

A
Survey of the
Summe
of
Church
Discipline

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

The format of this volume is copyright
© 2011 Quinta Press

www.quintapress.com

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

Introductory:

Part 1: 1–140 [no pages 141–184] 185–296 [end]

Part 2: 1–90 [end]

Part 3: 1–46 [end]

Part 4: 1–59 [end]

A

SURVEY

of the Summe of

Church-Discipline.

WHEREIN,

The Way of the Churches of

NEW-ENGLAND

is warranted out of the Word,
and all Exceptions of weight, which
are made against it, answered: Whereby
also it will appear to the Judicious Reader,
that something more must be said, then
yet hath been, before their Prin-
ciples can be shaken, or they
should be unsettled in
their practice.

By Tho. Hooker, late Pastor of the Church at
Hartford upon Connecticut in N.E.

ISA. 62. 1.

For Sion's sake I will not hold my tongue: and for Jerusalem's sake, I will not rest: until the righteousness thereof break forth as the light, and the salvation thereof be as a burning lamp.

2 COR. 13. 8. *For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.*

LONDON

Printed by A. M. for John Bellamy at the three Golden Lions
in *Cornhill*, near the Royal Exchange. M.DC.XLVIII.

A Preface of the Author, By way of Introduction to this following Discourse.

Wherein the attentive Reader may understand

*the scope, the matter and method thereof,
and how far there is a joint concurrence of
most of the Elders of New-England.*

Truth is the Daughter of time,
was the saying of old, and our daily ex-
perience gives in evidence and proof
hereof, to every mans ordinary observa-
tion. Only as in other births Jokers, the
barrenness and fruitfulness of fever, all
ages, depend merely upon God's good
pleasure, who opens and shuts the womb of truth from bearing,
as he sees fit according to the counsel of his own will. Not that there is any change in
the truth, but the alteration
grows, according to men's apprehensions, to whom it is more
or less discovered, according to God's most just judgement,
and their own deservings.

Sometimes God makes an eclipse of the truth at midday,
that so he might express his wrath from Heaven, against
the unthankfulness, prophaness, and Atheism of a ma-
lignant world.

Rom. 1:18

A 2 Hence

Hence it was he let loose these hellish delusions, immedi-
ately after the Ascension of our Saviour; That though his
life and conversation gave in evidence beyond gainsaying, that
he was true man: Though the miracles and wonders he
wrought in his life and death, resurrection and ascension,

were witnesses undeniable, that he was true God: yet there arose a wretched generation of Hereticks, in the first, second, and third hundred years, who adventured not only against the express verdict of the Scripture, but against sense and experience, fresh in the observation and tradition of living men, with more then Satanical impudency to deny both the natures of our blessed Saviour.

^a adannu 72. ^b adannu 100 Ad annum 174. Samosatenu ad annum 269. Arrius ad annu 324. Epiphanius Augustinius Magdeburgenses. ^d Ad annum 137. 143. 14. And after them followed Sabellius ad annum 257. and Manichæus 281.

Some denied the Diety of our Saviour, and would have him mere man. As Ebrion,^a Cerinthus,^b Montanus,^c &c. Others deny him to be true man, as the Gnostici,^d Valentiniani, Marrioniræ.

2 Thes. 2:11. ἐνέργειαν πλάνης

Eusebius lib. 4 in vita constantini. At hanasius in Evangelio de sanctissima Dei parasi mo so sit At harasij-Audi silia Davidis & Arabæ & inclina aurens tuam in preces nostras: & ne obilviscaris populi tui ad te clarantis.

Sometimes when men entertain the truth in profession, but not in the love of it, and that endeared affection, that is due thereunto, the Lord gives men up to the Activity of error, as the Apostle speaks, because they did not love, that the truth should be truth, they embraced falsehood instead of truth, that so they might be deluded and damned. This made way for Antichrist, and did Midwife that man of sin into the world, and by little and little advanced him into his throne. For while men did verbally acknowledge the nature and offices of our Saviour, they did begin, though subtly, yet really, to usurp the honour and exercise of all to themselves.

First, They began to encroach upon the
 PRIESTLY OFFICE of our Sa-
 iour, and not only to pray for the dead,
 but to pray to them, and to attribute too
 much to the martyrs and their worth;
 and to derogate from the meritts, and that plentiful and

perfect redemption wrought alone by the Lord Jesus. The Spouse of Christ thus like the unwise virgins, was taken aside with the slumber of Idolatry, till at last she fell fast asleep: as the following times give in abundant testimony.

Not long after, these sleeps were attended with suitable dreams, for not being content with the simplicity of the Gospel, and the purity of the worship appointed therein: They set forth a new and large edition of devised and instituted ceremonies, coined merely out of the vanity of men's carnal minds, which as so many blinds, were set up by the subtlety of Satan, merely to delude men, and mislead them from the truth of God's worship, under a pretence of directing them more easily in the way of grace: and under a colour of kindling, they quenched all true zeal for, and love of the truth.

Insomuch that Augustine complaind, The present condition of the Churches in his time, was worse then that of the Jews. They were subject to the burden of legal Ceremonies, laid upon them by the Lord; but we (*saith the Father*) are pressed with pre-emptions devised by men.

August.	epist.	119.	&	tolerabitior	
sit	conditio	Iudgorum	qui	etsi	tem-
sut	libertatis	non	agnoverint,		lega-
libut	tamen	sarcinis	non		humanis
<i>presumptionibus subijclantur.</i>					

And thus at once they usurped upon the PROPHETICAL and justled our Saviour also out of his REGAL OFFICE, for so they are linked together by the Prophet. He is our King, he is our Law-giver; it is in his power and pleasure

to provide his own laws, and appoint the ways of his own worship.

Isa. 33:22.

Thus were the OFFICES of our Saviour secretly and cunningly undermined till at last that man of sin, seeing his time, and taking his advantage, adventured openly and impudently to challenge the chair of supremacy.

Boniface the third obtained by policy and treachery at the hand of Phocas for himself and his successors, that the Bishop of Rome, should be the head and chief Bishop of all Christian Churches.

2 Thes. 2:4.

But the one sword was not sufficient for Hildebrand, He rested not, until by his hellish contrivements he had got two swords, to fill both his hands withal, and a Triple-crown upon his head, and carried it with mighty violence against the imperial Majesty: that whereas no Pope in former times might be chosen without the confirmation of the Emperor: so now no Emperor might be chosen without the confirmation of the Pope: as appears in the story of Henry the Emperor.

Thus while the Pope pretended to be the Vicar and Vicegerent of Christ, to supply his absence here on earth, by being *caput ministeriale*.; in issue he justled him out of the room and right of his HEADSHIP.

He makes Canons to bind conscience, and so assumes the place of the chief Prophet; Gives dispensations, sends out Indulgences, sells pardons, retains, and remits sins, improves the treasury of the Church to that end, and so challengeth the place of being chief Priest. Lastly, arrogates the plenitude and supremacy of power in causes Ecclesiastic and Civil, no less then two swords will satisfy, to fill both his hands, and a Triple-crown to load his head withal, and thereby arrogates to be head of the Church.

When God had revenged the contempt of the Authority of his son, by delivering up such contemnners to the tyranny and slavery of Antichrist, by the space of many hundred years: That by their own experience they came to know the difference betwixt the service of God, and the slavery of

men: *the golden scepter of Christ, and the Iron rod of Antichrist; who tortured their consciences upon a continual rack, held their souls smoking over the mouth of the bottomless pit, put them into hell, and plucked them out at his pleasure, whence men desired to die, rather than to live.*

They then began to sigh for some deliverance from this spiritual, more than Egyptian bondage; and being thus prepared to lend a listening ear unto the truth, God sent them

Brightman in *cap. 9. Aposol. ad y 6.*

some little reviving in their extremities, a day-star arising in this their darkness.

He stirred up the spirit of the Waldenses, Armachanus, Wickliff, Hus, Jerome of Prague, who openly proclaimed the usurpations of that man of sin, slowly asserted the fullness and sufficiency of the Scriptures, cleared and maintained the deciding authority thereof in all the ways and worship of God, and so set up the Lord Jesus, as the only PROPHET of his Church.

After them succeeded Luther, who made a spoil of the Popes treasury, marred wholly his market, and the sale of his indigencies, and so wonderfully cooled and quenched the fire of Purgatory, and the Popes kitchen: that his holiness, and the wretched rabble of all his black-guard, were forced to improve all their power and policy to crush the credit of that champion, and the authority of that doctrine which he taught, but all in vain.

For the virtue of the bloody sacrifice of Christ once offered for all, the perfect satisfactor, Justification, and redemption, came so strongly to be received and maintained in many places and persons of note. That now all the unbloody sacrifices, masses, and multitudes of that trash, which the merit-mongers did studiously set forth to sale, and by which they set up themselves in the hearts of the people, grew to be abhorred of such as were pious and conscientious, and all such who would but suffer themselves to be led by the principles of right reason. And thus the PRIESTLY office of our Saviour came

in some measure to be acknowledged, and appropriated to him, whose peculiar it was.

Only the SUPREMACY OF THAT KINGLY POWER, upon which the Pope had encroached, and maintained the possession thereof so long, was yet retained and fortified (as reason would) with greatest resolution, nor could he suffer the appearance of any approach or battery to be creat-

ed, that might seem to hazard the safety of that, but he sets him fully and fiercely against Reformation, which sticks like the cunny skin at the head principally.

Hence for the surprisal of so strong a peice, the Lord in his providence provided many means to make approaches thereunto by little and little. The Councils of Constance and Basle just led the Pope to the Wall, and took the wall of him, made him lower then the council, but let him enjoy hit Headship over all his officers and particular Churches.

King Henry the eighth, he further clipped his wings in temporals, shook off and renounced that supremacy that he had arrogated and erected over kings and kingdoms in former ages: Only that is storied of him as his mistake, he cut off the head of Popery, but lest the body of it (in Arch-Bishops, Primates, Metropolitans, Archdeacons,) yet within his realm, and the churches there established.

This power having a double respect; Partly to Ministers, Partly to Churches: The first of these was abated, when a Parity in the Ministry came to be acknowledged and received in the Churches of the reformation. And that the sole and princely power, which was arrogated and exercised by the Bishops and their officers, over the faithful Pastors of Christ was cashiered, as contrary to the government and power bequeathed to each particular officer of his own appointment, who all have Ministerium, non Dominium, are stewards, not Lords of God's inheritance.

But whether all Ecclesiastical power be impaled, impropriated and rightly taken in to the Presbytery alone: Or that the people of the particular Churches should come in for a share, according to their places and proportions;

This is lest as the subject of the inquiry of this age, and that which occasions great thoughts of heart of all hands: Great thoughts of heart in the Presbytery, at being very

loth to part with that so chief privilege, and of which they have taken possession so many years. Great thoughts of heart amongst the Churches, how they may clear their right, and claim it in such pious sobriety and moderation, as becomes the Saints: being unwilling to loose their cause and comfort, merely upon a nihil dicit: or for ever to be deprived of so precious a legacy, as they conceive this is, though it hath been withheld from them, by the tyranny of the Pope, and prescription of times. Nor can they conceive it less, then a heedless betraying of their special liberties, and not selling but casting away their inheritance, and right, by a careless silence, when the course of providence, at the juncture of things now present themselves, allows them a write Ad melius inquirendum.

And it seems God sets out this disquisition (fall the issue on which side it will) as most suitable and seasonable to these times, which appear fruitful in discoveries: Truth seeming to be in travel, having fulfilled her appointed months, and the instant opportunity of her deliverance drawing on apace, as the Scripture account, may seem to give symptoms to that purpose, and such as will not fail.

For these are the times drawing on, wherein Prophecies are to attain their performances: and it's a received rule, and I suppose most safe, when Prophecies are fulfilled they are best interpreted, the accomplishment of them is the best Commentary.

These are the times, when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters the Sea: and these waters of the Sanctuary shall increase from the ankles, unto the knees, thence unto the loins, and thence become a river that cannot be passed.

These are the times when people shall be fitted for such privileges, fit I say to obtain them, and fit to use them.

Fit to obtain them at God's hands, for Dan. 12:4. peo-

Hab. 2:14. Ezek. 47:4, 5.

Dan. 12:4. *Brightm. in loc.*

ple shall run too and fro, and knowledge shall increase: *they shall by the strength of their desires, improve the most painful exercise of their thoughts in the most serious search of the mystery of godliness, and blood-hound like, who are bent upon their prey, they shall most indefatigably trace the truth, and follow the least appearance of the foot-steps thereof presented, until they come to see the formings and framings in the first rise, Scire est per causas seire, and thus digging for wisdom as for hid treasures, and seeking the Lord and his will, with their whole hurt, they shall find him, and understand it.*

Fit to use them, *new the Lord will write his laws in their hearts, and put it into their inward parts, and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, For they shall all know me, from the least of them, to the greatest of them.*

And whereas it hath been charged upon the people, that through their ignorance and unskilfulness, they are not able to wield such privileges, and therefore not fit to share in any such power. The Lord hath promised: To take away the veil from all faces in the mountain, the weak shall be as David, and David as an Angel of God. The light of the Moon shall be as the Sun, and the Sun seven times brighter. When he hath not only informed them, but made them to be ashamed of their abominations, and of all that they have done, then he will show them the frame of his house, and the pattern thereof, the going out thereof, the coming in thereof, the whole fashion thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, all the figures thereof, and laws thereof: And write them in their sight, that they may keep the whole fashion thereof, and all the Ordinances thereof, and do them. Observe how often, the Lord expresseth the enlarged manifestations of himself in those many universals.

ALL LAWS, ALL ORDINANCES, ALL FIGURES. 2. *Not only SHEW all, but make them, SEE ALL, and do all.*

The travel off he truth, as I said that drawing on, it hath pleased the Lord to improve the pens and pains of many of his Worthies (midwife like) to lighten and ease the throws of the truth, in this sharp and sore travel for a safe delivery.

Amongst these M Rutherford hath deserved much for his undefatigable diligence; A man of eminent abilities the depth of whose judgement, and sharpness in dispute, is evidenced beyond all exception, by that accurate and elaborate piece of his Apologetical exercitations, wherein he appears to be Malleus Jesuitarum, and of their factors and followers the Arminians, who receive their errors by whole-sale from them, and retail them out again in their particular treatises. And for these pains of his, I suppose the Churches will (I must profess for mine own particular I do) owe him much. And therefore it was a pleasing and pleasant providence, when I perceived by some books, set forth of late, that he did address himself seriously to debate of Church-Discipline, a subject, as of special difficulty, so of special advantage to the truth, and of help to the present times in which we live.

These two things seeming to be great reserves of inquiry, for this last age of the world,

1. *Wherein the spiritual rule of Christ's Kingdom consists, the manner how it is revealed and dispensed to the souls of his servants inwardly?*

2. *The order and manner, how the government of his kingdom is managed outwardly in his Churches?*

Upon these two hinges the tedious agitations that are stirring in the earth turn: either having their first rise from

hence directly, or by a secret influence, therefore-mentioned tanses send in and insinuate their special interests indirectly,

to make up that *μεαγς σεισμὸς* to set forwards the shakings of heaven and earth, which are to be seen even at this day.

This being the season, when all the kingdoms of the world, are becoming the Lords and his Christs: and to this purpose he is taking to himself his great might, which heretofore he seemed to lay aside and in silence, as himself speaks in a like case. Psa. 50. to suffer wicked men to put forth their rage, accordng to their own pleasure, but he resolves by his Iron rod to dash those earthen vessels to pieces.

Revelation 11:16.

Psa. 2.

The first of these, to wit; The spiritual Kingdom of Christ, is most opposed by a generation of Enthusiasts; and Familists, who having refined the loathsome follies of their former predecessors, do adventure to set open their conceits, with greater insolency, to the view of the world; and under the pretence of free-grace, they destroy the grace of God in the power and operations of it, in the hearts and lives of men.

The other, which concerns the managing of the outward kingdom, unless my prospective much deceives me, is coming towards its last trial: because there is more liberty now given to each, to plead their own interests, when in former times the tyranny of Antichrist, and blind obedience unto his dictates, turned the tomb-stone of untimely silence upon all men's endeavours, buried all men's debates in their own bosoms, or else the unreasonable rigour of the prelates laboured to destroy the being of the defense as soon as it came to the birth.

This present term of God's patience promiseth some allowance to his people the distressed and despised ones of Christ, sub formâ pauperis, to take leave to lay claim to these pri-

viledges, which they have conceived to be part of the legacy bequeathed unto them by the Lord Jesus, being estated

and entitled members of the visible Kingdom of his Church.

To set out the bounds of these interests, worthy M. R. hath bestowed great labour, which I have again and again attended, and as I do freely acknowledge to have received light therefrom: so I do profess I do readily consent with him in many things.

In the number and nature of Officers, as Pastors, Teachers, Elders, &c. appointed by Christ in his Church.

That the people hath right to call their own officers, and that none must be imposed upon them by Patrons and Prelates.

That Scandalous persons are not fit to be members of a visible Church, nor should be admitted.

That the faithful Congregations in England are true Churches: and therefore it is sinful to separate from them as no Churches.

That the members which come commended from such Churches to ours here, so that it doth appear to the judgement of the Church, whence they come, that they are by them approved, and not scandalous, they ought to be received to Church communion with us, as members of other Churches with us in N.E. in like case so commended and approved.

To separate from Congregations for want of some Ordinances: Or,

To separate from the true worship of God, because of the sin of some worshippers, is *unlawful*.

The Consociation of Churches is not only lawful, but in some cases necessary.

That when causes are difficult, and particular Chur-

ches want light and help, they should crave the Assistance of such a consociation.

That Churches so meeting have right to counsel, rebuke, &c. as the case doth require.

In case any particular Church shall walk pertinaciously, either in the profession of error, or sinful pra-

ctice, and will not hear their counsel, they may and should renounce the right hand of fellowship with them.

That Infants of visible Churches, born of wicked parents, being members of the Church, ought to be baptized.

In these and several other particulars, we fully accord with M. R. and therefore no man in reason can conceive, that I write in opposition to his book: for then I should oppose my self, and mine own judgment: but for further disquisition and search into some particulars, which pace tanti viti, craves further and fuller discovery.

And hence, THIS NEEDS NO TOLERATION OF RELIGIONS, or estrangement of affection, in tolerating the differences of such apprehensions, and that in some things until further light bring in further conviction and concurrence.

It is confessed by all the Casuists, I know, and that upon a rigid dispute, that longer time is to be allowed to two sorts of people, from whom consent is expected, then from others,

1. To some, *who out of the strength of their judgement are able to oppose arguments, in case they come not so well guarded and pointed as they should.*

2. To others, *the like Indulgency is to be lent, who out of their weakness cannot so easily and readily perceive the valour and validity of an argument, to carry the cause, and win their assent thereunto.*

Of this latter I profess my self, and therefore plead for allowance, and present Forbearance, especially considering, that modestly to inquire into, and for a time to dissent from the judgement of a general counsel, hath been accounted tolerable.

He that will estrange his affection, because of the difference of apprehension in things difficult, he must be a stranger to himself one time or other, If men would be tender and careful to keep off offensive expressions, they might keep some distance i n opinion, in some things, without hazard to

truth or love. But when men set up their sheaves (though it be but in a dream, as Joseph's was) and fall out with everyone, that will not fall down and adore them, they will bring much trouble into the world, but little advantage to the truth or peace.

Again, The Reader must know for his direction in this inquiry, my aim only was, and is, to lay down, and that briefly, the grounds of our practice, according to that measure of light I have received, and to give answer to such reasons, which might seem to weaken the evidence thereof: declining purposely, for the present, the examination of such answers, which are made to the arguments alledged by some of our Reverend Brethren, touching the same subject because I would neither prejudice nor prevent their proper defense, which I do suppose in the fittest season thy will so present unto the world, as shall be fully satisfactory to such at love and desire the knowledge of the truth.

The Summe is, we doubt not what we practise, but its beyond all doubt, that all men are liars, and we are in the number of those poor feeble men, either we do, or may err, though we do not know it, what we have learned, we do profess, and yet profess still to live, that we may learn.

And therefore the err and upon which this present discourse is sent, is summarily to shew these two things unto the world,

1. *That there must be more said (then yet it hath been my happiness to see) before the principles we profess will be shaken, and consequently it cannot be expected that we should be unfitted in our practice.*

2. *That I might occasion men eminently gifted to make further search, and to dig deeper, that if there be any vein of reason, which lies yet lower, it might be brought to light, and we profess and promise, not only a ready care to hear it, but a heart willing to welcome it.*

Its the perfection of a man, amidst these many weaknesses, we are surrounded withal, by many changes to come to per-

fection. It's the honour and conquest of a man truly wise to be conquered by the truth: and he hath attained the greatest liberty, that suffers himself to be led captive thereby.

That the discourse comes forth in such a homely dress and course habit, the Reader must be desired to consider, It comes out of the wilderness, where curiosity is not studied. Planters if they can provide cloth to go warm, they leave the cuts and lace to those that study to go fine.

As it is beyond my skill, so I profess it is beyond my care to please the niceness of men's palates, with any quaintness of language. They who covet more sauce then meat, they must provide cooks to their mind. It was a cavil cast upon Hierom, that in his writings he was Ciceronianus non Christianus: My rudeness sees me wholly from this exception, for being Λόγω, Ἰδιώτης, as the Apostle hath it, if I would, I could not lavish out in the looseness of language, and as the case stands, if I could answer any man's desire in that daintiness of speech, I would not do the matter that Injury which is now under my hand: Ornari resipsa negat. The substance and solidty of the frame it that, which plea-

seth the builder, its the printer's work to provide varnish. If the manner of the discourse should occasion any disrelish in the apprehension of the weaker Reader, because it may seem too Logical, or Scholastical, in regard of the terms I use, or the way of dispute that I proceed in, in some places: I have these two things to profess.

1. That plainss and perspicuity, both for matter and manner of expression, are the things, that I have conscientiously endeavoured in the whole debate: for I have ever thought writings that come abroad, they are not to dazzle, but direct the apprehension of the meanst, and I have accounted it the chiefest part of Judicious learning, to make a hard point easy and familiar in explication. Qui non vult intelligi, debet negligi.

2. The nature or the subject that is under my hand, is such, that I was constrained to accommodate and confirm my expressions more or less, in some kind of suitableness thereunto: for in some passages of the dispute, the particulars

in their very rise and foundation, border so near upon the principles of Logick: (as whether Ecclesia Catholica visibilis, was to be attended, as a Totum universal, or Integrale) that either I must resolve to say nothing, or to speak (though as sparingly as I could of such things) as the quality of the things did require. And let any man make a trial, and I do much mistake my self, but he will be necessitated to take the same course, if he speaks to the cause. If the Reader shall demand how far this way of Church-proceeding receives approbation by any common concurrence amongst us: I shall plainly and punctually express my self in a word of truth, in these following points, viz.

Visible Saints are the only true and meet matter, whereof a visible Church should be gathered, and confederation is the form.

The Church as *Totum essentiale*, is, and may be, before Officers.

There is no Presbyterial Church (*i.e.* A Church made up of the Elders of many Congregations appointed Classicwise, to rule all those Congregations) in the N.T.

A Church Congregational is the first subject of the keys.

Each Congregation completely constituted of all Officers, hath sufficient power in her self, to exercise the power of the keys, and all Church discipline in all the censures thereof.

Ordination is not before election.

There ought to be no ordination of a Minister at large, *Namely, such as should make him Pastor without a People.*

The election of the people hath an instrumental causal venue under Christ, to give an outward call unto an Officer.

Ordination is only a solemn installing of an Officer into the Office, unto which he was formerly called.

Children of such, who are members of Congregations, ought only to be baptized.

The consent of the people gives a causal virtue to the completing of the sentence of excommunication.

Whilst the Church remains a true Church of Christ, it doth not loose this power, nor can it lawfully be taken away.

Consociation of Churches should be used, as occasion doth require.

Such consociations and Synods, have allowance to counsel and admonish other Churches, as the case may require.

And if they grow obstinate in error or sinful miscarriages, they should renounce the right hand of fellowship with them.

But they have no power to excommunicate.

Nor do their constitutions bind formalitèr & judicè.

In all these I have leave to profess the joint judgement of all the Elders upon the river: Of New-haven, Guilford, Milford, Stratford, Fairfield: and of most of the Elders of the Churches in the Bay, to whom I did fend in particular, and did receive approbation from them, under their hands; of the rest (to whom I could not send) I cannot so affirm; but this I can say, That at a common meeting, I was desired by them all, to publish what now I do.

Lastly, To ease the ordinary Reader, who happily is not Acquainted with discourses of this kind, I shall take leave to send him this little advise,

The Treatise being divided into four parts, if he will be entreated to survey the Table set before the work, by a short and sudden cast of his eye, he shall presently perceive those particulars, which as so many pillars principal, bear up the whole frame.

