angels, and men; that they do it to avoid the Cross of Christ, (to wit, persecution) which may be avoided in a great measure, if persons come to Church.

It

It is well known, that sundry of them are so sincere and constant in their profession, that as they have suffered much for the cause of Christ, against human corruptions in God's worship: so they would be ready to suffer yet more, for neglecting to come to Church, if they suspected any human corruption at all in it.

Again, It is well known, that any stranger in *London*, (by removing now and then his lodging) may escape not only persecution, but observation, for a longer time, then any of our hearers are ordinarily wont to sojourn there: Besides, in this time of universal freedom from all persecution during this long Parliament, why do not our members of these Churches forbear to hear the Word in the Parishes now, when there is no fear nor danger at all of persecution, for not coming to Church?

His fixed and last particular consideration is, *That however Mr. Cotton saith, He hath not found such presence of Christ and evidence of the Spirit in such (separate) Churches, as in the Parishes: What should be the reason of their great rejoicings and boastings of their own separations in New-England, in so much, that some of the most eminent amongst them have affirmed, that even the Apostles' Churches were not so pure? Surely if the same new English Churches were in Old England, they could not meet in Old England without persecution: which therefore in Old England they avoid, by frequenting the way of Church-worship in the Parishes, which in New-England they persecute.*

*Reply.* 1. The Examiner might easily have satisfied himself in this consideration, if he had been willing to understand that which he knoweth to be our meaning. He knoweth very well, and hath often told us one before, that we our selves in our Churches do practise some kind of separation here, to wit, separation, not from the Churches in *Old England*, as no Churches, but from some corruptions found in them. In such Churches as so separate, we never speak of them, that we hold not found the presence of Christ, or evidence of the Spirit in such Churches. But I speak of such rigid Separatist's Churches, as renounce the Churches, and Ministry, and worship, and Saints of *England*, as if they were all false, or none at all, and therefore utterly do refute to hear the word in their Assemblies, which is such a way of separation, as I told him in my Letter, the *Lord Jesus never delivered, nor any of his Apostles after him, nor any of his Prophets before him.* Of which he taketh no notice,

notice, nor giveth any ground either from Christ, or his Apostles, or Prophets, for such practice; but putteth us off, that we practise separation our selves, and rejoyce therein? as if our separation and theirs were both of one nature, and measure: which indeed differ as much (as I said before) as Chirurgery, and Butchery,

Reply. 2. When he telleth us, *We boast of oour separations in New-England, yea so far, that some of our most eminent have said, that even the Apostles' Churches were not so pure.*

I must needs profess, I never heard, nor read of such a speech, but only in this Examiners Book. The speech itself favoureth, I know not whether of more ignorance, or arrogancy, or blasphemy, The broadest speech in this kind, that ever I heard to fall from the lips of any in this Country, was that of Mr. *Williams* himself, who whilst he lived at *Salem* (as I am credibly informed) would say, *That of all the Churches of Christ in the world, the new English were the most pure, and of all the new English, the Church of Salem.* I and so well acquainted with the liberty and boldness of the Examiners tongue in calumniation, that until I know the name of that eminent person, whom he reproacheth to have so spoken, he must give me leave to fear, either a mistake, or that which is worse.

Reply. 3. It is a double calumny, (but suitable to many other of the former) *that we in New-England do persecute the way of separation, whether the one kind of separation, or the other.* It is true of neither, for we practise the one, and tolerate the other.

And again, *that we frequent the Parish-Churches in Old England, to avoid persecution.*

Unless men's tongues were their own, I wonder, how they can allow themselves to speak so excessively at random.

These his six Considerations, having so little considerable truth, or weight in them, I justly said, *That he in withdrawing the people of God from bearing the voice of Christ in so many Congregations, both in New-England, and in Old, did not help Jehovah against the mighty, but Satan against Jehovah, and against the mighty Ordinances of his Word, and Ministry.*

How he helpeth them I know not, unless it be by depriving  
them

them of many precious means of grace, which they might enjoy by hearing the Word in either *England*: or unless by his own example he now help them, *Proficere in peius*, to separate further from all instituted worship of the Lord, to call off their own Churches, Ministry, Worship, as they have cast off others before, that so they might seek (for that which will never be found under the Sun) new Apostles to make all things new. And as little do I know, how he helpeth us to seek the Lord Jesus without halting, unless it be to seek him, as he himself doth without Church-Ordinances.

For the Conclusion of his Book, he is willing to take up the conclusion of my Letter; *That whosoever will not kiss the Son*, (that is, will not hear and embrace the words at his mouth) *shall perish in their way*, Psal. 2. 12.

This word is established in heaven, and will take place in the earth throughout all generations.

But least this word might profit himself, (as self-love is apt to apply a word of threatening to any rather than to it self) he applieth it to Mr. *Cotton*, and to every soul, (to whom these lines of his may come) *seriously to consider, in this Controversy, if the Lord Jesus were himself in person in Old, or New-England, what Church, what Ministry, what worship, what Government he would set up, and what persecution he would practise toward them that would not receive him.*

For Answer, let me say in a word, this point hath been seriously considered already: and let it be still considered and pondered in the Balance of the Sanctuary, and doubtless, for the first of these points, it will be found, that if the Lord Jesus were here himself in person, he would set up no other Church, nor Ministry, nor worship, nor government, then what himself hath appointed in his Word: which though the Examiner, and many others, have sought and searched what enormities they might find in it, yet they have wearied themselves, and found nothing. So true is the faithful promise of the Lord Jesus, that he hath built his Church upon a Rock, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, nor against the Ordinances thereof.

And for the latter point; *What persecution the Lord Jesus if he were on earth, would practise against those who would not receive him.*

The

The Answer is near at hand, and is written for the warning of all gain-sayers; *Those mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither, and slay them before my face, Luk. 19. 27.* And yet I would not be so understood (in alleging this Scripture) as if Christ did allow his Viceregents to practise “all, that himself would practise in his own person. For not all the practises, or acts of Christ, (as the Examiner seemeth to intimate) but the Laws of Christ, are the Rules of man’s Administrations. But of that more distinctly in due time, if the “Lord shall give liberty to enquire further into the Examiner’s *Bloudy Tenent*.

To the Lord Jesus, be the kingdom, power, and glory.  
*Amen.*

---

**FINIS.**