{1. Look at the Churd in its first rise and essence, The causes of it, in the efficient, Matter and Form: The justification of it in its precedency, power, priviledges, make up the first part.

{2. Look at the Church) as completed with, all her Officers, the number and nature of them, in her elections, and Ordinations, where the loathsome title

of Independency is opened: these lay out the matter of the second part.

- {3. *The Church thus constituted, The power that she exerciseth in admissions, dispensations of Sacraments, and censures, especially that grand and great censure of excommunication, how it is to be managed, and the power of it lastly resolved. In these the third part is spent.*
- {4. *The consociation of Churches in Classes, Synods, and connects, is shortly discussed in the fourth part.*
-

Let him be intreated to carry these along in his confederation, he will readily know, whether to refer any thing, and where to find any thing; and as readily conceive the method and manner, both of the constitution of the Church, as the House of God, and the right managing of all the occasions and affairs thereof.

In the handling of all these particulars, so full of difficulty and obscurity, I am not such a stranger at home, but that I am easily sensible of the weight of the matter and mine own weakness: and therefore I can profess in a word of truth, that against mine own inclination and affection, I was haled by importunity to this so hard a task, to kindle my rush candle, to join with the light of others, at least to occasion them to set up their lamps.

Now he that is the way, the truth, and the life, pave out all the ways of his people, and make their paths plain before them: Lead us all into that truth, which will lead us unto eternal life; bring us once unto that impotency and impossibility, that we can do nothing against the truth, but for it, that so our Congregations, may not only be styled, as Ezekiel's temple, but be really what was prophesied the Churches should be, in these last dates, Jehovah Sham-mah. In the Arms of his everlasting mercy I leave thee, but never cease to wish,

Spiritual welfare
in him.
Thomas Hooker

TO
THE READER,

ESPECIALLY

**The Congregation and Church of Jesus Christ
in *Hartford upon Connecticut.***

THE eternal blessed Lord, whose ways of mercy to his redeemed ones (as his judgements to others) are unsearchable and past finding out, hath through the contrivances of his infinite wisdom, reserved many glorious discoveries of the for ever to be adored depths and riches of his grace in Jesus Christ, to this last age of the world. And as he hath fitted instruments for the holding forth of the mystery of Christ (the hope of glory) in that great plot and work of redemption and application with much evidence and power to the gaining of many souls to himself: So he hath in a special manner caused the truths concerning his visible government of the Saints in this world, in communion and fellowship with himself, and one with another, according to the order of the Gospel, as with more glory to break forth, so with more power to lay hold upon the spirits of many, then in former times: So that not contenting themselves with mixed fellowships, and other pollutions in the things of Christ (the abhorred errors and mistakes of their former ways) and not finding encouragement for what they desired according to God, in the places of their then sojourning: They were provoked to make many inquiries on earth, and send up many cries to him, whom their souls loved in heaven, to know where he fed his flock at noon. The favour and faithfulness of the Lord Jesus (the King and head of his Church) was not wanting to his people in this thing. He answered the desires of many in carrying them into this wilderness, where they acknowledge themselves to have received

warmth and refreshing under his wings, he sent out his light and his truth and led them to his holy mountain, and his tabernacles.

Among others (dear Brethren) we have been sharers in this rich privilege, a large portion hath been carved out unto us, by the hand of our blessed God in the things of his kingdom, and grace: we have for many years lived under his shadow, been fed with the dainties of his house, enjoyed the full improvement of the large abilities of faithful watchmen and overseers for our good, to whom our comforts and welfare in every kind have been precious.

But the only wise and holy God, for our great unworthiness hath lately made a sad breach upon us by the death of our most dear Pastor (the Author of the ensuing Treatise) whereby our glory is much eclipsed, our comforts not a little impaired, and our fears justly, multiplied. The stroke is direful and amazing, when such, a stake is taken out of the hedge, such a pillar from the house, such a Pastor from his flock, in such a time and place as this.

It is not our purpose or is it suitable to our condition and relation, to lay out the breadth of the excellencies wherewith through the abundant grace of the Lord he was enriched and fitted for the Service of his great mame, or if we were willing to improve our selves in that kind, have our pens received an anointing for such an employment; what we express is only to put you and our selves in mind of the invaluable loss we have sustained, that our hearts being deeply and duly affected under that sad afflicting providence, we may look up to the holy one of Israel our Redeemer, who teacheth to profit, that instruction may be sealed upon to us thereby.

He was (as you well know) one of a thousand, whose diligence and unweariedness (besides his other endowments) in the work committed to him was at most beyond compare. He revealed the whole counsel of the Lord unto us, kept nothing back, dividing the Word aright. His care was of strong and weak, sheep and lambs, to give a portion to each in due season, delighting in holy administrations, which by him were held forth in much beauty and glory. In this work his Master found him, and so called him to enter into his glory. Some of you are not

ignorant with what strength of importunity he wajs drawn to this *present service*, and with what fear and care he attended it.

The weight and difficulty of the work was duly apprehended by him, and he looked upon it, as somewhat unsuitable to a Pastor, whose head and heart and hands, were full of the employments of his proper place.

Besides, his spirit mostly delighted, in the search of the mystery of Christ, in the unsearchable riches thereof, and the work and method of the spirit, in the communication of the same unto the soul for its everlasting welfare, some discovery whereof may hereafter be presented to the world, as the Lord gives liberty and opportunity.

Such strength of parts clothed with humility, such clear and high apprehensions of the things of God, with a ready cheerful condescending to the infirmities of the weak (which was his daily study and practice) are not often to be found among the sons of men, nor yet the sons of God in this world.

The present discourse was finished by himself in the time of his life, and sent near two years since to be made public, but the Lord in whose hands all our works and ways are, determined otherwise. That sad providence was entertained by him in reference to the present work, with much contentedness and humble submission to the good pleasure of the most high, and if he might have enjoyed the liberty of his own judgement and desires, no further discoveries should have been made to the world of these his labours, they should have been buried in everlasting silence; but at last he was overborn and condescended to what now is again endeavoured, though before the full transcribing, he was translated from us to be ever with the Lord.

The Reader may well conceive, had the judicious Author lived to peruse the Copy now sent, the work would have been more complete, and perhaps some additions made in some parts thereof. But we have not yet had the happiness to find among his papers what was intended in that kind.

We have little more to say at present, but to let the Reader know, that nothing is added to, or taken from the Author's primitive Copy for the substance of it; and to assure him that his unwillingness to make his thoughts public, did not arise from

any doubts in him concerning the truth of what is held forth in the present disputes, for he was abundantly satisfied therein: *As he believed so he spake*, but other considerations retarded his resolutions to that work.

It hath been rightly observed that disputations in Religion, though they are sometimes necessary, yet they are usually dangerous, by drawing commonly the best spirits into the head from the heart, and, if extraordinary are be not taken, abating pious affections towards God, and love towards men. But you (Brethren) who knew him, are witnesses of the prevailing lively power of the rich grace of God, in the heart and life of this Author in all respects, even unto his very end, the Lord who taught him from his youth, and enabled him then to declare and hold forth his wondrous works, forsook him not when he was grey-headed, but he went on in the strength of the Lord God, *making mention of his righteousness, even of his only.*

There were some workings in his thoughts before the sending away of the first Copy, to have recommended these his labours in an Epistle to this Church, and thereby lest them (to use his own expressions) as his last legacy to us: Though these thoughts of his were not then prosecuted, yet there being necessary occasion upon this great turn of providence to intimate a few words unto the Reader at this time, we thought it not amiss to acquaint you, our beloved Brethren, with those former purposes of our most dear Pastor, whose remembrance we hope will be forever precious with you all, that you may look upon this work (the result of many thoughts and prayers) is the *lost breathings* of his love towards you, for your establishment in these present truths. It shall be our endeavour that in due season you may have other of his labours among you, in your daily view for your further comfort and edification, and so may still hear him speaking to you in this way, whose lively voice you can hear no more. And we shall not cease to look up to the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies, and God of all consolations, for you, and for our selves, that we may be duly sensible of the price that was in our hands, effectually humbled under any misimprovements, and conscientiously prosecute the advantages yet continued, least a worse thing happen to us, our candle-

stick be removed, and we lest wholly desolate, in this time of the Lord's riding circuit over all his Churches, and that hour of temptation which is even now over the face of the whole earth.

Your Brethren in the fellowship of the faith
of the Gospel, and deep fellow-sufferers
with you in this great,
EDWARD HOPKINS.

WILLIAM GOODWIN.

Hartford upon Connecticut, the 28. of Octob. 1647.

**In obitum viri Doctissimi THOMÆ HOOKERI
Pastoris Ecclesiæ Hertfordiensis,
Novangliæ, Collegæ sui.**

*A Star of heaven whose beams were very bright,
Who was a burning, and a shining light,
Did shine in our Horizon fourteen years,
Or thereabout, but now he disappears:
July the seventh six hundred forty seven,
His blessed soul ascended up to heaven.
He was a man exceeding rich in truth;
He stored up rich treasures from his youth.
While he was in the University,
His light did shine, his parts were very high.
When he was fellow of Emmanuel,
Much learning in his solid head did dwell.
His knowledge in Theology Divine,
In Chelmsford Lectures divers years did shine.
Dark Scriptures he most clearly did expound,
And that great mystery of Christ profound.
He had a singular clear insight, in
The souls conversion unto God from sin;
And in what method men come to inherit,
Both Christ and all his fulness by the Spirit.
He made the truth appear by light of reason,
And spake most comfortable Words in season.
To poor distressed sinners and contrite,
And such as to the Promises had right.*

*Which did revive their hearts and make them wonder:
 And in reproof he was a sin of Thunder.
 He spake the Word with such authority,
 That many from themselves to Christ did fly,
 His preaching was full of the holy Ghost,
 Whose presence in him we admired most.*

*He did excel in Mercy, Peace and Love,
 Was Lion-like in courage, yet a Dove.
 He from the largeness of his royal heart,
 His treasures was most ready to impart.
 To many Ministers he was a father;
 Who from his light, much pleasant light did gather.
 The principles he held were clear and strong:
 He was to truth a mighty pillar long.
 I can affirm I know no man more free
 From Errors in his judgement, then was he.
 His holy heart delighted much to act
 The will of God, wherein he was exact,
 No other way could with his Sprit suit;
 His conversation was full of fruit.
 He was abundant in the work of God
 Until death came, and heaven was his abode.
 At his lat clause Christ found him doing well,
 Hit blameless life, but few can parallel.
 The peace he had full thirty years ago
 At death was firm, not touched by the foe.
 Of all his days and times, the last were best:
 The end of such is peace, he is at rest.
 His lips, they were a spring and tree of life,
 Unto his people, family and wife,
 In which much wisdom, health and grace was found,
 Are sealed up, and buried underground.*

*If any to this Platform can reply
 With better reason, let this volume die:*

*But better argument if none can give,
Then Thomas Hooker's Policy shall live.*

SAM. STONE, Teaching Elder
of the same Church at *Hartford* with him.

*Oh my Reverend and dear Brother, M^r Thomas
Hooker, late Pastor of the Church at
Hertford on Conectiquot.*

TO see three things was holy *Austin's* wish,
Rome in her Flower, Christ Jesus in the Flesh,
And *Paul* i'th Pulpit; Lately men might see,
Two first, and more, in *Hooker's* Ministry.

Zion in Beauty, is a fairer sight,
Then *Rome* in Flower, with all her Glory dight:
Yet *Zion's* Beauty did most clearly shine,
In *Hooker's* Rule, and Doctrine; both Divine.

Christ in the Spirit, is more then Christ in Flesh,
Our Souls to quicken, and our States to bless:
Yet Christ in Spirit brake forth mightily,
In Faithful *Hooker's* searching Ministry.

Paul in the Pulpit, *Hooker* could not reach,
Yet did He Christ in Spirit so lively Preach:
That living Hearers thought He did inherit
A double Portion of *Paul's* lively spirit.

Prudent in Rule, in Argument quick, full:
Fervent in Prayer, in Preaching powerful:
That well did learned *Ames* record bear,
The like to Him He never wont to hear.

'Twas of *Genevah's* Worthies said, with wonder,
(Those Worthies Three:) *Farel* was wont to Thunder;
Viret, like Rain, on tender grass to shower,
But *Calvin*, lively Oracles to pour.

All these in *Hooker's* spirit did remain:
 A Son of Thunder, and a shower of Rain,
 A pourer-forth of lively Oracles,
 In saving souls, the sum of miracles.

Now blessed *Hooker*, thou art set on high,
 Above the thankless world, and cloudy sky:
 Do thou of all thy labour reap the Crown,
 Whilst we here reap the seed, which thou hast sown.

J. COTTON.

**In sepulchrum Reverendissimi viri, fratris charis-
 simi M. THO. HOOKERI.**

*America, although she do not boast
 Of all the gold and silver from this Coast,
 Lent to her Sister Europe's need, or pride,
 (For that's repaid her, with much gain beside
 In one rich Pearl, which Heavens did thence afford,
 Aspious Herbert gave his honest Word)
 Ttttbinnts, SHE in the Catalogue may come
 With Europe, Aftica, Asia, for ONE TOMB.*

E. ROGERS.

MY Times (*saith David*) are in thy hand: *Neither* is it *meet* for us *so much* as, to know the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. *This is as conspicuously made good in his appointing the seasons for justifying his own cause, as of any other event whatsoever, wherein, as he hath as great an interest; so, himself being the principal, yea, file AUTHOR of all that is written or spoken for it, assumes the prerogative to judge and determine of the fittest opportunity, for every word, that shall be uttered, much more published in testimony thereof. This I have with silence and submissi-*

on learned (as many other lessons) from his so strong and all wise-disposing Providence towards this treatise; And some other, both passages and treatises that have related to, or been intended for defence and clearing of this Argument. This Treatise was finished and sent over transcribed, under the eye and exact review of the eminently accomplished Author himself, well nigh Two years since; who also then followed it (as I have heard) with many prayers and tears, for a blessing upon the publishing. But it was then buried in the rude waves of the vast Ocean, with many precious Saints in their passage hither. The most of those that were affected to this cause, did then judge, in respect of the Opportunity, and importunity of that season, (that impetuously called for a Model of this way) this to be a loss not recompensable, at any other time. But God (we see, and that by this strange disaster) thought best to reserve it rather, for such a time as this: as wherein, the noise and tumultuous outcries of many, being somewhat stiled, the words of the wise, may be (as Solomon speaks) the better heard in quiet. And the raging violence of that hot season, (which like a fiery Oven, (as the Prophet speaks) devoured all that was cast into it) being a little moderated, and allayed, men may be better disposed to hear and consider Reason, especially coming from this hand, whom all men knew, and had in esteem, as a man of God, of more then

an ordinary spirit. And perhaps some of those Reasonings, which were then, or would still have been deemed as broken and bruised Reeds, in the hands of others, may become in his as rods of Iron, and prevail to Victory: And those Rods, which have been turned to Serpents, become Rods again, now they are taken up by him.

That forementioned destiny, that hath attended this book, hath, at times visited my thoughts with an apprehension of something of Like Omen to the cause it self it pleads for against the Presbyterial Government: That after an overwhelming of it with a flood of obloquies and disadvantages and mis-representations and injurious oppressions, cast out after it, it might (in the time which God alone hath put in his own power) be again emergent; yea and shoot forth out of the same seeds of Truth, which have been scattered and buried under ground, which hath the more rea-

dy entertainment with me, because from our first entrance into this conflict, I made account and looked for it, That this truth and all that should be said for it, was ordained as Christ (of whom every truth is a Ray and beam) to be as a seed of corn, which unless it fall to the ground and die, and this perhaps together with some of the persons that profess it, it brings not forth much fruit. All that is His, is always at first sown in weakness; but afterwards riseth in power: One Age sows and another reaps: And yet in these latter days wherein the light and Sunshine grows hotter and more intense, the same age may perhaps see, and enjoy both the seed-time, and the increase.

However, certain I am of this, which may more visibly be read out of this, and a more then usual conjunction of many other occurrences falling out at this juncture of time, evidently proclaiming by a loud and powerful voice of providence, that God's design and pleasure is (for what ends and issues himself only knows) to renew and hold up this controversy amongst us, as if it were but new begun, notwithstanding all that sluggish backwardness in those that have been called, yea cried out upon, to maintain it; and those slight and despising thoughts in others, as not worth the pains and travail. God not only having stirred up the spirit of this great worthy to undertake the defence thereof (whose humility and modesty to appear in Print in any other subject, considering his abilities in all kinds, both for preaching and disputing

were singular) but ordering of it so, as that it should be accompanied with many other Treatises now published, or to be made public, that have as long since been prepared, but detained, as if to bear it company, but now issuing forth as it were at once. Some of which will provoke and occasion others, or necessitate some of those engaged to make fresh Replies, or some other way to vindicate the truth.

Mr Norton's
Answer to all
the Quæries
of Apollonius
in Latin. Mr Shephard's

and Master Allen's defence of the nine Questions and Positions from New England.

The Reasons and Answers the Dissenting Brethren and rhe Assembly, and the trans-

actions about Accommodation all that were given in in writing.

Mr Cotton's Answer to Mr Basly, &c. The doctrinal part.

Tea, and which is more eminently observable to this purpose in hand, that the Assembly of Divines it sense (Providence so conspiring and contriving it) should now, and not till now (though upon the Order of the Honourable House long since issued forth, a faint attempt towards an entrance thereunto was made of them) should now be set awork and betake themselves a new, to assert and convincingly make forth the Jus Divinum of Church-government, both in the general principles, upon which it is to be made forth, and the particularities thereof: And so not only take a new survey, but go over, upon a new woof, the whole piece and platform they had debated & before presented, but under A THERE MAY BE, and IT IS LAWFUL AND AGREEABLE TO THE WORD, and the like: The Lord, by all these coincident events calling his Saints to a fresh and more serious revisal of these Controversies, as not yet determined, nor fully cleared either to the satisfaction of God or man. And moreover by this last alone, (if there were no other consideration higher and of more weight) putting in a sufficient caveat and demur to the swords plea or entermeddling, as in relation to this quarrel, pendente lite, the suite as yet depending upon an other way of trial.

As touching this Treatise, and the worthy Author of it, I intend not to preface any thing by commendation of either unto the Reader; which were indeed, to lay paint upon burnished marble, or add light unto the Sun. The trust of viewing it at the press being committed to my care, I have, out of the honour I bore to him; and love unto this cause my heart is in, endeavoured to discharge it with my utmost diligence and faithfulness: I have done it all the right I could. And Reader, be assured thou hast it here presented as it was now transcribed and sent over, without Addition or Diminution:

Neither did I entermeddle so far as to look The Quotations in the Authors themselves, whom he confutes; but lest them as I found them to the Copy. Only I believe upon some Conjectures, that the Copy which perished, And was throughout revised, and perhaps added to by the Author, was more perfect then this.

I have no more but to commend it and thee to the blessing of God.

APRIL. 17. 1648.

THO. GOODWIN.

THE CONTENTS.

A Survey of the Summe of Church-Discipline.

PART I.

Ecclesiastical Policy Defined.

CHAP. I.

- E**cclesiastical Policy is a skill of ordering the affairs of Christ's house according to the pattern of his Word. page 1.
- Chap. 2. The constitution of a visible Church in the Causes thereof: The Efficient and Matter. p. 11.
- Chap. 3. Of the invisible Church: *Whether the invisible Church be the principal, prime and only proper subject, to whom all the Seals and Privileges of special note do belong,* p. 35.
- Chap. 4. Of the formal cause of a visible Church, the Church Covenant. p. 41.
- Chap. 5. *Whether Baptism doth give formality or make a member of a visible Church?* p. 55.
- Chap. 6. *Whether profession makes a man a member of a Congregation?* p. 60.
- Chap. 7. *An Answer to Arguments made against the church-Covenant.* p. 68.
- Chap. 8. *Wherein the precedency of a Church, as it is Totum homogeneum, is handled.* p. 89.
- Chap. 9. *of the nature and being of a Presbyterial Church.* p. 94.
- Chap. 10. *Such arguments as M^r Rutherford allegeth*

-
- for the confirmation of a Presbyterian Church answered.* p. 130.
- Chap. 11. *Touching the I. subject of Ecclesiastical power, where the nature of it is discovered, and the arguments brought against it answered.* p. 185.
- Chap. 12. *Touching the Catholic and visible Church, whether to the Ministry and guides of the Catholic visible Church, hath the Lord committed the Keys, as to the first subject. Discussed.* p. 217.
- Chap. 13. *Of the Catholic Church as it is totum representativum, in the Assembling of Pastors, &c. in a general Counsel.* p. 229.
- Chap. 14. *of the Church universal, as it is totum integrale.* p. 243.
- Chap. 15. *An answer to M^r Hudson, concerning the Church Catholic viable, as totum integrale.* p. 250.
- Chap. 16. *Of Church communion as it is a Peculiar Privilege to the members of a Church.* p. 188.

PART. II.

Of the Church considered as it is *corpus Organicum*.

- Chap. 1. *Of the number of officers therein, and the nature thereof.* p. 1.
- Chap. 2. *Wherein the nature of ordination it discussed, and the 17. Chap. of M^r Rutherford is considered, and answered, at touching the power he giveth to a Pastor in and over other Congregations beside his own.* p. 38.
- Chap. 3. *Of an Independent Church, Wherein the state of the question is opened, the distasteful term of Independency cleared, and the right meaning put upon it. M. R. his Argument in the 13. Chap. debated,* p. 78.
-

PART III.

- Chap. 1. *Of the Government of the Church.* p. 1.
- Chap. 2. *Of the dispensation of the Sacraments.* p. 8.
- Chap. 3. *Of Censures.* p. 33.

PART. III.**Concerning Synods.**

- Chap. 1. *Wherein M. R. 6. Argument is debated, taken out of Act. 15. and the nature of that Synod discussed, and how far that or any other Synod can be said to bind by any warrant from the Word.* p. 1.
- Chap. 2. *Where M R. his Arguments touching the superiority of Classes and Synods above particular Congregations are considered and answered: And they are in number 6. were set down in the 15. Chap. of his book.* p. 15.
- Chap. 3. *An appendix to the former Treatise concerning Synods.* p. 45.
-

An Analytical table.

- A Church considered in her
 Constitution
Corpus Homogenium, whose
 Causes
 Efficient
 And
 Material
 Formal
 Qualification which is either in
 Order and Precedency
 Excellency of
 Power
 Priviledges
Organicum where Officers, whose
 Number
 Ruling Only.
 Ruling and teaching
 Pastor,
 Doctor.
 Supporting the
 Estates of the members, as Deacons.
 Wealth, as Widows.
 Institution
 Election.

Ordination.

And

Gubernation

Severed

What the wotch is, which appertains to all.

What the behaviour of all under it

Assembled, in

Admission

What to be done before they come,

What, when they are met, in receiving such who

Are no members,

Come members from other Congregations

Dispensation of

Sacraments

Parties who have right to

give,

receive.

Manner

Common to both, as to be

Public in the Assembly

Accompanied with the Word.

Peculiar to

Baptism

with one element

once administered.

Supper administered.

Frequently

With distinct blessings, as there be distinct

elements.

Censures of offences.

Private

Public, where

Preparation to the sentence which is

Examined,

Cleared.

And

Recorded,

Published.

Execution by

Admonition
Excommunication.

I

A SURVEY of the Sum of Church-Discipline.

CHAP. I. Ecclesiastical Policy Defined.

*Ecclesiastical Policy is a skill of ordering the affairs
of Christ's house, according to the pattern of his word.*

S Kill.] When we speak of spiritual things, we desire to speak in the words which the wisdom of the holy Ghost teacheth, and so we shall compare spiritual words and spiritual things together. And therefore it is, though the Government, whereof we are now to intreat, shareth, with other of the like rank, in the general nature common to them and it, and thence may (as it is) truly be called, an Art or Policy, as civil governments are styled: and there be a like parity and proportion of reason, in regard of the nature of the work: yet we attend the language of the Apostle, who, when he would instruct *Timothy*, touching the subject now to be intreated of, and furnish him with directions fitting and sufficient thereunto he terms it, *knowledge or skill, how to demean himself in the house of God*, 1 Tim. 3:15.

Its the knowledge of the duty of some rule that lieth upon him. Thus knowledge how to convert and carry our selves in Church, work, as the effect, leads us by the hand to look to the cause, whence it comes, namely the rule by the staple-precepts whereof, as by the King's standard, this knowledge hath its being, and is

bounded in its operations, the effect thus is expressed, but the cause is implied.

Ordering.] Its the art of ordering the affairs of the Church, For so the Apostle speaks, *Colos. 2:5. When I behold your faith and order*, as if he would refer the whole work of the Gospel to these two heads, *Doctrine* and *Discipline*. So much of Religion, as concerns the nature and work of Faith inwardly in the soul towards God and man, that is contained in the first branch, *Faith. Order*, which is the second and opposite member, includes the exercise of *Discipline* and censures of the Church, so far, as by rule they are expressed, and concern the rectifying of the carriage of such, who are in confederation each with other.

This word taken in its native and narrow signification, implies *the right posture of things in their proper places and ranks*, when they are marshalled by the rule of *Method*, according to their especial precedencies and dependencies they have, each upon other. And here by a Metonymy of the Adjunct, The managing of all Church-Ordinances, according to all the *forms thereof*, as *Ezekiel* speaks, the outgoings thereof, and incomings thereof, with that piety and spiritual prudence, as is most rotatable to all, that time, place, and persont, and practises, can require, as dispensed by some, received by others, is understood.

So that, when all offices and ordinances are managed in this manner, in a comely demeanour, the Church is then truly visibly Militant, becomes *terrible* like a well ordered army with *banners*. But when you loose the ranks, and rout the company, by disorderly administrations, it is the overthrow of the Army, and so of the Church.

House of Christ.] It is the expression of the Apostle in the place formerly quoted, *1 Tim. 3:15. That then mayest know how to behave thy self in the house of God, which is the Church*

Chap. 43. II.

3

of the living God. God is the father of all the family in heaven and earth. Christ the Head and Redeemer, the holy Ghost the Comforter.

As the Head, so the Church which is his Body, admits a double consideration.

Christ is a Head,

Mystical, by Spiritual influence.

Political, by his especial guidance in the means, and dispensation of his Ordinances.

The Church also is a Body,

Mystical

Political.

The mystical Body it the Church of true Believers, who being effectually called by his word and spirit, by faith yielding to the call, are spiritually united unto Christ, from whom, as from a head, all spiritual life and motion is communicated on his part, and received on theirs. And this takes up the *Invisible Church*, because the union, and so the relation, in the truth of it, is inward, and not to be seen by sense. *Of this* we do not now inquire. It is that we do believe. *The Political body or Church visible* results out of that relation, which is betwixt the professors of the faith, when by voluntary content they yield outward subjection to that government of Christ, which in his word he hath prescribed, and as an external head exerciseth by his word, spirit, and discipline, by his ordinances and officers over them, who have yielded themselves subjects to his Headship and supreme Authority. For Christ having humbled himself to the death, the cursed death upon the cross, God the Father hath given him a name, above every thing that is named. Hath given him all things: Hath committed all power into his hand; and hath delegated unto him, the immediate dispensation of this power. *For the Father judgeth no man*, and by a parity of reason, in a right sense, he calls quickens, rules no man, but hath committed the immediate dispensation of all to the Son: which power he exerciseth invisibly in their hearts by the operations of his spirit: but exerciseth it visibly by his ordinances and officers in his Church, as upon his subjects, who profess allegiance and homage to him. So the Apostle, *Ephes. 4. When he ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men, some to be Pastors, some be Teachers*, all see in his Church, and all for the good of his Church.

Phil. 1:9.

Joh. 13:3.

Mat. 28:18.

Joh. 5:22.

4

And as he hath a golden Scepter for the guidance of his servants, so, as a Judge, he hath an iron rod to break his enemies in pieces like a potters vessel. *Bring hither mine enemies, that will not have me to rule over them, and slay them before my face.*

Hence observe *obiter* and by the Way, that the root of this power lieth first in Christ, as a Head, and is communicated by virtue of that commission received from the Father. *All power in heaven and earth is given to me, therefore Preach and Baptise, Matth. 28:18, 19.*

We now see the proper and adequate subject about which ecclesiastical policy is exercised, to wit,

The affairs of his house,] the things that appertain to the visible Church, his visible Kingdom on earth. And to this place appertain the disputes, touching the difference betwixt; Ecclesiastical and civil Policy, what kind of influence they have each into other, together with the tyrannical usurpation of that man of sin, and the false claim that Antichrist makes to both the swords, with all the pretences he deviseth to serve his own turn, and the false colours he puts upon his proceedings, when he would allay his cruelty, with a far-fetched device, as though he did all *in ordine ad spiritualia*, and by the colour of that order, he might disorder and overturn the whole frame of all Kingdoms and commonwealths, if they will not stoop to his tyranny and usurpation.

All those controversies take here their proper consideration, as in their proper place. But our intendment being to comprehend things in short, we shall wholly leave such tedious disputes, which would trouble our work, and weary the Reader.

Certain it is, Ecclesiastical policy confines it self within the affairs of the Church, as within its proper compass. *My Kingdom, saith our Saviour, is not of this World;* and so the weapons of his Kingdom are spiritual weapons, as in the inference our Saviour fully concludes. *If my Kingdom were of the*

world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But his Kingdom is not of this world, therefore his servants will not fight.

Men sustain a double relation.

As members of the commonwealth they have civil weapons, and in a civil way of righteousness, they may, and should use them.

5

But as members of a Church, their weapons are spiritual, and the work is spiritual, the censures of the Church are spiritual, and reach the souls and consciences of men.

According to the pattern of the Word.] This clause points where the laws of this Kingdom are to be found, and whence to be fetched. As *Moses* saw his pattern in the Mount, according to which he was to mould, all things in the Tabernacle: So we have ours lest upon record in the holy Scriptures, unto which we must not add, and from which we must not take any thing. Christ the King of his Church, and Master of his House, he only in reason, can make laws that are Authentic for the government thereof.

And here we shall take leave to stay a little, and make this ground good before we pass, because we shall have special use of it, as a main pillar to bear up the building, of the following discourse, against the cavils of Papists and Formalists.

We shall first explicate, and then argue.

Church-government then is attended in a double respect,
Either in regard of the

Essentials, or

Circumstantials, of it

Essentials required to the completing of Church government are,

Partly in the persons that dispense.

Partly in the ordinances that are dispensed.

In the persons that dispense, the kinds of officers that are appointed to that work: the nature, bounds, and limits of their offices, all these are essentials.

The ordinances which these are to dispense, as preaching, prayer, seals, Church-censures, &c. all these are to be found in the word, and should be fetched from the word: and now under the Gospel, they are and ought to be the same; in all places,

amongst all people, at all times, in all succeeding generations, until the coming of Christ.

Media cultus sunt immutabilia.

It is not lest in the power or persons, Officers, Churches, nor all states in the world, to add, or diminish, or alter any thing in the least measure. But as God did appoint all in the Old Testament, and those his institutions, did endure their *Ever* (as the Scripture speaks) *i.* until the coming of Christ, when the same power which appointed them, changed them, So in the New Testament where we are to expect no alteration,

6

Christ the Law-giver he only appoints. none but he can, and he hath made known his will, that he will not change them.

The *Circumstantials* of Discipline, as time, place, the carrying on of these dispensations in civil decencies, suitable to the quality of the things, and conditions of the time, as peace and persecution: the general rules of these are in the word delivered: but the particular application admits varieties, mutabilities and alterations, according as necessities or conveniences shall appear by emergent occasions.

That there is an immutable rule, touching the *essentials* of discipline, lest in the word, and thence to be fetched, we are now to prove.

1. Argument.

All parts of God's worship are by God alone appointed. In the word revealed, and thence to be fetched.

This is evident from the nature of worship, which only proceeds from Gods will, and the appointment of it is his peculiar prerogative. For came it from the will of man, it would be will-worship. *Deut.* 12. and last. It's here true, what God doth not command God doth not accept: It is the charge he lays against all superstitious and false devices of men; *They never came into his mind or heart*, and therefore never have his approbation. Who required these things? He only knows what

will best please himself, and his own will can make best choice.

¹ Kings 12:32, 33.
Jeremiah 7:31.

But all Offices and Ordinances of Discipline are parts of God's Worship: being duties required in the second command, and thither are to be referred, by the grant of all.

2.

The essentials stand, either by the necessity of precept, and so immutably required, or else they are lest arbitrary to the will of man to appoint.

But they are not lest arbitrary.

The first part is evident by the fulness of the division.

All things spiritual are either Christian duties, or else are lest to Christian liberty.

The second part is thus proved.

If it be not in man to enable an Officer to his work, or offices or Ordinances to attain their end: Then it is not in his power

6

to appoint Officer or Ordinance in the Church. For such appointment should be cross to wisdom in attempting it, and so frustrate in regard of the end, in not attaining it.

But it is not in man to inable to the work, or to make the Ordinance attain its end; bcause the work is spiritual, and the end supernatural: And herein lies especially the difference betwixt civil and Ecclesiastical power, *Dominium* and royal Sovereignty may be seated in the one, *i.e.* in the Commonwealth; because they can communicate power from themselves to others, and enable others to attain civil ends, and to accomplish civil work, and in that respect they are called, *κτίσι; ἀνθρωπινη*. A human Creation. But in the Church there is only *ministerium* received from Christ alone, and therefore they cannot delegate from themselves, and by their own institution any Officer, but only attend the institution of Christ.

There is no man can have his Curate or Vicar, his Vicarius, because he is bound, in his own particular, to his place of Ministry: he can appoint none because he can give power to none.

3.

That which is a fundantental point of Religion, that hath divine Institution, and so becomes immutable, unless Christ himself repeal it. For principles of that nature must have divine authority to appoint and to remove.

But Church Discipline is a fundamental point of Religion. Heb. 6. *Laying on of hands*, being by a Metonymy of the adjunct put for Ordination, Ordination one particular, put for the whole of Church Discipline.

4.

If God received this as his peculiar to himself under the Law, To appoint Offices Ordinances in his word according to his will, Then it is unlawful now for any man to arrogate it: because his sovereignty is as much now as then, his word as perfect, there is no reason which can cast, the balance another way.

But this he did take at his peculiar in the Old Testament.
2 *Chro.* 29:25.

Hence by the way we may lay in a caveat against significant Ceremonies instituted by man in God's worship, as superstitious,

7

such I mean which are appointed to stir up the dull and dead mind of man to the remembrance of his duty towards God, by some special signification, whereby he might be edified.

1.

Beacule these under this Institution are *media cultus*, and are more efficacious to carry the mind and heart to God, as the Papists require, and such as all Orthodox Divines con-

demn. Nay if it be by teaching and stirring towards these supernatural works, as God's spiritual worship.

It's that which the Lord condemns in Images, *which tell lies*, It's that which the Lord threatens to punish. *Isa. 29:19. That his fear is taught by the precepts of men.*

2.

Because such ceremonies are of the same kind and homogeneous with the significative part of the actions of the Sacrament, and upon the ground may be said to have a real and true efficacy of teaching, which properly is a part of worship: since that part of the Sacrament, which is placed in signification is so. Doth Baptism consecrate the child to God? so doth the cross. Doth Baptism signify the Covenant betwixt Christ and the child? so doth the Cross. For its openly said by the Patrons thereof, *to betoken the engagement* betwixt Christ and the child, that he shall be Christ's servant, and soldier to follow his colours and fight under his banner unto his dying day. And this Image though it hath no tongue to speak or its own, yet it speaks by this instituted signification put upon it and pressed by the power of the Prelates.

3.

Those Ceremonies which are set in the same rank with God's own Ceremonies, in regard of their end and use, As those are truly religious because God is the appointer of them: So these must be superstitious, because man's will is the Institutor of them: the parity, and proportion of reason holds on both sides.

But significant Ceremonies thus instituted, are of the like nature with some of God's own rites. Instance the Phylacteries. *Numb. 15:39*, they were appointed for this end by the Lord, to be remembrancers and admonishers of the Law to those that used them, and the same place these Ceremonies supply, and are ordained for the same purpose,

9

The Circumstantials of Discipline, as Time, Place, outward Decency and Comeliness in the managing of God's Ordinances: these admit of varieties and mutabilities, according to emergent occasions, which alter with the conditions of the Church.

There is a comeliness and conveniency of Time and Places of meeting, and manner in their meeting, when the Churches are under perfection, which will be much altered, when the Churches enjoy peace and prosperity, and have Christian Kings and Queens for their nursing Fathers, and nursing Mothers. Yet in the carrying on of these *Circumstantials* according to the mind of Christ, among many other, these Rules lend a common influence, and are of special consequence and consideration.

1.

Though there be not, nor in truth can be particular precepts expressed in the Word, that may meet with all the special varieties of occurrences in this kind; yet there be general Rules, under the reach whereof, all the particulars will come, and by which they may be regulated, and that without fail. *All must be done comelily and in order*, without rudeness or confusion, *For God is not the God of confusion, as in all the Churches*, 1 Cor. 14:33. *All must be done to edification*, 1 Cor. 14:26. *All to God's glory*, 1 Cor. 10:31.

2.

All these *Circumstantials* of Time, Place and Decency, they are *common* to things *Civil*, as well as *Sacred*, and serve indifferently and equally to further the useful administration of both, and therefore cannot be conceived to be any part of religious worship, nor can be ranked within the compass thereof, by any show of reason, only the ancient maxim here takes place, *The later Art useth the work of the former, Ars posterior unitur prioris opere*; both civil and sacred administrations use these *Circumstantials*, as issuing from precedent Arts, and so put forth their own

action's to the best advantage, for the attaining of their own ends. As each man may meet with instances many, by easy attendance.

There must be a right understanding of the meaning of the words, and so a *Grammatical Analysis* of the phrase, where the promises or commands are expressed, before either our faith can believe the one, or a gracious, humble Heart make choice aright of the other, and obey it. Both *believing* and *obeying* are religi-

10

ous actions, and both suppose the use and work of *Grammar*, and so of *Logic*, about the promises and commands, and yet no man, that hath the exercise of reason about him, will say, that either *Grammar* or *Logic Analysis* are *religious* actions, much less religious worship.

The *will of no man*, neither Magistrate in the Common-wealth, nor Officer or Officers in the Churches, is the *rule* either of commanding or forbidding *things indifferent*. For if their wills were the rule, they could not err in commanding or forbidding: for the rule cannot err. They were not to give an account for those their commands, nor could be punished for any miscarriage in them. Then also, the will of the Inferior were absolutely bound to yield obedience thereunto, and that without either questioning or examining the nature of it. Yea blind obedience would by this means be not only allowed, but of necessity enjoined. Nor could the Inferior sin, in what ever he did in subjecting himself to the directions of the Superior in such indifferent things. All which are contrary to common sense.

4.

The determination of indifferent things, either absolutely to be attended, or absolutely to be laid aside, when there is no preponderates or necessity to cast the balance either way, is *beyond warrant*; because it thwarts the nature of the things, and that merely out of the pleasure of the Imposer, which is not a rule to go by, since God by rule hath lest these either to be done, or not done, as occasions are presented.

Appointment and injunctions of things indifferent, which are either unprofitable, and have no good in their use, or be but so far prejudicial, as that they occasion a stop in a Christian course upon any just ground: Such appointments are to be repealed as unlawful. 1. For if God's own *Ceremonies* were to be removed, *because unprofitable*, then much more ours, *Heb. 7:18*. 2. If we must answer for *idle words*, then for *idle Ceremonies*. 3. Things, indifferent, when they are used, not in subordination to help forward moral duties, their use is unlawful. For herein lieth their, use and good, that they may be in way to lend a lift to a higher end. But when they are unprofitable or prejudicial to the sense before expressed, then they are not in subordi-

II

nation to help forward the moral. *Ergo*, 4. That which crosseth the Place and Office of the Governor, that he must not do or maintain: But to enjoin any thing that is unprofitable, is against his place, for his Office is to *rule for their good*, *Rom. 13:4*. But unprofitable things are not such.

CHAP. II.

The Constitution of a visible Church *in the Causes thereof: The Efficient and Matter.*

This *visible Church*, the subject adequate of our Enquiry, is to be attended in a double regard, either in respect of the Constitution, or Gubernation of it.

The Church in her Constitution is considered two ways, as *Totum*

{ *Essential*,
 { Or
 { *Integrate*.

As *totum Effemiale* or *Hmogeneunt*, look at it as in the first causes, out of which (he exists, and comes to be gathered, and this is called, *Ecclesia prima*.

This Church hath the right of electing and choosing Officers, and when these are set in it, it becomes *totum Organicum*. Ames. *med. l. 1. c. 33. 18.* The Corporation is a true body, when it hath no *Major*, nor other Officers, which happily she yearly chooseth.

We now come to enquire of the *visible Church in her first constitution and gathering*.

And in the handling of this, we shall take into confederation such special Questions, wherein there appears any difference betwixt us, and our Reverend and very learned Brethren, desirous to propound things, wherein difficulties yet appear unto us, hoping some further evidence may be given for the manifestation of the truth, which we only seek, if we know what we seek; and therefore would live and learn; only while we thus believe, we thus speak.

¹²

As Mr R. acknowledgeth *l. 2. p. 10, Ezek. 43:11.*

The causes of a visible Church, which will make most, for the clearing of the subject we have in hand,

are the

Efficient,

As also the

Material,

and

Formal.

Of the Efficient.

Concerning the *Principal cause* and Institutor of a visible Church, there is a common concurrence of all sides, so far as I can read, and therefore I shall ease the Reader of all large discourse in this behalf.

It shall be enough to point out the truth, as it is expressed in Scripture: namely, The institution of the Church issues from the special appointment of *God the Father, through the Lord Jesus Christ*, as the head thereof, *by the holy Ghost*, sent and see on work for that end. So the Apostle speaks most pregnantly and

plainly, *Heb. 3:31*. For this man (meaning *Christ*) was counted worthy of more honour than *Moses*, inasmuch as he that hath builded the house, hath more honour than the house. *Christ* is set over the Church, which is, the house of God, as the Son, *Moses* as a servant. He the master-builder, *Moses* as an Inferior and under-workman. And *vers. 4*. For every house is builded by some man, but he that buildeth all things is God. This ALL is to be referred to the things that went before, to wit, the things of the house.

What ever belongs to the Church hath God in *Christ* the Author of it. And hence in the old Testament it was given in charge to *Moses*, that as he saw all presented before him in the Mount, in a lively manner, so he must be cautelous and contentions to hold himself to that pattern, not to swerve an hairs breadth there-from, or to add any thing of his own deviling, And hence our Saviour claims this as his prerogative royal, *Mat. 16*. Upon tis rock I will build my Church. It is his house, and he knows his own mind, and therefore he only will fashion it there-unto. And from hence it is, that in the time wherein *Ezekiel* would limme out, and that unto the life, the Temple to be erected in the new Testament, he there lays out all the particulars by God's special appointment; The *Outgoings* and *Incomings*, *Forms*, *Fashions*, *Laws* thereof, and the *Ordinances* thereof.

Touching the Inferior helping cause, viz, *The Civil Magistrate*,

13

how far he may be said to have a hand in the erecting of Churches, It is that which hath exercised the heads and pens of the most judicious, and is too large for this place, and our purpose, we willingly pass it by, being not yet persuaded that the chief Magistrate should stand a Neuter, and tolerate all Religions.

Of the Matter.

Proceed we to make enquiry of the *Matter*, and there (though it hath not so much Art in it, yet because it hath more, and indeed more evidence, in regard of all, to whom we address this our enquiry; sith it concerns all, who seek the good of Church-fellowship, as all need it, if they were worthy to share therein. Our first Conclusion is negative.

Conclusion I.

Parish precincts, or the abode and dwelling within the bounds and liberties of such a place, doth not give a man right, or make him matter sit for a visible Congregation.

Reason 1. *No civil rule can properly convey over an Ecclesiastical right.* The rules are *in specie* distinct, and their works and ends also, and therefore cannot be confounded.

Civil power hath a nourishing and preserving faculty of Ecclesiastical Orders; Officers, and their several operations. Kings shall be nurfing Fathers, &c. But in their *proper constitutions*, they cannot meet. *Imperare* and *prædicare* are not compatible, hath been a ruled case, admitting no contradiction in an ordinary way: one is complete, and hath all the causes without the other, and therefore one doth not receive his constitution in whole or in part from the other. Civil power may compel Ecclesiastical persons to do, what they ought in their offices, but doth not confer their Offices upon them. The Kingdom of Christ is spiritual, and not of this world. That Proposition then is beyond control. The second is open to experience.

But the taking up an abode or dwelling in such a place or precincts is by the rule of policy and civility. A man hath it by inheritance from his parents, or purchaseth it by his money, or receives it by gift or exchange. *Ergo*, This can give him no Ecclesiastical right to Church-fellowship.

Reas. 2. That right which any man hath in Church-fellowship, Excommunication out of a Church can, nay doth take away. For Excommunication is, according to the intent of the Word, The

14

cutting off from all Church-communion: and what ever right before he had in his admission, is now disannulled by his Excommunication. *Let him be as an Heathen*, Matt. 18.

But Excommunication doth not, nor can take away a man's civil right to the house and land, the civil privileges he doth possess, or remove him from the right of his habitation, civil office or authority, he is inverted in.

Ergo, *That is no Ecclesiastical right.*

Reas. 3. If Parish Precincts should have right to Church-fellowship, then Atheists, Papists, Turks and profane ones, who are enemies to the truth and Church, yea men of strange Nations and

languages, who neither know, nor be able to do the duties of Church-members, should be fit matter for a Church, because they have abode in such places: yea those should have right to whom Christ hath denied right, *Revel.* 21:27.

Much more might here be added, but that the tenet is so gross, that I suppose any, seriously judicious, will see the error of it.

We shall come nearer home then, and our

2d Conclusion is,

Visible Saints only are fit Matter appointed by God to make up a visible Church of Christ.

The terms shall be, 1. *Opened.* 2. *The Question stated,* 3. *The Conclusion proved.*

Saints as they are taken in this controversy, and in the current expressions of Scripture, which look this way, and speak to this subject (*Saints at Corinth, Saints at Philippi, at Rome, in Cæsar's house*) were members of the Churches, comprehending the Infants of confederate believers under their Parents' Covenant, according to 1 *Cor.* 1:14. and such constant expressions of Saintship do intimate, that either *they were such*, or at least conceived to be *such in view and in appearance.* I say in *appearance*: for when the Scripture so terms and styles men, we must know that *Saints come* under a double apprehension. *Some are such* according to *Charity*; *Some according to truth.* *Saints* according to *charity* are such, who in their practice and profession (if we look at them in their course, according to what we see by experience, or receive by report and testimony from others, or lastly, look we at their expressions) *they favour so much, as though they had been with Jesus.* From all which, as far as *rational charity* directed by rule from the *Word*, a man cannot but conclude, That *there*

15

may be some seeds of some spiritual work of God in the soul. These we call *visible Saints* (leaving *secret things to God*) in our view, and according to the reach of rational charity, which can go no further, then to hopeful fruits. We say and *hope*, and so are *bound to conceive they are Saints*: though such be the secret conveyances, and hidden passages of hypocrisy, that they may be gilt, not gold, seemingly such only, not savingly, known to God and their own hearts, not known to others. So *Judas, Demas,*

Simon Magus, Ananias, &c. And therefore our Saviour proceeds with such, not *as God* who knows the heart, but in a *Church-way*, as those who judge the tree by the fruit. *De occultis non judicial Ecclesia*, That which the Church doth not see, it cannot censure. *Some men's sins go before, & some come after*, 1 Tim. 5:24.

The *STATE* then of the *QUESTION* is this. Persons, though they be hypocrites inwardly, yet if their conversations and expressions be such, so blameless and inoffensive, that according to *reason* directed by the *Word*, we cannot conclude, but in *charity* there may be, and is some special spiritual good in them; *These are fit matter of a visible Church* appointed and allowed by Christ: and that for these Reasons.

Reason I.

From *the nature of a visible Church* rightly contented,

It is truly styled, and truly judged by Scripture light to be the *visible body of Christ*, over whom he is a *Head*, by *Political Government* and guidance, which he lends thereunto, 1 Cor. 12:12. And that it is a visible politic body, appears quite through the whole Chapter, but especially v. 27, 28. Because in *that Church God sets Orders and Officers, Some Apostles, Teachers, Helpers, Governments*. The like to this, *Ephes.* 4:12, 13. Where these *Officers* are, it is supposed there be *visible concurrences of many Saints* consenting, both to *choose* such, and *subject* unto such being chosen. Whence the Argument proceeds,

The members of Christ's body are fit alone to be members of a true Church, because that is the body of Christ, *ex concessis*.

But only visible Saints, who according to the rules of reasonable charity may be conceived to have some special good in them, are only members of Christ's body.

For to have a member, which nor doth, nor ever did receive any power or virtual impression of any operation in the kind of

it from the head, is not only against reason, but against that *reference and correspondence, which the members have to the head*. Now visible Saints only, according to former explication, can be said by the rules of reasonable charity, to have some

virtual influence of some spiritual operation from Christ as a Head.

Therefore *Such only are members of a Church.*

Reason. 2.

Those are fit to be members of Christ's Church, that are subjects in Christ's Kingdom.

The *Church is the visible kingdom* in which Christ reigns, by the scepter of his word and ordinances, and the execution of discipline. *To whomsoever* he is a *Head*, over them he *will be King*. He is *our King*; He is *our Lawgiver*. The *Church is his House*, and he is *Master and Ruler* of it. They who carry themselves, in *professed rebellion*, they are *Traitors*, not subjects. The members of the *Body* are under the *motion* and guidance of the *Head*. *Wolves and Cancers* are contrary to it. Members are in *subordination*, *Wolves and Cancers* are in *opposition* to the Head.

But visible Saints (as formerly described) *are only subjects in this kingdom.*

Christ is the *King of Saints* (not of drunkards and whoremongers, Athiests, &c.) they alone proclaim subjection in their practice: They only attend to know and do the will and command of God, or in case they swerve aside, and be carried unawares and unwittingly into conspiracy, yet are they willing to see, ready to yield, and come in again. But such, who cry, *hail Master, kiss Christ and betray him*: that in words profess the truth, but in *deeds deny* it, and are to *every good work reprobate, Sons of Belial*, who can bear no yoke, *but break all cords*, and *cast all commands behind their backs*, these are *convicted rebels*, but are not *subjects* of Christ's kingdom.

As a *General* of the field, he will overpower these, and *destroy* them *as his enemies*, but not *govern* them as *leige people*, and therefore he professeth to such as sent after him, that they would not have him to rule over them, that they were his enemies. *Bring hither mine enemies, and stay them before mine eyes.*

Reason. 3.

If those whose visible Saints, be not those that are only fit to be

17

members, then those who are not visible Saints, that is such who in the judgement of rational charity, are graceless persons for the present, and give up themselves to the twinge or their distempers, they may be members.

The consequence is beyond dispute, far contradicents divide the breadth of being.

*If visible Saints only be not;
Then non-visible may be.*

But this draws many absurdities with it: For then such who to the judgement of charity are *members of the devil*, may be conceived *members of Christ*. Those, who to the eye of reason, are *servants to sin*, may be *servants of righteousness* and of Christ: and those, who are under the *kingdom of darkness* by the rule of reasonable charity, by *the same rule*, at *the same time*, they may be judged under the *kingdom of light*. Those may be counted fit to *share in the covenant* and the privileges thereof, as Sacraments and Church society, who *are strangers from the covenant, and without God in the World*. All which are absurdities, that common sense will not admit.

If it be replied, that all these may be verified of cunning hypocrites not yet discovered.

I answer: The Argument leaves no place for the appearance of such an objection: for the terms in open expression are pointed directly against such, that in the judgement of charity were not Saints: and then the difference is exceeding wide. *Those that are darkness*, and the *servants of sin inwardly*, may to the *view of charity* seem to be *light*, and servants of Christ *outwardly*, and yet in *charity* be led by light. But that he who in his outward practice should appear to be a slave to sin, and subject to the kingdom of darkness, should yet be conceived to be a Servant to God and subject to his kingdom: Surely *charity* must not only pluck one her eyes to see by anothers spectacles, but loose eyes and spectacles and all, and cease to be *charily*; yea be turned into *folly* and madness.

Reason 4.

Those who by God are excluded from his covenant and meddling with that, as unfit, they are not fit to have communion

with the *Church*: For to *that* all the *holy things of God* do in an especial manner *appertain*.

It's *God's house*, and there all Gods treasury lies: *The keys of*

18

the kingdome are given to them: To them all *the oracles*, ordinances and privileges do belong, &c.

But those who hate to be reformed, and cast away his commands, God professeth) they have nothing to do to take his covenant into their mouth, Psal. 50:16, 17.

To this Mr R. l. i. p. 116. *answ. 2. things.*

1. "*That the wicked are forbidden in case, so long as they hate to be reformed, but not simply: but this hinders not, but that they may be ordinary hearers, and so members of a visible Church.*

To which I shall crave leave to *reply* several things.

1. The answer, in the 1. branch of it yields the cause, and grants all that was desired or intended, namely; *while they hate to be reformed* they have no title, which is all that is driven for: for if they come to see their sin, and to reform their evil ways, and give in evidence of their *godly sorrow* and *repentance*, then they are no longer haters of reformation, but true reformers and replicants in the judgement of charity, and then *visible Saints*, and fit to be made materials in the temple, when the rubbish and unhewnness of their distempers are taken away. But while they remain haters, they have no title, *ex concessis*. Therefore *that while*, they are not visible Saints; which is all the argument required, and is now yielded.

Whereas its added, "*that it hence follows not, that they should not be ordinary hearers of the Word.*

Answer: It is true, it was never intended nor inferred; therefore the argument is untouched. For we say, as you, it doth not follow, nor need be required, for help either of the reason or the question. For let it be supposed, they may so do, nay for ought we know, they should so do, and we yet have what we would.

It is yet further added, "*That being ordinary hearers and so members of a Church:* Such an expression I will not now inquire how near the cause it comes, I cannot but yet conceive, it is far from the truth.

1. If ordinary *hearing* make a man a member, then *excommunicate* persons, who are cut off from membership, are members, for they may ordinarily hear; *ex concessis*.

2. Then *Turks, Papists*, all sorts of contemners of the truth, *Indians, Infidels*, shall be members, for they may

19

be, and in many places are ordinary hearers.

3. Then in public cities, where several congregations meet, at several houses, *one* and the *same* man may be an ordinary hearer in them all, and so a man may be a member of three or four congregations.

The second thing Mr R. answers, is, "*That this argument nothing concludes against them, because such adulterers, and slanderers, which are forbid to take God's law into their mouths, are to be cast out: but the question is, if they be not cast out, whether the Church for that be no true Church.*"

To which I say, The first part yields the cause again, or if they should be cast out, there is no reason they should be received or taken in, nor have they right thereunto, nor be they fit matter for that work.

The second clause doth wholly miss the mark again. For the question is, touching the *constitution* of a Church, or what matter it should be made, It is not touching *separation* from a Church; for the error is in taking in such as be not fit. So that the argument is yet unanswered, yea by these answers, further confirmed.

So much may serve for the confirmation of the conclusion for the present, more shall be added in an opportune place.

But before we leave the conclusion, we shall make some *inferences* from it, which may further help us in our proceedings and purpose in hand. Something hence may be collected for the discovery of sundry *mistakes* in the *Separatists*, wherein they go *aside* from the truth. Something observed, for *to clear their way*, wherein they go along with it.

Inference. 1.

If visible Saints be fit matter for to make a Church, Then Church fellowship presupposeth them to be such, but properly doth not make them such.

Inference. 2.

And hence, such mistakes in judgement or practice that do not hinder men from being visible Saints, do not unfit men from being members of a Church.

Inference. 3.

Hence, the holding of the visible Churches in England to be true Churches (suppose it were an error, which it is not) doth not hinder men from being fit matter for a visible Church.

20

Inference. 4.

Hence lastly, the not being in a Church, doth not binder private Christian communion.

The two last inferences, are the *Tenets* of those of the Separation, not only extreamly rigid, but very unreasonable. For if they be fit matter for public commuion, they are much more fit for private: But men are or should be visible Christians before they come into Church fellowship, and are thereby fitted for it, and therefore much more fitted for private communion.

Something also may be observed to *dear the way* where they go along with the truth. Namely,

Hence, They who hold visible Saints in the judgement of charity to be fit Matter, though they be not inwardly sanctified, cannot in reason be thought to maintain only such, that be effectually called, justified, and sanctified, to be the only matter of a rightly-constituted Church.

And therefore I could have heartily wished, that M^r Reut. would not have disputed against that which they freely and professedly grant, to wit, "That hypocrites, because their falseness is coloured and covered over with appearances of piety, and so cannot be censured (as not discovered) may be received into Church communion, without the breach of any rule, because the Church therein goeth according to the rule of charity, being bound to hope all to be good (upon grounds which shall be afterwards laid) which reason enlightened by rule cannot prove to be had. This is yielded and therefore need not to have been proved.

But the pinch of the difference lieth in this.

Whether such as walk in a way of profanness, or remain pertinaciously obstinate in some wickedness, though otherwise professing and practising the things of the Gospel, have any allowance from Christ, or may be counted *fit matter*, according to the terms of the Gospel, to *constitute a Church*.

This is that which *is controverted*, and should have been evicted by argument. There is no colour for such a consequence: If *hypocrites* be received into the Church, according to the rule of rational charity and allowance from God, Then may *profane* persons also.

It is true, The expressions of *some* of our *brethren*, as those also of the *Separation*, are somewhat narrow at the first sight,

21

and seem to require exactness in the highest strain: yet were they but candidly interpreted by the received principles, according to which they are known to proceed, they would carry a fair construction, to any brotherly conceiving: of this I speak, because I do observe, and I cannot but profess I do observe it with trouble and grief, that Mr *R.* a man of such learning and sharpness of judgement, and in other things, and at other times of pious moderation, mould yet so commonly, and frequently, and if I mistake not, without occasion offered many times, load the expressions of those, against whom he writes, with such a sense, that their own grounds, to his own knowledge, do directly oppose, and their own words, by an easy interpretation, may admit a contrary meaning.

I shall contain my self therefore upon so just an occasion, to endeavour to clear this coast, that if it be the will of God, I may for ever silence *misconceivings*, or *misinterpretations* in this case: and therefore I shall labour,

1. To *lay out the meaning* of those of the *Separation*, out of their *own words*.
2. Punctually to express, *how far rational charity*, rectified by the word, will *go*, in giving *allowance* to the *visibility of Saints*.
3. I hope I shall make it appear, that *we* require no *more Saintship* to make men *fit matter for a visible Church*, then Mr *R.* his *own grounds* will give us leave.

I.

1. The *minds* and *meaning* of those *our brethren of the Separation* is written into great characters, that he who runs may read it, if he will, nor can he readily mistake, unless he will. Mr *Ainsworth* against Mr *Bernard*, p. 174. *Saints by calling are the only matter of a visible Church: yet, withal we hold, that many are called but few chosen.* Hence he cannot hold, that they are true believers, nor truly converted, or truly sanctified, for then they should have been all chosen and elected, which in open words he doth peremptorily deny. The *sense* then *can be no other* but this. That *Saints by external and outward calling* are fit matter of a Church, for had they been *inwardly called* they had also been *elected*.

This being the meaning of their Tenet, if Mr *R.* be pleased to look into his first book, *ch. 9. p. 100.* he will find that he there gives his reader to understand, that he and Mr *Ainsworth* are of

22

the same mind. For he says it as a firm corner-stone, the first conclusion that he propounds, for the true understanding of the true constitution of a Church. "*Saints by external calling are the true members of a visible Church.* These are *his* words, and Mr *Ainsworth's* are the *very same*, only he says the *true matter*, Mr *Ainsw.* says the *only matter*; wherein there can be no odds in regard of the substance of the thing intended; for *true matter* is that which now is inquired after, and if all other matter beside them is false, then they are the *only matter*, in truth, of the Church.

Hear we Mr *Robinson*, A man pious and prudent, express his own opinion, in his own words, who thus, *Justific. of Separ. pag. 112.* propounds the question, and the state of it betwixt him and Mr *Bernard*. "*Before I come to the point in controversy, I will lay down two cautions (saith he) for the preventing of error in the simple, and of cavilling, in such as desire to contend. 1. It must be considered, that here the question is, about the visible or external Church, which is by men discernable, and not of that Church, which is internal and invisible, which only the Lord knoweth, we speak, here of visible and external holiness only, whereof men may judge, and not of that which is within and hid from men's eyes, for we doubt not, but*

the purest Church upon earth may consist of good and bad in God's eye, of such that are truly sanctified and faithful, and of such, who have only for a time, put on the outside and vizard of sanctity, which the Lord will in due time pluck off, though in the mean time, man's dim sight cannot pierce through it.

So that we have expressions full. The Church consists of some who are faithful and sincere hearted: Some counterfeit and false hearted. Some really good, some really bad, only those who appear so bad and vile should not be accepted. And doth not Mr R. say the same?

In the same place Mr Robins. adds. *"I desire it may be remembered, that the question between Mr Bern, and me, is, about the true and natural members, whereof the Church is orderly gathered and planted, and not about the decayed and degenerate estate of the Church and members. For we know that natural children may become rebellious, the faithful city a harlot, the silver dross, and the wine corrupt with water,*

23

"the whole vine is planted, whose plants were all natural, may degenerate into the plants of a strange vine.

The expressions are so plain that there needs no explication, nor can a man, that will deal candidly, mistake, unless one should set himself on purpose to pervert a writer's meaning.

He that holds such may be received into the Church, who may degenerate from subjection and obedience, to rebellion, from faithfulness to falseness, from a profession pure and sincere in appearance and approbation of men, to a rotten, profane and unsavoury carriage: He must needs hold, that false, counterfeit, and hollow hearted hypocrites may be members of a Congregation.

When therefore we meet with such phrases printed and recorded, *Only the Saints, faithful, called, and sanctified are to be members of a Congregation,* He must needs be exceeding weak, or exceeding wilful, that will not easily and readily give such a construction as this, *Namely, Persons visibly, externally such to the judgement of Charity, not always really and internally such by the powerful impression of God's grace.* Let therefore such mistakes be for ever silenced in the minds

and mouths of such as are wise hearted and moderate. We have *thus cleared the expressions of our Brethren of the Separation.*

WE shall now punctually express our own apprehensions, and with as much openness and simplicity as our shallowness can attain unto, punctulis ergo agamus.

1. It is *not the eminency of holiness*, that we look at in the entertainment of members, but *the uprightness of heart*: It's not the *strength and growth of grace*, but the *truth* that we attend. *Rom. 14:1. Heb. 5:13.*

2. *This truth* we know is, and may be accompanied with many *failings and infirmities*, which more or less may break out and appear to the apprehension of the judicious.

3. *The judgement of this truth of grace*, (is clouded and covered with failings,) is *not certain and infallible*, either to *Church or Christian*. *Philip* was deceived by *Simon Magus*, *Paul* misjudged of *Demas*, all the *Disciples* conceived as well of *Judas*, as of themselves, though he was a *Thief* (and bare the bag) nay though a *Devil* in God's righteous sentence which he passed upon him. *Job 6.* & last, The Sum is, *The heart of man is*

24

deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it? The Lord himself takes that as his place, *I the Lord try the heart, and search the reins.* *Jer. 17:3.*

4. *This judgement*, then, of *others sincerity, est tantum opinio, non scientia*, and therefore the most discerning may be deceived therein, they may proceed according to the *rules of Charity*, and yet not pass a sentence according to the *reality of truth.*

5. *Charity* is not *ensorius yet judicious* (she wants neither eyes nor watchfulness) *hopes all, and believes all things*, that are *hopeful or believable*, *1 Cor. 13:6.* ever yields and inclines to *the better part*, unless *evidence* come to the *contrary*, when she hath not ground sufficient to prove an evil. She conceives her self bound to cast the balance the other way, and to believe there *is some good* (*take it in subjecto capaci whereof now we speak*) As in the eye, there must be either sight or blindness: So in the soul there must be either *some measure of grace*, or else *habitual wickedness*, or that we call a *graceless condition.*

If *Love* directed by the *rules of reason and religion* hath not *sufficient evidence* of the one, she *believes the other*: and in probabilities, where the weight of the arguments falls, love falls that way, and she hath warrant so to do, and by that means her persuasion comes to be poised.

6. The *grounds of probabilities* by which *charity* is poised according to rule, are either taken from the *practice* or from the *knowledge* of the party.

The way and ground of our proceeding according to both may be expressed in this *proportion*.

He that professing the faith, lives not in the neglect of any known duty, or in the commission of any known evil, and hath such a measure of knowledge as may in reason let in Christ into the soul, and carry the soul to him: These be grounds of probabilities, by which charity poised according to rule may and ought to conceive, there be some beginnings of spiritual good, I shall explicate both in a word.

1. *He must not live in a sin*] It's *not having* but *living in sin*: not to be surprised and taken aside with a distemper, but to trade in it, is that we here attend. And it must be *known sin*] also, Such, to wit, whereof a man is *informed* and convinced

25

by the power of the word, and the evidence of reason, otherwise sincerity may standwith a continued course in an unknown corruption, as the fathers did continue in poligamy. But he that commits some gross evil, and expressith no repentance for it, or after conviction persists in the practice of known wickedness: rational charity accounts such *workers of iniquity*, evil doers, such as be *of the World*, and lie *in wickedness*, and by *this the children of the Devil, are known from the children of God, He that hates his Brother, and doth unrighteousness*. In a word, such, if they were under the discipline of Christ, would be counted pertinacious and should be call out of a Congregation, therefore should not be received into it.

1 John 3:8. & 5:19. & 3:10. 2 Tim. 3:5.

2. *There must be so much knowledge at may let in Christ into the soul, and lead the soul to him]* for there is a breadth of ignorance in some, like a dungeon so dark and loathsome, that reasonable charity will readily conclude *there can be no grace: Isa. 27:11. It is a people that have no understanding: therefore he that made them will not save them: without understanding the mind is not good.*

And in this sense and according to this explication, we do directly deny that proportion of Mr. *Rutt. lib. 2. pag. 259.*

“This Proportion is false (saith he) Those only we are to admit to the visible Church, whom we conceive to be Saints, and are in the judgement of charity persuaded they are such.

This proposition, in the meaning formerly mentioned, we say, is true; and we require no more Saintship to make persons members of a visible Church, then Mr *R. his own grounds* will give us leave and allowance to do.

It is one principle maintained by M. *R. that profession and baptism do constitute a member of a visible Church. lib. 2. p. 25.*

Whence I Reason.

What is required of a man of years to fit him in the judgement of the Church for Baptism, that and so much is required to make him a member.

But visible holiness (ut supra) is required to fit a man of years to be baptized.

The consequence admits no denial, because to be baptized

26

and to be admitted a member, infer each other.

The *assumption* is proved by the constant and received practice of *John the Baptist, Mat. 3:5, 5.*

When *Jerusalem* and *Judæa*, Scribes, people and Soldiers came to be baptised, *they confessed their sins, vers. 6.* It was *such a confession*, as amounted to *repentance*, for the Baptist so interprets it: *Bring forth fruits worthy repentance and amendment of life, verse. 7, 8.* and their own words evidence as much, *Luke 3:5, 6. What shall we do?* The advice of the Apostle requires as much. *Repent*

and be baptized, Acts. 2:38. and the works of this Repentance, and the aim of Baptism imports as much. For the remission of sin doth call for such competent knowledge of Christ, and of remission of sins in him, that they may make way for the sight of the need of a Saviour, and also of going to him.

Again 2. when M. R. thus writes, *lib. 2. p. 99, "The ignorants and simple ones among the Papists, have not rejected the Gospel obstinately in respect it was never revealed to them, yet the simple ignorance of points principally fundamental makes them a non-Church.*

Whence I Reason thus.

That Ignorance which maketh persons to be no Church, that will hinder a person from being a true member of a Church.

But there is a simple ignorance of points fundamental that makes people a non-Church, by his own confession.

Therefore, by his grant, there is an Ignorance, that will keep a man from being a member of a true Church, and there is no point more fundamental, then Christ to be the foundation stone, laid by God, whereon our faith and we must be built.

A Third ground we take from Mr. R. is p. 196. l. 2. where he hath these words. *Faith to speak properly doth give us right to the seals, and to speak accurately, a visible profession of the Faith doth not give a man right to the seals, but only it doth notify and declare to the Church that the man hath right to the seals, because he believes, and that the Church may lawfully give them to him.*

Whence I Reason.

27

That profession which must notify to the Church, that a person is a true believer, that must notify THAT HE HATH TRUE GRACE.

But the profession that M. R. requires, must notify to the Church that a person is a true believer.

And if it notify thus true faith, it must present such grounds of probability to charity rectified by the rules of reason and religion that they will cast and carry the scales of a man's judge-

mem that way, and the evidences of grace to a charitable and readable consideration will overweigh all the evidences that come in competition or companion wuh them, otherwise they cannot notify a party to be a believer, but sway judicious charity to the contrary side.

3. Conclusion,

Churches constituted of fit matter may be corrupted by the breaking forth of scandals, and pestered with scandalous, persons which may so far be tolerated, until in a judicial way, the censures of the Church be exercised upon them, according to the rule of Christ, and they thereby reformed or else removed and cut off from the body.

There be *three branches* in the conclusion, which hold forth evidence of truth at the first sight, and therefore we shall not stay long upon proof.

That *Churches rightly conflicted may soon be corrupted,*] the Scriptures are pregnant which testify it, and experience is so plain, it is past gainsaying, at *Corinth, Galatia, Sardis, Laodicea, &c.* And above all, this is to be seen in the *Church of the Jews*, the canker of falseness in doctrine, and corruption in manners, had so far eaten into the very *essence* of the Church *Hos. 2:2, 9.* that the Lord threatened her to give her a *bill of divorce*, and to cast her out of his sight as not his wife.

2. Yet in such declining times, when diseases grow deadly, there is allowed, and a *toleration of necessary must be so far granted, until* Juridicè by a *judicial proceeding the evil be examined, the parties convinced, centres applied for Reformation*] For the Ordinances of Christ and rules of the Gospel serve, not only for the *constitution* of a Church, but for the *preservation* of it. That is the main scope of our Saviour his government: first, to gain a sinner it it may be, *for he came not to condemn*

the World (men can condemn themselves fast enough) *but to save it*, and the censures of the Church are sufficient to recover the sick and diseased, as well as to nourish the sound.

And hence out Saviour requires time of trial, if they may be healed, and until that be over, they must be tolerated. Cutting

off is only used when things come to extremity. *If he will not hear, let him be as an Heathen*, &c. Therefore had he heard and submitted to the censure of the Church, and been gained thereby to repentance and reformation, there had needed no further proceeding.

But in case they prove incorrigible and irrecoverable by the physic used, they are then to be abandoned. *Purge out the old leaven*. 1 Cor. 5. cast out such an one.

And hence it is evident, the corrupting of a Church constituted gives no allowance to bring in corrupt members to the contention of a Church, but the contrary, if a pertinacious member should be removed by the rule of the Gospel, then such a one should not be admitted.

These Conclusions premised; the arguments of Mr. Rutt, against the visibility of Saints to be right matter of a Church, will admit an easy answer.

“1. *Argument, is taken from the manner of receiving members in the Apostles Church, where there was nothing but a professed willingness to receive the Gospel, howbeit they received it not from the heart.*

Ans. There is not only a professed willingness to receive the Gospel, but a practical reformation, that in the judgement of charity gives ground of hope there is something real, before the contrary appear. And therefore Peter who received Simon Magus, upon his approbation of the truth and outward conformity thereunto in the course of his life, when his practise proclaimed the contrary, the Apostle rejected him, as one in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity, who had no share in Christ, and therefore certainly would not suffer him to share in the privileges of communion, to persisting without repentance.

2. *Argument.* “*If the visible Church be a draw-net, where are fish and filth: an house, where are vessels of silver and gold, and baser vessels of brass and wood: Then in*

“*a Church rightly constituted, there may be believers and hypocrites.*

Answ. The argument is wholly yielded, and the cause not touched, much less concluded, as may appear by the state of the question taken in a right meaning.

The like may be said to the third argument, touching the man that came to the wedding, not having on a wedding garment, for it seems by the text, he carried it so cunningly in appearance, that only the *Master of the feast* perceived it, others did not discover it, before his coming in.

The *three last arguments* having one and the same bottom to bear them up, admit one and the same answer.

“If the Churches of Israel, Judah, Galatia, Sardis, Laodicea, were Churches truly constituted, and yet in them were many wicked, prophane, unclean; then visible Saints are not only fit matter allowed by Christ to make up a visible Church.

But they were Churches truly constituted, and yet had clean and unclean mixed among them. Therefore,

Answ. *The consequence is denied,* and the cause is given in the *third conclusion,* because such are only by rule to be tolerated for a time, until the censures be tried upon them. But if then they prove incorrigible they are to be removed and excommunicated. So that the edge of the argument may be turned most truly against the cause it would prove.

If in all these Churches the unclean and profane were to be excommunicated: Then such as they, were not to be admitted. But by God’s command they were to be excommunicated.

Therefore such as they were not to be admitted. Its certain *Christ* allows the Tolention of some in the Church for a time, whom he doth not allow to be taken in as fit matter to make up a Church.

The *rest of his Arguments* propounded in his second book. p. 251. labour of the *same mistake,* and the *like answer* relieves the reader without the least trouble. For let him carry the conclusions formerly propounded along with him in his consideration, and refresh his memory with the *caveat* and *caution* that was put in by Mr *Robinson,* when I cleared the opinion of those our *Brethren* of the *Separation;* That our Question is not, whether members now received and visible Christians in the eye of charity may so degenerate and break out into scandalous cour-

30

ses and apostles, that they may be scandalous, and that grossly. But the Question is, whether in the orderly gathering of the Church, such according to the way and warrant of Christ can, and ought to be received.

And therefore to dispute, The Church now gathered hath wicked and ungodly in it, and such as be not visible Saints: Therefore it may be gathered of such, is so broad un consequence, and makes the Church door so wide, that M^r R. his own principles will proclaim it to be the broad way that leads cross to the tenure of the Gospel. For I would make a conclusion, that shall carry a parity of reason with M^r R. his Inference, which cannot Hand with his own grounds.

1. Such as were in the Church of *Israel*, in *Deut.* 29.
2. Such as the *false Apostles, Nicolaitans, followers of Balaam* and *Jezebel's doctrine*, who were members of the Churches of *Asia*.
3. Such who were *Schismatics, Railers, Partakers of the tables of devils*, 1 *Cor.* 6:10. with *chap.* 10:20.

Such may be received members, according to the order of Christ.

But such as these are openly scandalous.

Therefore such as be openly scandalous may be received into the visible Church.

And this doth not only see open the Church door, but pulls down the Church-side, and its that which M. R. himself gainsays, and that professedly and *in terminis*. lib. 2. p. 251. Let him therefore but defend his own opinion, and the like defence will maintain our cause from the force of these arguments.

His fourth argument taken from the 3000. in *Act.* 2. is answered before.

His fifth, is p. 253. Thus:

“If we are to bear one another's burthen, and so fulfil the law of Christ, and if grace may be beside many sins, yea if Simon Magus his profession was esteemed sufficient for to give him baptism: Then it is not required, that all the members of the visible Church, be visible Saints, as before explicated.

Answ. The *conference* fails, for all this may be, namely, there may be many weaknesses, and yet visible expressions of repentance to reasonable charity, and it is certain there were such

in *Simon Magus*, For what *Peter* exacted at the hands of those, *Act. 2:28. Repent and be baptized*; he would and did follow

31

the rule of Christ which he had received and delivered to others, and therefore required as much at his hands.

The examples of *Asa* and *Solomon*, the one breaking out into open persecution, the other into toleration of gross Idolatry, are here very impertinent, and prejudicial to M. R. his own defence and confession: For if such as these may be received; then openly scandalous may be entertained, which he denies, *ubi supra*.

His sixth argument is,

“If only visible Saints should be received, then we are not only to try our selves, but to examine and judge carefully one another, and that every one must labour to be satisfied in conscience anent the regeneration one of another.

Answ. M. R. maintains we should be satisfied in the judgement of charity that persons are such: for he holds, “1. that we must beware they be not scandalous. 2. They must be such as may be baptized by the order of Christ; and these must repent and profess their faith in the Lord Jesus. 3. They must be such as by their profession must notify they be true believers, ut supra. lib. 2. pag. 196. Therefore, They must try and examine them that they be such, and these grounds give warrant thereunto.

Argument seventh.

“If many be brought and called to the visible Church on purpose both in God’s revealed intention in his word to convert them; and in the Churches, that they my be converted: Then the Church doth not consist of those who are professed converts.

Answ. The proposition fails. Those who are converts in the judgement of charity, may yet in God’s intention be brought into the Church, that they may be truly converted.

But if he mean, that the Church doth of purpose receive them into the Church to be converted, then it is cross to his own Tenet, and a person may be received to the seals of the Covenant, who doth not notify that he hath faith, nay the Church may receive them to the seals, whom she knows have no right to the

seals; for she knows they are not invisible members, which in M. R. his judgement only gives them right.

Having thus cleared our way, We shall take leave in few words, to take into further consideration and examination *some expressions* of M. R. in *chap. 9. p. 99. l. 1.* where near the end he hath these words.

32

I. *Assertion.* of M. R.

1. “*We say that there is nothing more required, as touching the essential property and nature of being members of a Church as visible, but that they profess before men the faith; desire the Seals of the Covenant, and crave fellowship with the visible Church.*”

2. *Assertion.* of M. R.

2. “*Preaching the Gospel is called a note of a true Church.*”

We shall take these into *consideration*, in the order that they are propounded; and

To the 1. *Assertion.*

Those that have a shew of godlines and deny the power thereof:

The Apostle’s charge is, that, *we should turn away from such.* *i.e.* Renounce all voluntary, and unnecessary familiarity with such: For the condition, unto which we are called by God, may happily necessitate a man or woman to hold constant and intimate familiarity with such, in point of conscience, by virtue of their calling. A godly and pious *wife* must do the *duties* of a *wife* in the most inward and intimate manner of familiarity with her *husband*, though *profane* and *wicked*: *The bond of relation necessitates thereunto.* But were it that she was free, she were bound in conscience neither to match, nor to maintain any special familiarity: because she is now at her choice, and her *society* is *voluntary*, and thence to be avoided. Whence the argument groweth on.

Argument. 1.

If I must not enter into a voluntary or unnecessary familiarity with such, who have a shew of godliness and deny the power thereof: Then am I bound much more, not to enter into a special and spiritual society and fellowship of the faith.

Because this is much more, then ordinary and civil familiarity, and there is much more danger.

But this first part is the charge of the Apostle, therefore the second is undeniable.

Argument. 2.

Again the Apostles advice is plain and peremptory. *If a Brother be an Idolater, or covetous, &c. with such a one eat not,* 1 Cor. 5:11.

33

If he be unfit for civil, much more for spiritual society and communion, and therefore both are to be avoided, as far as in my power, and according to my part, I shall be able. For it sometimes so falls out, that I cannot remove a wicked person from my spiritual communion, because it is not in my power to cast him out, whom a congregation will keep in, yet I must by vertue of the Apostles charge, ever oppose, and protect against the admission of such, and the other of the brethren should according to God, keep him out of communion, as unfit wholly for spiritual fellowship, who is not fit for civil familiarity.

Argument. 3.

They who should be cast out of a congregation by the rule of Christ, those are unfit to be received in.

But men may have all those three properties (suppose a common and ordinary drunkard) i.e. Profess the faith, is eager after the seals, most desirous of society with the Church; as counting it a disparagement not to be born, if not admitted to the Sacrament; and yet such a one should be cast out; therefore also kept out.

To the 2. Assertion of Mr R. Which is,

“That it is vain to say the preaching of the Word is no essential mark of the true Church, is made good by distinguishing three things. 1. Single and occasional preaching, 2. Settled preaching or the settling of the candlestick, 3. The preached word with the seals. Whence the answer in the sum issues thus. It is not the single, but the settled preaching of the word, established and remaining in the Church, which is a mark of it.

Ans. How ever the tenet seems to be vain, yet it will not vanish to easily.

By *settled preaching of the word*] Is meant a constant opening and applying the Scriptures in one place to one people.

By *mark*] Is meant, not any *commen accident* or *adjunct* which doth indifferently agree to other things, as well as the Church, for then it could never be said to *notify the Church*, in that it may notify many things besides. But it must be a *differencing* and *distinguishing note*, and therefore it must be *proprium quarto modo*, as they call it, and *inseparable*.

These things confessed, which received rules of reason evince; I thence dispute.

34

That which is separable from the Church, and common to something beside that, cannot be a note of the Church.

This is evident from the right explication of the terms.

But settled preaching of the word, and constant opening and applying the Scripture to one people, in one place, is separable from the Church.

As suppose a Minister should preach many years, to a company of Infidels in one place. Nay suppose a lecturer speak constantly to a company of people, which resort from several Churches, unto the same Auditory.

Here is *settled preaching*, and yet here is *no Church*; and therefore *this is a separable adjunct, and no note*.

If it be *replied*, that you must consider settled preaching, as established and remaining *in the Church*.

To that the *answer* is; This plea is yet too narrow, to cover the nakedness and weakness of this assertion. For upon this grant, the dispute must follow one of these two ways. The *settled preaching of the word taken with the Church*, is a mark of the *Church*: and this is irrational, to make the *Church a mark of it self*. Or the meaning must be this; Settled preaching, *whilst it remains in the Church*, is a *note of the Church*: but this nothing helps, for the inference remains as feeble as before. For if such a settled preaching be but a common adjunct or separable accident, in the nature of it, let it be where it will be, it will never, nay it can never be a *proper note* to that thing, is *Sensitiva facultas in homine*, is *not a mark of a man*, though *in a man*.

Chap. III.
Of the Invisible Church.

Whether the Invisible Church be the principal, prime, and only proper subject, to whom all the Seals, and privileges of special note do belong?

MAster R. lib. 2. p. 242. *distinct.* 3. Is pleased to suggest a serious advertisement unto us, which being well considered, many of our erroneous mistakes, (as he says,) may seasonably be recovered, and we brought thereby to a right understanding of the things of Christ. Among other of my Brethren, I do profess my scope in this

inquiry, to be only this, to see the way of truth, and to walk therein; and therefore shall gladly lend a willing ear to his direction and advise, that our errors being thereby discovered, we may see and shun them for time to come.

That particular truth, which will be like a sea-mark to teach us how to steer our course and compass aright, is by him thus expressed.

“*THE INVISIBLE CHURCH CATHOLIC is the principal, prime, and native subject of all the privileges of Christians, &c. and the CHURCH VISIBLE, as she is such, it no ways such a subject: the non-consideration whereof we take to be the ground of many errors in our reverend Brethren in this matter.*”

This is his seasonable warning, unto which I readily attend: and because I would not *creare molestias, & serere lites sine causâ*: I shall crave leave to make inquiry into two things, wherein my stick is most, that being convinced and satisfied in them, I shall readily sit down in silence, and submit to the evidence of better reason, then mine own.

1. *Whether the invisible Church be the principal, prime, and only subject of the Seals of the Covenant?*
2. *Whether the holding of this conclusion will necessarily make us forsake our doctrine touching that power we give to the people, and our assertions of Independency and congregational Churches.*

36

I choose to restrain the proposition to that particular mentioned, because there appears the greatest difficulty, to my dim and shallow apprehension. As also because the *through explication* of this which is most familiar, will of necessity force and draw in with it a real consideration of the rest.

That I may be plain and punctual in our proceeding, I shall take leave, and I hope without offence, to let down the contrary.

The Invisible Catholic Church, is not the prime and only subject of the Seals, and therefore not of all privileges of Christians, by any argument that Mr R. hath here alleged for proof or confirmation hereof.

When I say, the *prime and only subject*, I understand the meaning of $\text{Καθ' \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron}$, according to Mr R. mind and exposition, *quod convenit Καθ' \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron} convenit αντισημιτικῶς και καθολικῶς*

Though his exposition of the rule is neither safe nor sound, yet it is a safe ground in dispute to take principles in that sense and meaning, which is confessed by him, with whom we dispute.

To come to the matter in hand, I shall endeavour two things.

1. I will consider *what he* hath said *for confirmation*, and shew what reason yet I have, to persuade me not to yield to his proof.
2. I shall propound *such arguments* as I have, which wholly hinder for the while, from entertaining this opinion.

To the 1.

The 1. *argument* which Mr R. alleadgeth to prove that the visible Church, as such, hath not right to the seals, but the invisible, is this,

“Those only who are within the covenant have right to the seals. And this is Peter’s argument, Act. 2:38. to prove the baptizing of infants.

Lib. 2. p. 348.

But only the invisible Church hath tight to the covenant,

I Answer.

People may be said to be *within the covenant* two ways.

Either,

Externally in the judgement of *charity*.

Internally and spiritually, according to the judgement of *verity* and truth.

Externally those are within the covenant, who expressing

37

their repentance, with their profession of the truth, engage themselves to walk in the ways of God, and in the truth of his worship, though they have not for the present that sound work of Faith in their hearts, and may be shall never have it wrought by God's spirit in them.

And of persons thus in covenant the Apostle speaks in *Act. 2.* and that to Mr R. his apprehensions elsewhere, as it will appear easily to any, who will weigh the context.

That being in Covenant is here understood, which was visible and intelligible to the Apostle, according to the grounds of judicious charity, otherwise the Apostles council had not been of warrant to carry them to the practice of Baptism, if he had given them direction upon a misconceived ground: nor had they reason to have followed his direction. For the reply had been easy.

Invisible Christians have only right to Seals: But whether we be such, we for the present do not know and its certain, you can neither see, nor know, for truth of grace is invisible to man.

But the being externally in Covenant, is thus intelligible by the Apostle, therefore this is here attended.

The first is proved, and *the second is as plain*.

The *Invisible Works of grace*, which do *make* the Church *Invisible*, are to be believed, cannot be seen, nor come within any certainty of human knowledge, And this is not only conferred in the general, but acknowledged also to be meant in this place. 3000. were added to the Church, who could not all be approved, to the consciences one of another to be true converts.

Clear then it is from *the scope* of the place, the ground of the Apostles counsel, and the nature of the promise here expressed,

1. That being *externally in covenant* is here attended. 2. That such a being in covenant doth *give right* unto the *Seales*, else *the frame of the Apostles reason and counsel* had fallen to the ground.

The proposition thus cleared, the Minor is to be denied as false: and the contrary tenet, *That only the Invisible Church hath right to the Seals*, will draw unavoidable difficulties with it, and give such advantages to the *Adversaries of God's grace*, and the dispensation of *his Ordinances*, that they will hardly be regained.

38

We are compassed about by Mr R. in this ch. l. 2. p. 247. with a crowd of accusations, to hold *one* of the grossest of the *Arminian, Popish, Socinian Doctrines*; and upon all occasions we hear *Ad nauseam usg*[[?????]], of our sodering with the errors of *Soci-nus, Catch. Cracov. Nicholaides. &c.* How justly, we have in part touched, and shall add something in the season thereof.

But I would be loath any of our tenets maintained professedly by us (not fathered upon us injuriously,) should lay such a corner-stone to build up the wretched doctrine of the *Anabaptists*, as this of his doth.

For let Mr R. help us to answer the *Anabaptists* upon his grounds, thus reasoning.

Those, that I cannot know have any right to the Seals, to them I cannot give the seals of the Covenant *in faith* as the Apostle calls *faith*.

But I cannot know that Infants are of the Invisible Church, which only gives them right to the seals.

Therefore I cannot of Faith give the seals to them.

If M R. will grant them the *proposition, that they may give the seals unto such, whom they cannot know have any right to them*, They will go away *triumphing*, as well they may. For they have such a hold, that all the battery of the strongest Arguments is not able to drive them from.

If M. R. help the *minor* with a distinction which he useth, l. 2. sect. 5. the variation. p. 185.

“Faith in Christ truly givth right unto the seals of the covenant, and in God's intention and decree, called voluntas beneplaciti, they belong only unto the invisible Church: But the

orderly way of the Churches giving the Seals is, because such a society is a professing or visible Church, and the orderly giving of the Seals according to God's approving will, called voluntas signi & revelata, belong to the visible Church.

This salve is too narrow for the fore. For the distinction will either make God order *the giving of the Seals*, to such who have *no right*, and so impeach his *wisdom*, to appoint the giving of the seals to such, to whom he gives no right to receive them: or else it doth *implicate* plainly, and the several expressions contain apparent contradictions. For this *voluntas signi*, which allows the Church visible to give the Seals, it either gives *another right besides* that which the invisible members have, or else it

39

gives no right. If it give *another right*, then the invisible Church hath *not only right*, which is here affirmed. If it give *no right* then the *visible Church* doth give the Seals *orderly to such who have no right to them*, as far as we can see: which was before denied in the grant of the proposition.

Quid plura? I must confess such is my feebleness, that I cannot see how this can be avoided. For ask the question, How come hypocritical professors to have right unto the Seals? As members of the visible Church they can have no right: they are the very words of M. R. p. 249. "*The visible Church as the visible Church, hath no right unto the Seals, therefore they as visible have no right.* And *Invisible* members they are not, and therefore can have no right that way. Either then the Church must give them *no seals*; or else give them seals, when *she cannot know* they have any right, for indeed they have none, since of the invisible Church they are not, whereby they may claim a right: and being only of the visible Church, she can give no right: and so she administers seals orderly to such who have no right any ways to them: and this an *order without order*.

For these reasons now expressed it is, that I cannot see weight enough in M. R. his arguments to persuade my judgement to be satisfied in the proof.

Having then gained so much, that in a true sense it is a truth, that the visible Church is within the Covenant, and hath right

to the Seals, according to the warrant which God hath lest in his word: Let us in short inquire

Whether there is not allowance given us in the word, to give to the Church visible titles of special note; and this also is an especial privilege, which is by M. R. denied to the visible Church.

1. It's called *the flock, or Church, redeemed by the blood of God.*

2. It's styled the *body of Christ.*

All this in a savoury sense (according to *former* and familiar-*explication*, speaking still according to the *Judgement of charity*, which is the only line, according unto which our conceivings are to be led) is safe and true.

The first is expressed, and to my apprehension, with as much evidence, as can be desired. *Act. 20:28. Attend to the whole*

40

flock, παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood.

The *Church* here is according to us, *Congregational*: to Mr *R.* it's *Presbyterial*. But take it either way, it must needs be *visible*.

That over whom Elders and Officer, are see to attend and fed, by doctrine and discipline, this must needs be a visible Church. For unless they did see them and know them, how could they execute censures upon them?

But THESE are called the Church redeemed with the blond of God, then which style, none can be more glorious.

It any man say that the elect and invisible are *only* there *intended* by that name. I *answer*. That conceit is cross to the very grain or the words, and the scope of the text, For they must attend *παντὶ* *to the whole flock*. The charge puts no difference betwixt *person* and *person*, nor must their care be different. Nay upon this ground the Elders should not know what their care was, nor upon whom they should bestow it. For they might reply, Lord, we cannot search into thy secrets, to perceive who are *elect and invisible Saints*; we cannot discern them, and therefore we cannot tell *how* to *feed* them: whereas by the current and common sense of the Scriptures, taking *redeemed* and *sanctified* as *visibly*, though not *really* such, the stream of

the text runs pleasantly, without the least appearance of a doubt.

It's called the *Body of Christ*, 1 Cor. 12:27, 28.

These evidences of truth once taken in and entertained, A way is readily made to the right understanding of *all Mr R. arguments* so far as they seem to cross any opinion and practice of ours.

And Secondly, Those heavy Inditements which are laid and pleaded against us, will be wiped away with a wet finger, For nenee it follows,

A Church may be visibly in Covenant, which hath not an infallible assistance, but may err in Fundamentals: which may fall away, and not endure as the days of heaven. And that is his *first* and *fifth Argument*.

A Church may be visibly redeemed by the blood of God, and be called the body of Christ be styled by the name of Sons and daughters of God, and yet not be really and inwardly

41

such: which is his second Argument.

The third is answered before.

A Church may be visibly redeemed and taught outwardly by the spirit of Christ, as he is *Political Head* of his Church, which was never taught inwardly, nor effectually brought home to Christ, which is *his last Argument*.

Hence again all those heavy indictments which are charged upon us, are wiped away, nay they melt away of themselves before the explication of this holy truth of God, as snow before the heat of the Sun.

They who hold a *visible Church* to be *externally within the Covenant*, and the redeemed ones of God, his sons and daughters, to be his body and house, of *which Christ is the Head and husband in A VISIBLE MANNER*: They cannot be said, by the inference of any right reason, to maintain: *That Christ died for all such in God's intention*, Or, *That all such are chosen to glory*: Or, *That God intendeth to save all such*; There is not a colour of any *consequence* from such a ground, to make good such a conclusion.

We have done with the *first* thing, which we propounded, namely, I have shewed the Reason, why M. R. his proof doth not evince the cause for which it is brought.

To the Second

I shall now propound such arguments which yet hinder me wholly, from yielding to the opinion, and that I may narrowly express my naked thoughts, *The Conclusion* I am to prove, *I thus propound.*

The Invisible Church Catholic is not the prime and principal subject of the Seals of the Covenant; they do not **Καθ' ἅντι**, belong to it, which is according to M. R. his mind, *they do not belong to all them and only to them,* **[[?????]]ἀντιστραμμενως καὶ καθολικῶς.**

Argument. 1.

1. *If those who were graceless, and had no interest in Christ, had yet acomntand from Godto receive the Seals had Warrant from his word to require them: Then they had a right from God (i.e. an outward or visible right, in soro Ecclesia, for of that we (peak) to partake of them. This admits no denial. For there can be no better right, then God's command to enjoin, and his word to warrant us to challenge any privilege.*

42

But such who were graceless and without any interest in Christ, and so none of his Invisible members, *have God's command to enjoin, and his word to warrant them to receive the Seals:* as *Ishmael, Esau, and all the males* were enjoined to be circumcised. *All the families* or the Jews were commanded to eat the *Passover*, many whereof without all question, were not Invisible and believing members of Christ.

Argument. 2.

2. *If many believers, who were sincerely such, had yet no warrant or allowance, because of that, to partake of the Seals of the Covenant, Then the Seals do not of right belong to all invisible members as the prime and principal subject thereof.*

The nature of the terms evidence the truth of the *proposition*. For *warrant* and *right* carry a parity of reason with them.

The *Assumption* is made good by instance thus.

Job and his *godly friends* were Invisible members of Christ, yet being strangers from *Israel*, they are expressly forbidden to *eat of the Passover*. Exo. 12:48.

Argument. 3.

3. *If the Invisible Church be the prime subject, to whom the Seals do appertain, then they belong immediatly to them, and to all others by their means, and this the rule of κᾰθ' ᾰυτὸ, infers undeniably. Therefore in an orderly way, they must first be dispensed to them, and from them communicated to others. As heat is first in fire, and from fire communicated to other things,*

But this M. R. elsewhere overborn, as it seems with the beauty of the truth, doth plainly deny. p. 182. "The orderly giving of the Seals belongeth to the visible Church, and by this device the visible Church must have them firstly, and the invisible from her.

Which is professedly cross to the rule formerly mentioned, as all men grant.

Argument. 4.

4. *Rom. 11:17. The true olive is there the Church of the Jews, the fatness thereof, is all such privileges as appertain thereunto. The way and means how the Gentiles come to partake thereof, is by their ingrafting into the Church visible.*

43

And this is the received interpretation of the most judicious *Beza, Pareus, Willet, &c.* and the *context* will constrain as much if it should be denied.

Whence I thus reason,

The Olive is the prime subject of that fatness that issues from it, and appertains to it.

But the visible Church is the Olive: the Seals (as other privileges) are part of that fatness, which appertains thereunto.

Therefore the visible Church is the prime subject of them.

Before I leave this place, I shall command to *M. R.* his review, and the consideration of the judicious reader, what is writ by himself. *Lib. 2. p. 260. If any after they be received, shall be*

found not to be added of God, because they be not regenerated, yet we are not to cast any out for non-regeneration, even known.

If you be bound to keep such in a complete Church state, I suppose you will not deny them the seals, and then they shall partake, and you shall give the seals to such, whom you know have no right to them, because they are known not to be of the invisible Church: because they are known to be non-regenerate persons.

We have now finished the main Query, and given in out Reasons, why we cannot yield to M. Rutters. his advertisement.

We shall add one word touching the other particular propounded to debate, which was this.

Whether the holding of this conclusion will necessarily make us forsake our doctrine of Independency and popular government, so far as we give power to people to act in Church affairs.

For Answer I yet conceive.

The holding of the former error will neither help us out of an error, if we be in it, nor yet help Mr R. to confute that opinion, or to bring us out of it. For the holding of one error will not help a person to see, much less recover him out of another. But this appears to us, by that which I have answered, to be an error. Therefore, this were enough for the while, to cause me to wave the inference.

But that which carries greatest weight with me, is,

That conclusion which overturns Mr R. his main principles touching the government of a visible Church: That will rather confirm our proceedings, then weaken them.

But this conclusion now in debate doth so: as may thus appear.

44

That which puts all offices and the exercise of them; and the seals and the dispensation of them into the hands of believers: That overthrows the pillar, principles of Mr R. concerning the government of the visible Church.

But this opinion, that makes the invisible Church the prime, principall subject of all Christian privileges, and so of all offices, officers, and the dispensation, (for these are such) doth put all offices and officers, the seals and dispensations of them into their hands.

This part can be only questioned, and it is thus confirmed.

Because this conclusion or opinion puts the formalis ratio of all these offices and ordinances into the hands of invisible believers: and that also is evident, Because it makes it agree to them, [[?????]] ἄντιστραμμενως καὶ καθολικῶς.

If Mr R. rid his hands of this argument with any reality of truth, he must shew some *essential cause* of offices and officers, of the right of seals and the dispensations thereof, *besides the invisible Church*; and that his conclusion and the interpretation which be hath settled, will not suffer.

I will only suggest this to him, to occasion him to clear this coast to purpose.

Those terms or things, which contain all the essential causes of each other, beside them there can be no formal, or essential cause added. For then all the essentials should not be there.

But these which agree [[?????]] Ἄντιστραμμενως καὶ Καθολικῶς, these contain

the essentials each of other. For this is the nature of those things which ate convertible or reciprocal, according to all the rules of right reason, unless there be a new logic made, which yet never saw light. *Homo est animal rationale.* A man is a living creature indued with a reasonable soul: and every living creature indued with a reasonable soul, is a man. An entire man consists of a soul and body so organized, and whatever consists of such parts, is an entire man. The one of these take up as much as the other: and all the essential causes of the one, are comprehended in the other: otherwise they had not been of equal breadth or capacity, which a reciprocation requires.

Of this kind are the Catholic invisible Church, and all Chri-

45

stian privileges, they agree thus reciprocally.

Whatever hath there, is the invisible Catholic Church: and the invisible Catholic Church hath all these. And therefore

All the essentials of these privileges are therein included. And therefore beside or without this, none can be added upon Mr R. grounds.

Chap. IV.
Of the Formal cause of a visible Church, the Church
Covenant.

WE have done with the *Material* cause of a visible Church: and we have seen that such as be *visible Saints* make up that. We are now come to consider of the *Formal* cause, *that* which *makes* the Church to be that which *it* and gives the *specific nature* (as we use to speak) thereunto.

For take *all* the *faithful* whether they be seemingly or sincerely such, *scattered up and down* the face of the whole earth, these are but like scattered stones in the street, or timber felled in the woods, as yet there is neither *wall* made up, nor frame erected.

They who be *sincere* are truly said to be the *mystical* body of Christ, built upon him by a saving faith, and so enjoy *union* to, and *communion* with the *head*: But they cannot (to common sense) be thought to make up a *visible communion* when they are, not only *severed* one from another, but it may so fall out, as in times of persecution, they may be wholly *unknown* each to the other.

This Invisible communion by faith makes up the *Church militant* taken *mystically*, and it is but *one* in all the world: But the *Church* we are to attend, must be *visible*: *so many as may come* meet together in one place, *who as they have the right to all ordinances, so they may enjoy the use of them in Christ his order: and so they must be, and accordingly are styled many.* The Churches of *Judæa*, of *Gatata*. &c.

That then which gives the *formality* of these Churches we

46

are now to inquire: and the conclusion we maintain this,

Mutual covenanting and confæderating of the Saints in the fellowship of the faith according to the order of the Gospel, it that which gives constitution and being to a visible Church.

We shall consider

1. *What this confæderating is.*
2. *How it is expressed.*
3. *The Reasons of the conclusion.*

I.

This confœderating and covenanting implies two things.

1. The *Act* that is performed betwixt some men for the while, and so passeth away in the expression.
2. The *State* arising from the *Act* of obligation, which is nothing else but that *relation* of these persons thus obliged *one to another*.

The *Sum* in short is this. By *mutual engagement* each to the other, such persons stand bound in such a *state and condition* to Answer the terms of it, and *to walk in such ways, as may attain the end thereof*.

And the right conceiving of the *nature* of the thing, I mean, the *incorporating of men together*, will constrain the judgement to yield this.

For consider these severals.

Consideration I.

It's free for any man to offer to join with another who is fit for fellowship, or to refuse. It's as free for another to reject or receive such who offer, and therefore that they do join, it is by their own free consent and mutual engagement on both sides; which being past, that mutual relation of engagement, is as it were the sement, which soders the whole together: or like the mortising or brazing of the building, which gives fashion and firmness to the whole.

Whence it is evident, First, that it is not every relation, but such an engagement, which issues from free consent, that makes the covenant.

Secondly, This engagement gives each power over another, and maintains and holds up communion each with other, which cannot but be attended, according to the terms of the agreement.

47

And lastly it being of *persons*, who were *wholly free*, each from the other. There *can no necessary tie* of mutual accord and fellowship come, but *by free engagement, free* (I say) in regard of any *human contraint*.

Consideration. 2.

This covenant being taken up in a *Church way* and for *spiritual* ends, therefore in reason should be of *such*, who are *fitted* thereunto, namely, *visible Saints*: there is *great cause*, why such, who thus are to engage themselves, and enter upon such a society, *should be careful and watchful to search sedulously, and labour to be acquainted with each others fitness and sufficiency in judgement, and spiritual discerning to such a service*: and because the work also is of so great a weight: It in reason calls for serious *humiliation* and *seeking unto God*, for to go along with them, and to vouchsafe his blessing and presence unto them, when they enter upon the same.

And hence it is the manner of our Churches, that there is both more *through* observation thereof attended by such touching the their estate and condition, and seeking of God by such by solemn fasting and prayer, when such a work is *first* entered upon, then is attended in *taking* in, or receiving of all the members that desire to join themselves to the fellowhip of the Church *afterwards*.

2. How the Covenant may be expressed.

This Covenant is dispensed or afted after a double manner.

Either

Explicitly,

or

Implicitly.

An *Explicit* Covenant is, when there is an *open expression* and *profession* of this engagement in the face of the Assembly, which persons by mutual consent undertake in the ways of Christ.

An *Implicit* Covenant is, when in their practice they *do that*, whereby they *make* themselves *engaged* to walk in such a society, according to such rules of government, which are exercised amongst them, and so submit themselves thereunto: but do *not* make any *verbal profession* thereof.

Thus the people in the *parishes* in England, when there is a *Minister* put upon them by the *Patron* or *Bishop*, they *constantly* hold them to the *fellowship* of the people in such a place, *attend* all the *ordinances* there used, and the *dispensations* of the

48

Minister so imposed upon them, *submit* thereunto, perform all *services* that any give countenance or incouragement to the person in this work of his Ministry. By *such actions*, and a *fixed* attendance upon *all such services* and duties, they declare that by their *practices*, which others do hold forth by public *profession*.

This Mr R. cannot be ignorant of, *a our opinion* and *professed* apprehension: and I would entreat the *Reader* to observe once for all: that if he meet with such accusations, that we nullify all Churches beside our own: that upon our grounds received there must be no Churches in the world, but in *N. England*, or some few set up lately in old: that we are rigid *Separatist*, &c. Such bitter clamours, a wise meek spirit passeth by them, as an unworthy and ungrounded aspersion: but the wise-hearted and contentious *Reader*, will reserve an ear for the innocent. *Audi alteram partem*.

Quest. If it be here inquired: *How far the covenant is of necessity required?*

Ans. According to foregoing expressions, the *answer* may be cast into these *conclusions* following.

1. An *Implicit* Covenant preserves the true *nature* of the true Church, because it carries the *formalis ratio* of a confederation in it, by which a *Church* is *constituted*. For *Implicit* and *Explicit* are but *adjuncts*, and these *separable* from the *essence*. And therefore *the essence and being of the covenant may consist with either*.
2. In *some cases* an *Implicit* covenant may be fully *sufficient*. As, suppose a whole congregation should consist of such, who were children to the parents now deceased, who were confederate: Their *children* were true members according to the rules of the Gospel, by the profession of their fathers' covenant, though they should not make any *personal* and *vocal* expression of their engagement, as the fathers did.
3. It's most according to the *completeness of the rule*, and for the better being of the Church, *that there be an explicit covenant*. For

1. Thereby the *judgement* of the members comes to be informed and convinced of their *duty* more fully.
-

49

2. They are thereby *kept* from cavilling and starting aside, from the *tenure* and *terms* of the covenant, which they have professed and acknowledged, before the Lord and so many witnesses.
3. Thereby their hearts stand under a *stronger tie*, and are *more* quickened and *provoked to do that*, which they have before God and the congregation, *engaged* themselves to do.

Hence also that *question* receives its explication and answer namely.

Q. *How far this covenant requires cohabitation?*

Ans. And here several *cases*, which carry much variety with them, do of necessity call for *various considerations*, discovered by following *directions*.

I.

Such cohabitation is required, which is *necessary for the dispensation of God's ordinances*, the administration of Church-censures, for otherwise, the *end of the covenant* would be made frustrate, and the benefit of the whole prejudiced. And hence there must needs be *such a cohabitation* of officers and a convenient company of members, *that they comely and conveniently meet together to the exercise of all God's Ordinances*, Acts. 14:27.

2.

Cohabitation in the *same strictness* is *not* required, nor can be attended by *all* in the same manner: but if the *special calling* in some, or the *public* behalf of the Church in others, do call for *some exceptions*, without the *prejudice* of the exercise of *public ordinances* (ut suprâ) such *exceptionom* may, nay in truth, should *be granted*. For the *policy* of the Church and *other rules*, as they are not in *nature*, so they should not in their *use* be in *opposition*, but in *subordination*, each to other.

Instance. *Merchants* whose employments are in far countries, and as the 107. *Psal.* *Occupy their business in the great Ocean:* their business and employments lie there, and their absence

usually is for many *months*, sometime for *some years*: they may be allowed to attend their course. (But *others should not*, nay others *cannot*, be *so dispensed with*) and yet these are laid to *cohabit*; because *the place of their abode is there in the issue*.

50

Hence upon the same ground the Church may send out *some*, either to begin plantations, in case the body require it, or to help on some others who want able guides to succour them in their beginnings, before they can attain a Church state. And it sufficeth they have such under their care, and in their power, to recall them, or take an account of them, as they see fit.

Solomon sent ships to *Ophir*, which returned not by the space of some *years*, All states may be compelled to send some men to *Sea* for *traffic*; sometimes by way of just war, and yet no *prejudice* done to any rule of thrift, or *Church-order* in that case.

3. *The reasons of the Covenant.*

I.

The first is taken from that *resemblance* which this policy hath with *all other bodies politic*.

Every spiritual or Ecclesiastical corporation receives its being from a spiritual combination.

But the visible Churches of Christ, are Ecclesiastical or spiritual corporations, Therefore.

The first part of the Argument, hath reason and common sense to put it beyond gainsaying. Each whole or entire *body*, is made up of his members, *as*, by mutual reference and dependence *they are joined* each to the other. Thus *Corporations* in towns and cities, as they have their *charter* granted from the *King* or *State*, which gives them warrant and allowance to unite themselves to carry on such works, for such ends, with such advantages: so their mutual *engagements* each to other, to attend such *terms*, to walk in such *orders*, which shall be suitable to such a condition, gives *being* to such a *body*.

It's that *cement* which soders them all, that *soul* as it were, that acts all the parts and particular persons so interested in such away, for there is no man contained to enter into such a condition, unless he wills and he that will enter, must also willingly

bind and engage himself to each member of that society to promote the good of the whole of else a member actually he is not.

The *polished* and *hewn stones* prepared with great comeliness and conveniency, gives yet *no being* to a *house* unless they be *conjoined* and *compact* together, and thence the whole frame comes to be constituted and made up.

It is so with every particular Church tightly gathered. It is

51

a *City*, Heb. 12:22. a *house* 1 Tim. 3:15. *the body of Christ*. Eph. 4:13,16. 1 Cor. 12:12, 27, 28. And all these places are spoken of particular visible Churches. For *where Pastors* and *Teachers* are set, and exercise their work; *where* members are *knit and compact*, and effectually edify one another, there must be a *particular Church*, not the *Catholic* and to this purpose speaks M. R. l. 2. 302.

“A *Church in an Island* is a *little city*, a *little kingdom of Jesus Christ*, Being then spiritual cities and corporations, the members must contain in them all the essentials which make up the whole. *Visible Saints* being the *matter*, this their *union* and *combination* must make up the Form.

2.

Those who have mutual power each over other, both to command and constrain the case; who were of themselves free each from other, in such a way by all rules appointed by God in providence: *They must by mutual agreement and engagement be made partakers of that power.*

But the Church of believers have mutual power each over other to command and constrain in case, who were before free from each other.

Therefore *They must by mutual agreement and engagement be made partakers of that power.*

The second part or Assumption is evident by the course of process and proceeding which our Saviour prescribes. *Mat. 19: 19. If thy Brother offend, &c.* where we have a *legal* and *orderly* way laid forth by our Saviour, in which brethren *only of the same Church*, ought to deal one with another, which they *cannot* exercise with *Infidels*, nor yet with *other Christian*, as

our own *experience* if we will take a taste, will give in undeniable evidences.

I may as a Christian, meeting with an offensive carriage in another, *rebuke* him for it: But if he will not hear me, shall I call in one or two, *he departs the place*, refuseth to come. Let me go tell the *congregation* they send for him, *he refuseth to come*, because one Congregation hath no power over another, one *Classis* over another; *But each have power over their own*, as M. R. grants, *Each member hath power over another: Each over Archippus*, not only to tell *him* by *intreaty*, but in a *legal way* to convince him, and in case of pertinacy to bring him to the

52

Church, and there to complain of him. For he is a Brother as well as any of the rest, and therefore the *process* of our Saviour lieth as fair against *him*, as against another.

Beside, all these are *degrees of binding*, each makes way for the other, and the gaining *and forgiving is a degree of loosening*, Nay in case *he* shall be detected and brought to the Church for *heretical doctrine*, or some heinous villainy, take M. R. his principles, in case the *Classis* will not censure him, he will grant the congregation may reject such a one, and make him *no Pastor* to them, and I suppose *that* will prove a *power*, which *can take away the chief power* an officer hath from him. This learned *Whitaker* (*vir undequag[[?????]] maximus*) hath disputed and concluded, *De concil.* cont. 3. q. 5. c. 3. p. 600. *Si Petrus ipse remittitur ad Ecclesiam, tanquam ad superius quoddam tribunal, & jubetur ad eam aliorum delicta deferre, tunc sequitur, Ecclesiam Petro, vel quoquam alio, autoritate majorem.*

Again he affirms *Christum generaliter loqui si frater in te peccaverit &c.* if therefore the pastor, the teacher, if *Peter*, if *Archippus*, be *frater*, Each brother hath as good law against *Archippus*, as *Archippus* hath against him, and the proceeding must be the same. For *Archippus* must remit him to the *Church*, if he were the meanest brother.

Obj. But happily it will be replied: *Whitaker* disputes of a *general council*, what power that hath over the Pope, not of a *particular Church*.

Ans. True he doth so. but it is as true that he gives a proportionable power to a particular Church: hear his words and see

the impartial reader then weigh them. *Ergo fateamur oportet, per Ecclesiam, corpus multorum, non unum episcopum, cætum hominum, non unum aliquem hominem intelligere.*

And to remove all doubt, that can be made, he adds. *Et si particularis qua[[]] Ecclesia majorem habeat auctoritatem in iudicijs, quam Petrus, vel quivis homo particularis, tunc multò magis universalis Ecclesia quæ in concilio generali repræsentalur.*

I add once more, Take it of a general council, and this will yet lend no relief to the answer in the least measure.

Every member of the general council hath power in the censuring of a delinquent (In M. R. judgement) that is, in passing a censure or sentence in the council.

53

But brethren or lay-men (as they are termed) are members of a general counsel. Therefore,

Each Brother hath power to censure a brother in case of delinquency.

The *Assumption* then of this second Argument is found and firm.

The *Proposition* is proved by instance and experience.

If others had no Church-power over this or that party, if he would have refused to come into their fellowship and joined with them, then it was hit voluntary subjection and engagement that gave them all the power or interest they have. And let any man use his own experience, it will evince as much. Severa Christian men come from far, into places, where Churches are planted. By what right or power can this Church charge or challenge him to sit down in thac society? or by what duty is he bound to close with them in that way? As it was in his liberty to come into that place, and amongst that people; so it is in his liberty to change that place, and go to another people, to refuse this, and choose to member with another Congregation.

In a word, *If they have no power over him without this, then if they have any, it is by this.*

At primum verum. Ergo,

Thus we read, *Act. 5:13. the rest durst not join. Luk. 7.30.* when the *Publicans* were baptized, the *Scribes* are said to *reject the counsel of God*, being not baptized: and neither *John* nor any else had power to constrain them to undertake such a service.

3. Argument.

If voluntary combining Churches together, *makes them a Classical or Presbyterian Church*, as *M. R. confesseth l. 2. p. 320.* *A coveniē number of Churches having ordinary converging one with another shall voluntarily combine themselves in one society. This last gives in the formality of Classical membership.* So his words are.

When God hath made him a combined member, now by Institution of one Presbyterian Church not of another: though by ordinary converse with other Churches, in case of scandal, his example may prove prejudicial and incestuous to others, yet this Presbytery must proceed in excommunication against him,

54

“because he is only combined with them.

If thus a *voluntary combining makes a man a member of a Church classical*, then a *voluntary combination will make a member of a Church congregational.* For there is the same reason to the substance of the work: *especially upon M. R. his principles*, because he would force the institution of a classis and synod from the same place of Scripture. *Mat. 18. l. 1. p.*

If there be one and the same Institution, then there is one and the same ground and cause of constitution.

4. Argument.

That society of men who may enjoy such privileges spiritual and Ecclesiastic, unto which none can be admitted without the approbation and allowance of the whole: That society must be in an especial combination, as members making up the whole. Because such an act argues combined power, which the whole hath and not any member alone: and that they cannot have, but by their agreement.

But a particular *Congregation is such a society who enjoy such spiritual privileges*, unto which none can be admitted without the approbation of the whole.

They who have power to choose their ministers and rulers, they have power to admit or *reject* such, who offer themselves to be members.

The last Argument is taken from Induction.

If the inventory of all other *respects being brought in, none can constitute a Church visible, then this only must,*

It's not *Christian affection* that can make it. For such are so united that never saw each other, and shall never enjoy the society of each other.

It is not *cohabitation*. For this falls within that dispute of *civil precincts*, which we have formerly proved, gives no being to an Ecclesiastic society.

Meeting in one Assembly unites not persons together. For *Infidels and Turks* (1 Cor. 14.) may come into Church assemblies to hear the word, as is confessed on all hands, and yet are not made members for that reason.

It is therefore in the *house of God*, as it is in other houses. We must become covenanting servants, if we have any interest there, or think to challenge any privilege there.

55

To this M. R. *answ. lib. 2. p. 125.*

The *enumeration it sufficient*, For the *SEALS OF BAPTISM* and *A PROFESSION OF THE TRUTH*, is that which maketh one a member of the visible Church, 1 Cor. 12:13. *We are all baptized by one spirit into one body, and can you deny the covenant that is sealed in baptism, and by this we are all the citizens and domestics in church and received into the visible Church.*

Of this we shall inquire at large.

CHAP. V.

*Whether Baptism doth give formality or make a member of a visible Church.**Answer Negative.*

Reason I.

IF *there be a Church*, and so members before *Baptism*: then *Baptism cannot give the formality*. Because *forma* is causal, and so is in *nature* before *firmatum*.

But the Church now considered as *totum essentiale*, is before *Baptism*.

For Ministers are before baptism: else *Baptism* may be administered lawfully by such, who are not *Rulers, Pastors* or *Teachers* which is denied by all *Orthodox Divines*, and I question not, but by *M. R.* And there must be a *Church of believers* to choose a *Minister* lawfully. For none but a *Church* can give him a call, and without a Call he cannot administer.

To this *M. R. answers. l. 2. p. 219.*

“It is false that the Church ministerial, which only can baptize, is before the Officers for they should then be before themselves, which is absurd.

To which the *reply* is easy.

That we speak not now of the *Church*, as *Ministerial*, or as *totum Organicum*, but as *totum essentiale*, which is before *Organicum*, therefore the argument is wholly untouched: nor doth the answer teach the reason at all, it secretly confutes it

56

self and confirms the cause. For, If *Baptism* cannot be before a *Ministerial Church*, nor that before a *Church congregational*, which must make choice of a ministry, then such a *Church* is much before *Baptism*.

Beside let it be supposed that at the corning of some godly zealous Christian and scholar into the country, and a company of *Pagans* (many) are converted to the faith, I ask whether these may not join in a *Church-fellowship*, and choose that man *Pastor*, and whether that choice was not lawful according to God?

Therefore here is a *Church* before a *Minister*, and so before *Baptism*.

2. Reason.

If *Baptism* give the firm to visible membership, then while that remains valid the party is a visible member, for where the form is, the *formatum* must needs be, if the principles of reason may take place.

But there is true *Baptism* resting in the party, who hath no visible membership: as in an *excommunicate*, in him that renounced the fellowship of the Church, or when the Church is utterly dissolved then all Church-membership ceaseth. for *Relata mutuo se ponunt & tollunt*. And yet *Baptism* is valid.

M. R. Answer. p. 220.

“This is against your selves and doth as well prove that baptism is not a seal of the covenant of grace, For an *excommunicate* person may remain externally without the visible Church, when *Baptism* remaineth a seal, and may be a seal of grace or privilege, which is interrupted or removed in act, but remaineth in habit. As to be the eldest-son of a King may be a seal of the sons heirship, and yet he may for a fault be disinherited and cast out.

Reply.

The first part of the *Answer* is no whit satisfactory, nor doth remove the force of the Argument. For let it be granted that an *excommunicate* person may remain externally without the covenant to the judgement of the visible Church, and yet *Baptism* be a seal of it, because *Baptism* is but a *separable adjunct* unto the *Covenant* whose efficacy may be hindered (and therefore the spiritual good) by the unworthiness of the receiver, though in its own nature, its the end of baptism to do that, and as much

57

as in it lieth, doth and would do it, but the act of it is hindered by the wickedness and unworthiness of the receiver.

But the reason is far otherwise, when *Baptism* is made the form of membership, and therefore the inference will be far other, namely,

Though a *separable adjunct* may be severed from *his subject*; or the *effect thereof* (which often is) may be hindered: yet it's never heard that the *form* of a thing could be and remain in its full *vigour*, and the *formatum* not to be. If to be the *eldest* son of a *King*, had given the formality of the possessing of his inheritance, that could never have been taken away: but he should have *stood possessed* thereof. But so it is not in case some *notorious fault* disinherit him, only *that* makes him *capax subiectum remotè*, but that which gives the *formality* of possession, is an *heir well-deserving*.

2. M. R. adds.

The Church and Church-membership are relata secundum esse, not secundum dici, or relata, κατὰ το λέγειος.[[?????]]

“*But Baptism and Church-membership are not so perfect relatives, but Baptism doth remain, and Church-membership may be dissolved. The Burgess ticket, whereby a man hath right to all the City-privileges, may remain, when the man for some crime committed against the City, hath lost all his City-privileges, and is not now a free citizen: in which case his Burgess-ticket sealeth nothing to him.*

The Reply is.

This *answer* which should maintain the cause doth fully *yield it*, For if Church and Church-membership be *relata secundum esse*, and yet *Baptism* comes not within that compass, then certainly *it* gives not the *formality* to Church-membership; and that upon a double proof.

1. If Church and Church-membership be perfect *relata*, without Baptism, then are they mutual *causes one of the other*, and receive *no constitution*, or essential causes elsewhere. For, *Relata constant ex mutuâ affectione*.

2. If Baptism give the *formale* to *membership*, it then stands in the same kind of *relation*, as Church-membership doth, as giving the *specific* and proper *being to membership*.

But that you say it doth not, and therefore *it cannot lend the*

59 [58]

formality to it.

Lastly, Let it be yielded that Baptism and Church-membership are not so perfect relatives, for that we question not, but

that (which is granted) *it is forma*, and then *forma & formatum mutuò se ponunt & tollunt*.

That of the *Burgess ticket*, if it seal nothing of his city-privileges to him, it remains a *writing*, but no *Authoritative* means of freedom, and therefore not a *formale of his freedom*. For if it had given him his Burgess-ship, the corporation would have provided for the *taking away of that* at the first, as well as the taking away *of his liberty*. As the *King* sends for the broad Seal, when he will out the *Lord Keeper*, of his power and place.

“Further the grant that Baptism sealeth other things, and is valid to that end, but sealeth not membership, This, I say, destroys the cause, which it is brought to defend, to wit, *That it cannot be the form*, for the *form* remaining, the *formatum* will certainly continue.

Reason. 3.

This tenet doth of necessity evidence the *Church of Rome*, to be a *true Church*, which is thus gathered.

Where all the members are true members, there the Church is a true Church.

But all the members in the Congregations in Rome are true members.

Assumption proved.

They who have the true form of a Church member, they are true members.

But all the members of the Church of Rome have received true Baptism, and so the formality of true members. Therefore,

Therefore the Church is a true Church.

But this last is false, therefore the first also.

Reason 4.

That which is a *Seal* of the *Covenant* and our *incorporation* info the *Church visible*, that *cannot* be the *form* of it.

At primum verum, Ergo.

The *Proposition* is proved, because *the seal comes after the thing sealed* in nature: but *the form goeth before it*.

M. R. l. 2. p. 213, 214, 215, 216. is very large to lay forth the *nature and efficacy of Seals and Sacraments*, and his dispute is

58 [59]

to good purpose, and to edify the Reader, in that point, unto which I willingly yield in all the severals thereof, for the sum and substance of the expressions. Namely, That the *Sacraments* are *signs* and *seals*, and *exhibitive instruments* of the increase of grace. Nor do I know any of ours that ever spake or writ otherwise.

And what he grants in this, gives in testimony to the truth of the Argument and confirms it strongly, only let the right sense of some words be weighed, as they should, and not racked beyond the intendment of the *Authors* mind,

For when it is said that Sacraments are not appointed to *make* a thing that *was not*, but to *confirm* and establish a thing that *was*.

This is the easy and *ordinary sense* of such phrases, to wit, *A Sacrament doth not give grace*, where it was not, but confirms grace where it was. It begins not grace in such as have it not, but increaseth and confirmeth it in such as have it, which is the same he bestoweth to many pages, and to much pains to prove, which is confessed without any further trouble, and so all that labour might have been spared, And we crave no more, then, what is thus acknowledged on all hands.

For if the Seals do not work grace, where it was not, but suppose the first grace wrought, then the Sacrament sealing our *incorporation* into the Church, It presupposeth this *covenant first* made, only it adds a further *confirmation* thereunto.

Argument. 5.

The *Church was visible when there was no seal, neither circumcision or Baptism.*

Therefore *these do not constitute it or any member of it.* Gen. 17:10, 11.

CHAP. VI.

**Quest 2. Whether PROFESSION makes a man
a member of a Congregation.**

Answ. We shall first inquire the *meaning* of the *Question* and the *intendment* of *M. R.* and so lay down the *state* thereof in the *severals* of it.

**2. Then give in our Arguments why we cannot
give our consent to this tenet.**

I.

THE meaning of the question will best be discovered by our inquiry of the nature of profession, what it implies, and how it is taken in this discourse. I. *PROFESSION* in the most frequent and familiar apprehension, signifies *the public Manifestation of our assent to the doctrine of Faith, as in the word delivered and received by us, and our resolution to persist in the maintainance of the same.* And then it is commonly used in a way of distinction from *PRACTICE*. And thus we say many profess *fair*, but their *practice answers not their profession.* And in this sense I suppose *he doth not*, nor indeed can be take *profession*, as serving his purpose.

For an excommunicate, who is cast out of the Church for his sinful carriage, may notwithstanding in his judgement avouch all the truths of Scriptures, and outwardly desire to enjoy all God's ordinances, and yet this gives him no formality of membership, because he may have all these and be cut off from membership.

2. *Profession is yet larger*, and includes also a *suitable carriage in the life*, so far as the profession which is made, is *void of scandalous courses.*

3. As *Profession* must not be too narrow, so we must be careful not to make it too broad, as to exact more then is compe-
tible in truth unto it. Namely *Such a profession of the faith and*

assent to the doctrine of truth, it not here exacted, as that a person should not be counted to hold forth a profession of the faith, that (happily through ignorance and mistake) shall hold something differing from the truth, and from the apprehensions of many other both persons or Churches which profess the same.

As suppose a Christian maintain *Justification* by Christ's *passive obedience only*; *Reprobation* in massa corrupta; whether *Children* have *habitual* or *actual faith* also. Such mistakes which may fall in some particulars, wherein pious and prudent men are of a different *Judgement*, do *not make* a person to be such a one, *as doth not profess the faith savingly*, so as may make way for *membership in a visible Church* warrantably.

Profession conceived according to the compass of the former explication, *doth make* (i. add a causal power with baptism to) a member of the visible Church, and so a member of all the visible congregation on earth.

The *expressions* of M. R. which lead me thus to conceive his meaning are *diverse* in divers passages of his books, lib. 1. c. 9. p. 116.

"This doth not hinder but yet they may hear, and so be members of a Church, l. 2, p. 125. 3. last lines, when a person removes from one Congregation to another, he makes a tacit covenant, to serve God in all his ordinances, with that new society; but he is not therefore made a member of the visible Church, for that he was before, l. 2. p. 95. A called Pastor is a member, of the visible Church, before he be called to be the Pastor though he be no member of any particular Congregation, (which expressions carry a kind of mysterious difficulty with them, we shall take liberty to look farther into them in the following discourse) Lastly, lib. 2. p. 194. the 2. last lines, he hath these Words. "He who is a member of one visible congregation, is by his Baptism and sincere profession, and his professed standing in covenant with God, a member of all visible congregations on earth, and is baptized into all congregations on earth.

Hence then we have two things to discuss.

1. *That this profession makes not a member.*

2. *Being made and standing in his professed Covenant with God, or is not a member of every particular Congregation on earth.*

62

To the first.

Argument. 1.

1. *That which opposeth and hinders the work of Baptism, and so hinders the constitution or formality of membership: that doth not help it forwards.*

Because this is made the most especial ingredient in the constitution of that relation.

But Profession lawful and warrantable may do so.

For suppose a man profess the whole truth of God, only he differs or mistakes in this, that *all the Churches on earth are ill gathered*, and therefore he dares not, and so *refuseth to be baptized*. This profession is a warrantable profession (as it hath formerly been explicated in the third conclusion) and yet this hinders the work and dispensation of baptism in the sense their specified: and therefore hinders, and helps not to the constitution of membership.

Argument. 2.

2. *That which gives membership to a party, who had it not before, that can restore membership when he hath lost it. But this cannot restate membership lost.*

That power which *Juridicè* cast him out, thit must *Juridicè* or *regularly* receive him in.

But the power of the Church in virtue of his consociation in that he satisfied it, cast him out, and therefore must also receive him in upon his humiliation and *subjection* to the covenant again.

Whereas if possession and baptism were sufficient to do the deed, baptism remaining the same, as before his excommunication, and now his profession being renewed, there is the whole formality of membership, which *experience evidenceth to be false*.

Argument. 3.

3. *That which gives actual existence to a member, must give interest to a totum actually existing, and therefore to some particular Congregation.*

For *existentia est tantum Individuorum*. Individuals only

63

exist, and since such a person is an Individual member, he must have respect or reference to the whole that doth actually exist, and *this* the *general nature* of the Catholic Church doth, in the particular *Congregations only*.

Beside if he be a particular member, he must be comprehended within the compass or members, But all the members of the Church catholic (take it as an *integrum*) are comprehended within particular Congregations, therefore he must be a member of some of them, or else he comes not within the compass or number of members.

Lastly, to be a member to the Catholic Church firstly, that is to be a member to an whole, *which* a man *nor did, nor could see*, nor do any homage to, nor receive any direction or influence of government from, This, I say, is such a sublimated imagination, that I must confess, it is beyond my shallowness to conceive. I do believe, beyond the breadth of any man's brain to express.

That which is said afterwards, That a member is call one of the Catholic Church *antecedenter*, will prove an apparent paralogism, and we shall try the truth and strength of it, when, we come unto that place.

The Proposition then hath free pass.

But (I assume) *this profession gives no interest to any particular Congregation.*

That which equally and indifferently belongs to all, that can make no particular appropriation to any one, why rather to this, then any other.

But this profession is equal and indifferent to all, as well as to any one, Therefore It can give no appropriation to any particular. *No more*, then if a woman *love all* Christian men, with Christian *affection, therefore she is a wife* to this or that man. So it is here, it is not *general profession* that will serve the

turn: but there must be a *peculiar engagement* and *appropriation*, to this or that particular body.

Argument. 4.

If a party become a member of a Church by this profession, then the Church hath Authority over him.

(For so she hath over her members) and can proceed against them in case of desert.

62

But by this profession no man hath authority over a party, for if they have any, let them claim it, and their own experience will easily evidence their mistake, 2. How can or why should one Church claim it more than another?

Argument. 5.

If this profession would give membership, then a man might make himself a member of this or that congregation, whether they would or no, nay, without the privity of the Congregation.

A man baptized goeth into *Africa*, or to the utmost parts of the earth, he comes where many of the *Churches* of Christ are, he hath been baptized, and doth profess, and this is enough to make him a member of any Church, and therefore he hath right amongst them, as a member, whether they will or no.

We have done with the first.

The *second* now comes into consideration, namely.

Q. *Whether a person, who is a member of one visible Congregation, is, by his baptism and sincere profession, and hit professed standing in covenant with God, a MEMBER OF ALL THE CONGREGATIONS ON EARTH.*

Ans. Negatur.

This tenet I cannot see how it can stand with the principles of truth, or with M. R. his *own grounds*.

Not with the principles of truth, because it draws many *inconveniences* with it, *ne quid gravius dicam?*

1. *If he be a member of all the Congregations on earth, then he can perform the duty of a member unto all.*

But that is impossible.

2. Look *what liberty or power a man hath in one particular Congregation, as a member, he hath the same in all.* because he is a member every where.

If so, then he hath as much in *choosing all the Officers* of all particular Congregations and in maintaining of them.

Then he cannot be *cast out of one Congregation*, unless all the Officers of all others do cast him out.

Nay *no Officers of one Congregation* shall proceed against him, for he will depart to another, because he hath as much right there

65

as here: and the Officers of those Congregitions are his *Pastors* and *Teachers*, whose Judgement, presence, and concurrence, he may justly require, and none can justly deny, before any admonition or Church ceniure shall pass against him.

3. Hence I cannot see, but it omit of necessity follow, that *one particular Congregation must be another*, *Ephesus* must be *Smyrna*, and *Smyrna* must be *Thyatira*, For I reason thus.

Where there be the same Individual members, there of necessity must be the same Individual members, and the ground is undeniable from the received rules of reason *Integrum est totum, cui partes sunt essentialiaes*. Therefore the same members carry the same essence which they give unto the whole.

I assume then from the former grant.

There be the same Individual members, of all the particular Congregations.

For id one professor be a member of every particular Congregation, then by a parity of reason, All particular professors must be so: and so all of them members of one particular congregation and so of every one.

Hence, there being the *same members of every particular congregation, every particular Congregation is the same*, and thence it will follow that *Ephesus* is *Smyrna*, and *Smyrna* to be *Thyatira*.

Hence, when *Smyrna* is destroyed, yet *Smyrna* remains, because it is the same with *Thyatira*, and *that yet stands*. *Ec.*

Again secondly, this cannot stand with those *principles of Mr. R.* that are granted, and maintained, as *maxims*, which admit no denial. *l. 1. c. 7. p. 72.*

We deny that Christ hath given power of Jurisdiction to one particular congregation over another.

Every member hath right to meddle with the Congregation whereof he is a member.

But a man professing, being *baptized* into *one*, he is a member of every particular congregation upon earth, *therefore* a member in every province and nation. Therefore the members of *this province* may send messengers to the *Synod* of *another province*. For the members of the Congregations of *that province*, may send messengers to the *Provincial Synod*, But the members of the Congregations in this Province, are members of the Con-

66

gregations of that Province, because they are members of all the Congregations on earth, Therefore they may send messengers to the *Synod* of that *Province*.

And this is a ready way to turn all into a *chaos* and *confusion*, and therefore certainly is not the way of God, who *is the God of order, not of confusion*.

Hence that expression of M. R. which he lays as a peremptory conclusion, will prove not to have so much certainty and solidity, as might appear at the first sight.

“It is folly to seek for a difference of particular Congregations, for Church-covenant makes not the difference, for a Church covenant is common to them all.

The Reply is.

That particular Congregations and Church-covenants do not differ in their general nature or essence, is a truth, and confessed on all hands, as that which is suitable to common sense. For things common or general do not difference particulars, because in them they all agree.

But there is a *specificating*, or to speak more narrow, an *Individual formality*, which makes a real difference in the particular nature of *this Church*, from *that*.

1. The rule was or old, *Genus cum formâ constituit speciem*.

2. If this and that particular combination or Churches give a peculiar being distinct to this Classis from another, then the like may be in particular Congregations. That M. R. grants, and therefore this cannot be denied.

3. This Congregation differs really from another, *habem se ut res & res*, therefore there must be answerable grounds whence this reality of difference must proceed.

4. If they differ only in *accidents*, those must be *common or proper*. If common they then bring in agreement and no difference. If proper, then they arise from some propriety, and peculiar formality of the being of each Church. Nay,

5. How comes it that this Church hath power over this person, which another hath not, but that he hath a peculiar interest in that, and they in him by special engagement?

Lastly in all voluntary Covenants, which arise from the free consent of party and party, there is no difference to be found in those Covenants, but in the peculiar and Individual formalities of special engagements, which pass betwixt party

67

and party, and therefore the difference is there alone to be sought, and there alone it can be found.

Should a man come to a servant, and tell him, I am a matter of servants, and it is a folly to seek for differences, for household covenant, or servants covenant, makes no difference; for servants covenant is common to all, there is only a difference in number, and some accidents, as there is betwixt many servants in my family. *Therefore thou art my servant, and must do the work of my family.*

Should people of one Congregation come to the Pastor of another, and tell him; come and bestow your pains constantly with us, for its all one, as if you did it with your own people, for its folly to seek for differences *in covenant*, betwixt *Pastor* and *people*, for that makes no difference, since the covenant is common to all. There is only a difference in number and accidents, as there is betwixt the Elders which we have in our Congregations, *Therefore you are our Pastor, and must do the work of our Congregation.*

That a man should be a general Husband to all women, or a woman a general wife to all men, because marriage-covenant is common to all, It seems strange at the first sight, and therefore it's counted folly on our part to seek any difference here, and we are content to bear the charge of folly for it.

Chap. VII.

An Answer to Arguments made against the Church covenant.

WE have thus positively set down, what yet we conceive to be the mind of God touching that which *formally constitutes a Church*. I perceive M. R. his spirit carried with a marvellous distaste against this way: we shall as we are able, labour to remove all mistakes and misconceivings, that the mind of the Reader, may not be missed with the multitude and throng of expressions, many whereof come not up to the point in hand. To level the path in our proceeding, we shall lay these *considerations* following, to fill the uneven ditches, that the devices of men have made in *this high way of holiness*.

1. Conclusion.

1. *Relation, As such*, is not the foundation of a *free covenant*, (whereof we now speak) Because there be some relations founded in the *acts of nature*, in the putting forth whereof, there is neither the observation nor consideration of the parties required. As when twins are born together, or one within the distance of a twelve month one from another; those have the relation of brethren and sisters, and yet it is without the apprehension of either: the relative tie, and the duties issuing therefrom, have their rise and power from the impression of the rule of *nature*.

And hence when the *Reader* shall meet with the name of *covenant*, which proceeds from such a root, let him know it makes nothing to this cause.

And hence also it follows, that such relations and duties, proceeding therefrom, may be multiplied without any covenant at all, much less needs there the multiplication of any covenant, according to the specialties which attend upon them.

2. Conclusion.

2. *Covenants* are attended either in the *rise* of them, by such as are the *first makers* of them, or else in the *communication* of them, or the bonds they lay upon others, *after* the entrance made. Thus the *covenant once made* by the mutual and *free a-*

greement of the parties, it may be communicated to others without *their consent*, as namely to their children, because they are as the Scriptures speak *in their loins*, under their power and dispose, and therefore can make such an agreement and engagement for them. So it was in *Israel*, Deut. 29:9, 10. And the like course is commendable in the times of the Gospel, *So that a Minister is Minister to the children born of the parents who have chosen him, and the children of covenanting parents are in covenant with the Church by virtue of their parents covenant.*

3. Conclusion.

3. *Amongst such* who by no impression of nature, no rule of providence, or appointment from God, or reason, have power each over other, *there must of necessity be a mutual engagement*, each of the other, by their free consent, before by any rule of God they have any right or power, or can exercise either, each towards the other. This appears in all covenants betwixt *Prince and People, Husband and Wife, Master and Servant*, and most palpable is the expression of this in all *confederations* and *corporations*: from *mutual acts* of consenting and engaging each of other, there is an impression of an *engagement* results, as a *relative bond*, betwixt the contractors and confederators, wherein the *formulis ratio*, or *specific nature* of the covenant lieth, in all the former instances especially *that of corporations*. So that however it is true, the rule binds such to the duties of their places and relations, yet it is certain, it requires that they should *first freely engage* themselves in such covenants, and *then* be careful to fulfil such duties. A man is allowed freely to make choice of his wife, and she of her husband, before they need or should perform the duties of husband and wife one towards another.

4. Conclusion.

4. *This Covenant once made, if any relations be inferred*, and so were virtually included in it, or do result from it, as there is none, so *there needs no new covenant*, to make up those, or to require the exercise of duties unto them. As he that binds himself to be a *covenant-servant*, he binds himself to walk with his *fellow-servants* in the family according to the *order* thereof:

these follow from the *first* covenant, and are *included in it*, and *inferred from it*.

5. Conclusion.

5. If you take the covenant of the *Gospel*, in *so full* a breadth, as that it should include whatever *is warranted* by the *Gospel*,

70

then this Church covenant, may be truly said to be *included in it*.

But if it be taken in the *narrowest Acceptation* [Believe and live] Then *it is not the Covenant of the Gospel*. For that is inward and *invisible* in its own nature, betwixt *God* and the *soul* only: But *this is visible* betwixt those who do profess the Faith. That concerns all, and at *all times*, to do the duties of it, *i.e.* to *believe* and to *live*. But this concerns only those who are in this Church estate. So that in case the Churches are dissolved, and through persecution scattered, they are not then bound to the duties of this confederacy.

It is then *an ordinance of the Gospel*, and *warranted by the Gospel*, but it is *not* in propriety of speech *the covenant of the Gospel*.

And this also is here considerable, that we may discern things that differ: The making of the confederation belongs to the *Gospel*, but *being made*, it hath also a confirmation from the *law*. As the appointing of *Baptism* and *Eucharist*, belongs to the *Gospel*, are ordinances thereof, but being instituted, they stand by virtue of the *second Commandment*, and must be observed by virtue thereof. A man may be within the covenant of the moral law, and yet not be bound to the duties of a husband, unless he make a particular covenant with such a woman to be her husband.

And hence there is a broad difference betwixt duties and duties as the difference is large in the respects upon which they do arise. Many duties flow from the general and necessary duties of morality, which reach a man as a *creature*, with reference to *God* as a *Creator*, or else to his *fellow-creatures*. And hence *this relation* from a rule of *nature*, it hath nothing to do with a *free covenant*, that must come between the persons and their duties. But in that they are creatures they must do homage to their creator, and duty to their *fellow-creatures*. If a neigh-

bour preserve their honours, lives, goods, good names, yea be merciful to their beasts, because such a creature, But there must *intervene a new covenant* betwixt parties and parties by mutual and free consent, before they either should or can take up *another sort of duties*, People must by mutual content grow up into engagement one with another into a corporation, before they should do the duties of a corporation. *A servant must cove-*

71

nant with his Master, before he need or ought to serve him as a Master.

And here these two things are apparently distinct. To *Swear* to do *the duties* of a servant, when he is one, doth *not make* him a servant. But to *engage* himself and *enter into covenant*, that doth make him to be a servant. The like to this, we may say touching the choosing of *Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons*, these are *ordinances of the Gospel*, and there is a peculiar covenant betwixt those that choose, and those that are chosen, which is *not the covenant of the Gospel* in precise consideration.

The substance of this was in the time of the Law, and that covenanting among them issued, as it seems, from the Gospel, They were a called and select people unto God, *Amos. 3, You only have I known, of all the nations of all the nations of the world*, and therefore received into visible covenant, to walk in the ways of God, and the truth of his worship: and God engaged himself. that he would bless those privileges, and the life of them, to their good, and the good of their *children, reserving secret things to himself*.

These grounds being laid, we shall attend M. R. *his reasons* against this covenant. l. 2. p. 88.

Argument. 1.

“All will-worship laying a bond upon the Conscience, where God laid none is damnable.

But to tie men to enter into Church estate by Covenant, so that without such an oath or Covenant, persons should have no right to the Seals of God’s grace: is will-worship, and bulding where God hath not bound.

Assumption is proved thus.

“All will-worship laying a bond upon the Sonscience, where God laid none is damnable.

“But to tie men to enter into Church estate by Covenant, so that without such an oath or Covenant, persons should have no right to the Seals of God’s grace: is will-worship, and binding where God hath not bound.

“That a Minister swear the oath of fidelity to his flock is lawful, that a Father swear to perform the duties of a Father, a Master the duties of a Master is lawful, But to tie an oath or Covenant so to his Ministry, to lay a bond of Covenant upon a Master, that keep in conscience and before God no Minister, no Master, &c. except to swear to perform these duties, is to lay a bond when Christ hath laid none.

72

Ans. That example of a Father, because it results upon a rule in nature, without any free consent required, it reacheth not our cause. *vide supra* conclus. 1.

The two other instances are either apparently misapplied, or else do undoubtedly confirm the cause that they would seem to confute. For I will ask any man living, that will not lay aside human consideration, whether any man can charge another to be his servant, or he challenge another to be his master, unless there be a mutual covenant and engagement passed betwixt each to other, the one to pay and provide for him, during his time: The other ties himself to do him honest and faithful service such a time for such wages, do not men’s *speeches* proclaim as much? he is such a man’s *covenant servant*.

It is so here in a *Church way*, The person engageth himself, by *solemn promise*, to walk with this society in the ways and worship of Christ. The Society receives him, and engage themselves so to walk with him and towards him. As it is in the covenant of any corporation civil. The like may be said touching a Minister and his people, That which makes him a Pastor to this people, is the choice of the people, as freely taking of the person to be their shepherd and guide, and the engaging of themselves to submit unto him in the dispensation of his office according to God: The acceptation of the call and engagement

of himself to take that office and charge according to God's appointment and their choice, makes them his flock. And without this covenanting there neither is, nor ever was, or will be, Pastor and Flock.

So that these instances brought in for proof, cut the throat of M. R. his cause. *As Master and Servant, Minister and people, come to stand in such estates and relation one to another, so come the Church and a person that it received to be a number to stand in their respect.*

But a Covenant gives formality of being to the former, and therefore so to the latter.

These phrases of M. R. *to swear to perform such duties*, p. 89. *to tie by an Apostolic law and practice, the oath of God to such duties*, either are misprinted, or else they miss the conclusion wholly, which they should prove, For we do *not* make the *swearing to do a duty* to be our covenant, for that is as far differing from our question almost, as heaven is from earth.

73

A witness comes into the court, ties himself by oath to swear the truth, here is no covenant betwixt man and man at all. So that *these things* are seriously to be distinguished and differenced.

1. *An agreement of persons*, one to, and with another to combine and consociate in the ways and worship of Christ.

2. *The doing of these duties.*

3. *The swearing they will do them*, when they are *combined* The first of these is the *form* of a corporation. The other two may be done *when they are incorporated*. Thus 1. Man and Woman engage themselves each to other by way of contract. 2. Being contracted they do the duties. 3. They may swear and bind themselves to God, they will do them. *I have sworn and will perform it, that I will keep the righteous Judgment.*

Argument. 2.

“That way members are to be inchurched, and enter into Church-fellowship, which way members were entered into the Apost. Churches. But members were not entered into an Apostolical Church, by such a Covenant but only they believed,

professed belief, and were baptised. When the incestuous person son is reentered, It is said only 2 Cor. 2. that he was grieved and testified it, and they did forgive him, and confirm their love to him. ver. 7, 8.

“There is here no Church covenant. Act. 8:12. Samaria received the word gladly, believed, and was baptised. Simon Magus baptised. Act. 8. Cornelius and his household. Act. 10. The Church of Ephesus planted. Act. 14. Of Corinth. Act. 18. Of Berea. 17:10. Philippi. Act. 16. Thessalonica. Act. 17. Rome. Act. 28. we have no express vocal covenant.

Ans. The proofs here alleged as precedential, are of three sorts.

1. Touching the receiving of *the Incestuous Corinthian* after his repentance. But that doth not overthrow the *covenant*, but confirm it, For their forgiving and confirming their love again to him, was cross to his excommunication, and therefore an *estating* of the person into that *corporation* and communion which formerly he did enjoy, his subjecting himself in so solemn a manner to the rule of Christ in the Congregation and Church, and

74

craving acceptance at their hands, and entertainment into the like privileges of communion, of which he was deprived by reason of his sin, and their ready receiving and entertaining of him into that relation and state, and *confirming their love to him* in that behalf, is *full engagement* of the *Church* to him, and of *him* again to the *Church*.

Whereas had *his profession* at large made him a member, he had been a *member* whether the Church would have received him or no: or if his *baptism* had made him a member, as long as his baptism had remained, his membership had continued, for whiles the *forma* remains, the *formatum* must needs be also. This example will appear most pregnant, if we do but parallel it with the like in a civil corporation. A person, a member of the corporation and in combination with them, through his ill carriage is *disfranchised* and put out of his place and privilege; if he shall express that sorrow and reformation, that suits the quality of his sin, and give satisfaction to the Company, his subjecting himself to the Company, and power of the combination, and their re-

ceiving and entertaining of him upon such terms, is an express *recovery and renewal of the Covenant* again, and by that an estab-
lishing of the party in the same condition and relation in which he
was.

The *rest of the proofs* carry no concluding force with them. For
if there be any force in the Argument, it must lie here.

2. If no Church-covenant be there expressed, then there was none.
The feebleness of which *consequence* appears at first sight. For
so reason from *one* or *some* places against the expression in *any*
place, is to conclude from an imperfect enumeration of some
species, to deny the *genus*, which is a fallacy. It was not expres-
sed in *one* or *two Evangelists*, therefore, *in none*. It is not said in
three or *four* of the Prophets, therefore in none of them. We
know it was the rule which the Apostle prescribed before bap-
tism, *Repent and be baptized*, Act. 2:38. So the *Baptist* trained
up his disciples. To reason therefore this profession of repentance
is not mentioned in these places, therefore either was not here
done, or that it is not in other places required, carries no force of
reason with it.

That lastly of Act. 2:41. *As many as received the word gladly,
were baptised, and there were added three thousand. But these were
not gathered as you gather.*

75

M. R. takes this place as wronged by us, and therefore he re-
solves to deliver it out of our hands: 1. *Because these did not first
“meet frequently for prayer and special conference, until they were
satisfied touching the good estate one of another. 2. They could
not set apart and celebrate a day of fasting and prayer, and dispatch
the confessions of thirty hundred within such a time.*

Answ. If we cast an eye to the fore-going conclusions, it will
appear that *such fasting* and prayer is only required at the erecting
and laying the foundation of a Church, and so also *such* frequent
meeting, before they enter into so solemn engagement, and the
setting up a holy Church unto Christ. But these solemnities are
not expected in the *taking in* of several members, nay the addi-
tion of all the ordinary members to the body. Besides, these were
members of the Jewish Church before. The stroke that fell up-
on their spirits by the Ministry of the Apostles (for I do not
think that *Peter* only preached) was so extraordinary, and car-

ried such an apparent discovery of the presence and power of Christ, that without any miraculous power of discerning, their expressions might make way for members of the Jewish Church to find acceptance with this Apostolic, and Christian Church now beginning.

It's added by the *APOLOGY of the Church-covenant*.

1. That they professed their glad receiving of the word, and renouncing that froward generation.

2. Being baptised they continued in fellowship, that was Church fellowship, for it was not the excrcise of the Sacrament, which the *Syriac* conceives.

To this M. R. answers, "*They could net continue in the Apostles fellowship and doctrine before they were added to the Church: for steadfastness in doctrine, and giving themselves from the froward generation, could not be but habitual holiness, not perfected in six hours. Now the same day, vers. 41. in which they gladly heard the word, they were both baptised and added; and therefore their steadfast continuing in Church estate, can no ways make them members in Church state.*

Answ. True; nor is the Argument urged in that manner, but the dispute lies from the *effect* to the *cause* in that particular of it: In that they gave constant attendance to the ordinances of Christ, and in that fellowship, as taking themselves bound thereto, it argues they took themselves engaged thereunto by that subjection

76

they did express in renouncing their former society, and desiring and receiving acceptance from the Apostles and the Church, so as such carriages carry the reality of a Covenant.

Whereas it is said, "*If they had returned to Pontus again, they had returned added to the Church.*

It is easily *replied*. Had they returned with a purpose not to have walked in that fellowship, it is sure, they had not been of that Church by their Baptism: for *ALL Jerusalem* then, and *Judæa*, and the coast about *Jordan* had been members of the Church by the baptism of *John*.

Obj. 3. "*But here is no word of a Church-covenant, which was necessary to have been intimated, if there had been any such thing.*

Answ. If it be not mentioned, therefore it was not, *non sequitur*, 1. If the *thing* be there, we need not trouble our selves for

the *Word*. And if *Calvin's* judgement may be taken, who expounding [*Libenter amplexos coram sermonem,*] he thus writes, *Adjunctos Christi discipulis fuisse, vel in idem corpus insitos & perseverasse in doctrina.* And I shall offer to *M. R.* his consideration, That when there is a solemn Baptising into a Church, *that* ever implies that the person is made a disciple of Christ, *Mat.* 28:19. For upon that ground their commission warrants the administration of baptism: and so to be a disciple of Christ, is to be ingrafted into the body of the Church, and to be as the Apostle hath it, *Fellow-heirs, and of the same body,* *Ephes.* 3:6. which is spoken of the visible Church: And therefore though many believed in Christ, *Joh.* 12:40. Yet they would not confess him, or become his disciples, because they *feared they should be cast out of the Synagogue.* And hence it is that *this* embracing the word, *this being made a disciple,* it's expressed by the word *προσέτιθεντο,* *added to or incorporated,* as in *Act.* 2:41. & 5:14.

Whereas *all the people* were then said to *magnify them,* and therefore to approve of their doctrine, and so confess the truth and goodness of it; yet there was more required to this *Church-work,* and to become a disciple. And therefore its added, *The believers were added,* i.e. they confessed their sins, and became disciples and followers of that doctrine, and so engaged themselves, and *covenanted also for their children,* to follow that truth of the Gospel. And if this being a disciple include not thus much, how can our Divines use this, as so strong a testimony against the Anabaptists, to make good the inference? If the converted

77

father was baptized: Therefore their children also, unless they *ingaged* themselves in *Church-covenant* for their children also?

Follow this order of the Apostle. Let them be members of Congregations. Let them expresse the *work of repentance with that power* upon their souls, as these did, and *receive the word with gladness.* Our principles formerly propounded, will make way for their admittance.

The place thus expounded, finds much liberty and content to be in our hands, and will not be delivered, by all the reasons alleged by *M. R.* to go away from us.

Argument 3.

“*If Baptism be the seal of our entry into the Church, 1 Cor. 12:13. as circumcision was the seal of the members of the Jews visible Church: then such a Covenant is not the formal reason of our Church-membership. But the former is true, as I shall prove hereafter; Ergo, so is the later.*

“*The proportion stands, because all baptised are members of the visible Church before they can swear this Covenant, even when they are infants.*

Answ. The Proposition fails, nay fights against it self. For if it seal up our membership, and Covenant with the visible Church, then is it after-membership, and therefore not the formal cause of it, for then it should be before it.

Again, If it seal up our membership, as *circumcision* sealed up membership in the Jewish visible Church, then certainly it presumes the Covenant, for so that did, *Gen. 17:10, 13. He that is born shall be circumcised;* so that he was in Covenant, and so called a *holy seed*, before in his own person he could make a Covenant, but was included in *the Covenant of his parent.*

And if M. R. be of another mind, we desire he would tell us, How children of believers are said to be *holy*, if not by a *fæderal* holiness? and if so, then by the *visible* Covenant of their Parents. *For many children are SO holy that have parents not spiritually and invisibly within that Covenant. Ergo.*

Lastly, The proof is also false, namely, children are members before they are in this Covenant, because though they do *not* covenant *personally* by themselves, yet they are *included virtually* in the Covenant of their parents, *Deuteronomy 29:10, 11.*

Argument 4.

“*The Church-covenant either is all one with the Covenant of Grace, or it is a Covenant diverse from the Covenant of Grace. But neither ways can it be the essential form of a visible Church: Ergo. The Covenant of Grace cannot be the form of a visible Church, because then all baptised should be in Covenant with God, which our brethren deny. If it be a Covenant diverse from it, it must be of another nature, and lay another obligatory tie, then ei-*

ther the Covenant of works, or the Covenant of Grace: and so must tie to other duties, then either the law or Gospel require of us, and so is beside that Gospel which Paul taught, and makes the teacher, though an Angel from heaven, accursed. lib. 2. pa. 93. *Bona verba.*

Ans^w. *The Covenant of Grace* is to be considered, either according to the *benefits* of saving grace *given* in it, or according to the *means* of grace *offered*. It is not the Covenant of the Gospel in the first sense; but it is within the verge, and contained within the compass of the Covenant in the second sense. And hence the consequence upon which the stress of the cause (as it is urged by him) lies, vanisheth wholly. If it be distinct from the Covenant of grace, then it doth oblige us to some other duties, then the Ordinances of the Gospel require. For it hath appeared before, That a man may be in the Covenant of grace, and share in the benefit thereof, who is not in a Church state; and a man may be in a Church state, who is not really in the Covenant of grace: And therefore a Church state, and the Covenant of the Gospel, in the former sense expressed, are different. Yea it hath been proved, That all are bound to come within the Covenant of the Gospel, who are not at that time bound to come into the Church estate, nor yet to do the duties thereof.

M. R. when he is to answer to this difference, *l. 2. p. 93. Ubi supra*, he grants, That an excommunicate person may be in the Covenant of grace, and yet cut off from the visible Church: and yet denies the consequence, but gives no reason of that denial, but only speaks of another thing, which toucheth not the pinch of the Question in hand.

“A believer (says he) in the Covenant of grace, may not do a duty to a father, brother, or master, and yet it is a weak consequence,

79

“that there is a covenant or oath betwixt these, brother and brother, Son and Father, Master and Servant, commanded by a divine law of perpetual equity to make such to be in such relation.

We confess this is a weak consequence, and is of his own making, and therefore may as easily be confuted as it is propounded, but *this is our consequence.*

A man may be within the covenant of grace, and not within the covenant of the Church, and therefore the one is not the other. For if two things be the same in themselves, so far they be the same in the third, and where the one is, the other will be. So that the Answer stands in the full vigour wholly untouched, only he speaks of other things, *some* not touching the cause in hand, *some* that will not stand by a rule of truth.

These expressions touch not the cause in hand, namely when he thus writes.

“The covenant of grace teacheth us to confess Christ, to walk before God, to join my self to a visible Church. But none can conclude in right reason, that it is a divine law, that necessitates me to swear another covenant, then the covenant of grace in relation to these duties.

Ans. It’s true, no law binds to enter into another covenant, then the covenant of the Gospel: because these duties result out of relations, which arise from the nature of the creature in reference to God, but come not within *the free and voluntary covenant* which is made by the voluntary consent of the parties. But take the same expressions as looking at a covenant which issues from the willing consent betwixt man and man, as master and servant, man and wife, and it will be evident at the very first light, that it is false.

For to say there is no divine law to necessitate a man to enter into another covenant for marriage, beside the covenant of grace, before he can do the duty of an husband, is to go against the experience of all ages, the common sense of all men. As though a person might adventure to take the place and do the duties of a husband to a woman, who never made a covenant of marriage, and tell her he hath been in the covenant of grace many years, and there needs no other, there is no law necessitates him or her to make a marriage covenant together, I suppose a person might suspect the man had not only lost his honesty, but his prudence also.

80

Should some *Nimrod* of the world come upon a poor solitary people, and tell them that the covenant of grace and the Gospel, teacheth the people to pay tribute to their Prince, and the Prince to exact it. They both profess this Gospel: There is no divine

law to bind them to make another covenant of King and Subject, and therefore now they must pay, and he must exact tribute their hand. I suppose the poor people, out of their own sense will tell him, that there is indeed a covenant required between God and man to make men Christians. But there must be another covenant betwixt Prince and people, to make them Rulers and Ruled: otherwise he could expect no homage from them, nor they protection from him.

Hence the Author of *the Apology* suggesting to M. R. that it is not the word only that giveth power to the husband over his wife, but the covenanting of the wife with the husband. He answers, "*This is all which with colour of reason can be said, and therefore labours to decline the dint of the dispute, because it carried such a troop of inconveniences with it, affirms "that those places of Scripture were not brought to move the Pastors calling to the people, or their relative case of subjection to him: but only thy prove that the covenant of grace and the Gospel layeth a tie of many duties upon us, which obligeth us without the coming under the tie of an express, vocal, public oath.*

And I wonder who ever denied this: let the man be brought forth, and bear his blame and shame, that should be so void of sense, only let it be here also remembred, that also this is wrested by strong hand, and confessed, *that there be in some conditions a Covenant that comes between persons, at betwixt man and wife, Master and servant, before they can come under these relations,* which was denied in the 93. pa. immediately preceding. Such is the brightness of the truth that it cannot be overborn.

That which is next added, is partly a craving the question. and the proofis yet inefficient to make it good, "*Because I pfeess the Faith, and am baptized. I am a member of the visible Church, without such an oath: Because the covenant of grace, doth tie me to join myself to some particular Congregation, &c.*

Reply is.

That of Baptism is answered. 2. The ground of that which is

81

added is a mistake, to wit, If the Covenant of the Gospel tie me to join myself to a visible Congregation, Therefore there is not a covenant required to do that.

If this be a good confluence, take the like, If the Gospel require me to seek for the help of a godly Pastor, that may rule and teach me. If it require me *to marry* and not to burn. Therefore there is no *Covenant* required to make me a husband to a woman, that I must marry; nor a sheep of that Shepherd who must guide and rule me in the Lord. If these be false, then the former is as feeble and weak, for they both carry the same parity and proportion of reason.

Some expressions which here fall from the pen of M. R. are to my apprehensions, new Paradoxes. As, "*A called Pastor who hath gifts, and a calling from the Church, is a member of the visible Church, before he be called to be their Pastor, though he be a member of no particular Congregation.*"

The difficulties are these.

1. That a Pastor may have a *calling* from the Church, before he is *elected* by a particular Congregation, and so be an *Individuum vagum*, a *Pastor of all people*, and yet of *no particular people*.

2. That a person may be a member of the visible Church, and yet be no member of it, and that I will infer from his own words. Thus,

He that is no member of a particular Congregation, he is no member of a visible Church. But a Pastor may be a member of a visible Church, and yet no member of a particular Congregation. Therefore he may be a member of the visible Church, and yet no member. The second part M. R. affirms. I prove the proposition.

If all particular Congregations are all the members that the visible Church hath, Then he that is not a member of a particular Congregation is no member of a visible Church: for that which comes not within the number and compass of members is not a member.

But all particular Congregations are all the members that the visible Church hath, Therefore he that is not a member of a particular Congregation is no member of a visible Church.

But of these, thus much by the way occasionally we shall in-treat more fully of them, when we come to the place of the

82

calling of Ministers.

In the end of the 95. *pag. lib.* He plainly professeth, That when one doth enter a member to such a Congregation, under the Ministry of *A. B.* he cometh under a new relative estate by an implicit and virtual Covenant, which is cross to what was affirmed before, *p.* 92. The rest of the examples either confute his own assertion, or else do not reach the Question in hand. For we have shewed before, that excommunicates when they come to be restored, they renew the Covenant with the Church, and the Church with them.

That which is added, "*touching a Church newly erected, she then becomes a sister church with others, yet she needs not a new Covenant to accomplish it.*"

Ans. No certainly, the reason is from the third conclusion, *supra.* Our Covenant once entered upon, all the relations, that depend upon *that*, or may be inferred from *that*, are included in that Covenant, and therefore needs no more. As a woman being in Covenant with her husband, all the duties to *his kindred* are required by that, and flow from that Covenant, there needs no other.

Especially that inference is a wide mistake. "*If I must have a new Covenant to bring me into an estate, which issues only from free and voluntary consent; Then I must not honour men in several relations, as Physicians, Lawyers, learned Philosophers, unless I take up a particular Covenant.*" I say, such a consequence hath no shadow of reason in it, nor the least appearance of any approach to the cause, because the honour we owe to each man; as a neighbour, in his place and condition, is founded in a *natural* relation we have, as fellow-servants to the great God and Creator of all man-kind. And therefore we must love God, and all things of God, in our neighbour, which concerns us: and therefore we must preserve the honour, life, goods, good name, of all, whether Lawyers, or Philosophers, or Physicians. Let me infer from hence.

That I should therefore do the duty of a servant to him that is not my master: of a husband, to her that is not my wife, is a very weak inference, and carries no proportion of reason with it.

He adds, *pag.* 97.

“Though there be a tacit Covenant betwixt a new member of a Congregation, and A. B. Pastor. and they come under a new relation,

83

“Covenant-wise (which I grant) this is not the point in question, But this new Covenant is that which by necessity of a divine Commandment, of perpetual equity maketh the new adjoiner a member.

Answ. We are now then at the last, almost come to our selves, for we are come to this, that there must be a new relation Covenant-wise betwixt parties in estates and conditions, which issue from free consent betwixt them, before they can be tied to the duties of that estate, by being in the Covenant of the Gospel, the contrary whereof was affirmed, *p.* 93. *juxta finem*, and 94. *lin.* 1. to the ninth.

Hence therefore that which the *Apology* expressed, to wit, “That its not the rules of the Word touching man and wife, Magistrate and subject, that makes people in such an estate, but the Covenant that is made betwixt them to those ends. I say, this was by him to be answered, *pag.* 94. but yet stands in its full force, and not weakened, nay not torched, nay in truth confirmed by this grant.

Lastly, That is made the great hinge of our debate, that I think never came into our thoughts, neither waking, nor sleeping, namely, “*That this new Covenant betwixt a person, and A. B. Pastor, did make such the new Adjoiner, a member of a new Congregation,*

I answer, I would fain have one of ours produced, that either in writing or printing ever said any such thing, or any thing that carries a shadow of any such conceit; when its well known to all, that know our principles and practice, we profess the Church is a true Church, as *Totum essentiale*, before her officers, and the choice of them. The particular persons are members before this choice, and therefore are not made such by this choice or new Covenant.

Argument 5.

“If this Church-covenant be the essence and form of a visible Church, which differenceth between the visible and invisible; Then there have been no visible Churches since the Apostles date, nor are there any in the Christian world this day, save only in N. E. and some other places.

The *Answer* is open, and hath been formerly intimated, in the opening of the nature of the Covenant, and the manner of the ex-

84

pressing thereof, to wit, It is either *implicit* or *explicit*. The Covenant is preserved for the *substance* of it, whether of the ways it comes to be acted. And all the Churches that ever were, or now are, true Churches, either in *England, Holland, France, &c.* have, at least, in them an implicit Covenant, which is abundantly evidenced by the constant practice, which is performed, and is also required at the hands of all that are members therein.

Argument 6. and last.

“A multitude of unwarrantable ways, partly go before, partly convey this Church-covenant.

Answ. If the ways were unwarrantable that conveyed the Covenant, or went before it: if yet they do not *touch the nature of the Covenant*, that may yet be lawful, when they are unlawful. As it is in the Covenant of marriage. A man may upon wrong grounds, upon wrong ends, undertake such a work, proceeding also in a disorderly manner, and yet if the substance of the Covenant be right and good, the marriage is lawful in it self and substance of it. But let us hear the *ways* that are so *unwarrantable*.

1. “It is a dream, that all are converted by the means of private Christians, without the ministry of sent Pastors, l. i. p. 120.

Answ. I confess it is a dream to say so, or think so. And if any do dream of such a device in the night, let him own it, and defend it in the day, we own it not. Is it likely that any man is so forsaken of reason, as to say, that the Apostles when they came to plant Churches, that private Christians, not they, converted the people? And if they converted all those first Churches, where is the man that will affirm, that *All* [*All*,] are

converted by private Christians? Though it's possible that private Christians may convert some, *Act. 11:19*. Beside, materials of new gathered Churches with us, are such, as have been converted by Ministers in their several Congregations.

2. *"Its an unwarrantable way, to say that Pastors, as Pastors, are not sent to Indians.*

Answ. There is warrant enough to affirm that, and evidence enough to prove it; As shall appear in the handling of the ordination and power of a Pastor.

3. Absurdity. *"That men must be satisfied in their consciences, touching one another's conversion.*

85

Answ. That the members of Churches should be visible Saints, and that to reasonable charity, we have formerly proved: and that such should *so profess, at that the soundness and truth of their faith may be notified to the Church*, is granted by M. R. and this is as much as we desire, and so we doubt not, but *Ananias, Simon Magus, &c.* did appear such to the judgement of charity, which always judgeth the best, unless it can prove the contrary.

4. Unwarrantable way. *"By what warrant of the Word are private Christians, not in office, made the ordinary and only converters of souls?"*

Answ. There is no word that warrants it; and I know none of us that affirm it, that all are converted by private Christians. The sound of such an absurdity is so continually in the ear and mind of M. R. (but from whence it comes, I know not) that I see it finds such welcome, that he is willing to repeat it twice, rather than to miss the remembrance and mentioning of it, and therefore he repeats it as a double absurdity, this fourth being the same with the first, and by this way he may fill the number of unwarrantable ways easily.

If by *ordinary*, he understand that which is *frequent* in a course of common providence, which is neither *miraculum*, nor yet *mirandum*, for the extraordinariness thereof, I suppose each man's *experience* will evidence this truth, *That the endeavour of persons out of office, hath been blessed, and is blessed to the conversion of divers*, and that without prejudice to the office and ordinance of Christ. But were all this granted to be unwarrantable, what is such a conceit to overthrow the Covenant? That may be yet a truth, though

such apprehensions may be false, but the Proverb is true, *He that counts a man his enemy, he is content to go much out of his way, that he may lend him a blow*: If there may be any blemish cast upon the Covenant, it skills not from what coast it comes.

5. *“What warrant have the sister-churches to give the right-hand of fellowship to a new erected Church? For to give the right-hand of fellowship is an Authoritative and Pastoral act, as Galat. 2. when James, and Cephas, and John perceived the grace that was given me, they gave unto me and Barnabas the right-hand of fellowship.”*

Answ. Suppose the sister-churches had no warrant to give the sight-hand of fellowship, yet the *Covenant* for all that may be

86

warrantable. And yet the quarrel must hence be maintained against the innocent Covenant. *As the lion quarrelled with the lamb for mudding the water, when she drank many miles below his watering.*

But let us see the heinous *unwarrantableness* of this course of giving the *right-hand of fellowship* to sister-churches. *The first cause is, because it is an Authoritative act, as Pareus, Beza, &c.*

Answ. The Authors give in no evidence this way. For the words of *Pareus* in the margin, *lib. 2. p. 161.* shew the contrary, It is made *Intimæ conjunctionis symbolum*, but not *authoritatis*. *Intimate love*, friendship and familiarity doth not infer *authority*. But *Beza* his words put it beyond question, *Porrexerunt manum, quod symbolum esset nostræ in Evanglij doctrinâ summæ consensionis*. Why *M. R.* should construe, *symbolum consensionis* to be *symbolum authoritatis*, is beyond my understanding. But if Interpreters help not, yet his *Argument* it may be will settle the cause, therefore he repeats this again, and adds this reason. *“By no authority can they receive them as members of the Catholic Church, for this receiving is a Church act, and they have no Church power.* The frame stands thus,

Argument 1.

They who have no Church-power, they can put forth no Church-act.

Answ. The Proposition is apparently weak. The *Church* can put forth an act of *counsel*, of approbation, of love, of conjunction, as well as an act of *power*.

M. R. grants that one single Congregation hath no power over another, one Classis over another, one Provincial Synod over another: Yet I suppose he will not deny, but these may counsel, reprove, approve, reject or convince one the other.

One Church, or many Congregations, may meet with the *Heathen*, may teach them occasionally, convince them, encourage them, and yet have no power over them. Many Churches being sent to the *Parliament* to declare their judgement, couching any thing in agitation, may approve of their counsel and determinations, if holy, or disallow them, confute them, if other, and yet I do believe, he will not say, they have authority over them.

87

Argument 2.

“They cannot upon two or three hours sight, hearing none of them speak, be satisfied in their consciences of their regeneration.

Answ. If they shall hear *positive testimony* of experienced and approved witnesses of their constant and conscientious walking without all scandal. If they shall hear the expressions and *professions of repentance* towards God, and *faith* in our Lord Jesus: This is Argument sufficient to the judgement of charity to hope they are visible Saints, when nothing upon knowledge or proof to the contrary is given in.

Argument 3.

And that therein the greatest weight lies, is this, “What a meeting is this, of divers sister-churches to receive a new sister-church? It is a Church, I believe, meeting together (and yet it is not a Congregation) and it is an ordinary visible Church. For at the admitting of all converts to the Church order, this meeting must be. Surely here our brethren acknowledge, that there is a Church in the N. T. made up of many congregations, which hath power to receive in whole Churches, This is a Visible, Provincial or National Church, which they otherwise deny. If many Churches meet together to ap-

prove of the way and proceeding of a Church gathering by our judgement, then we acknowledge a Church Provincial and National.

Answ. The conference hath no colour of truth in it. Did ever any of us deny the consociation of Churches in way of counsel and advice? and yet consociation is one thing, and the constitution of a new species or kind of a Church is another.

Suppose two Congregations now newly erected and gathered, which have no power over one another, should meet together to consider and consider touching the sin and offence of some classical Churches this then a Provincial or National Church? Suppose two Congregations of two several and distinct Classis should be sent by either of the Classis to concur with a Church in an Island, now to be gathered, to see and consider of their way, and to lend them direction and approbation, and this done ordinarily. Here is a Church-meeting: A Classis it cannot be, because they are two only Congregations of the Classis: and Provincial it is not, nor yet National: Therefore there is now a new Church made up of many Churches, which is neither Classical nor Provincial. When will there be an end of such inferences?.

88

6. “*We see no warrant, why one, not yet a Pastor or Elder, should take upon him to speak to a Congregation, though they all consent that he speak.*

Answ. If M. R. will look into the practice of the Church of Scotland, or to his first Book. He shall find, that there be such, who must have their gifts of teaching tried; and therefore may and do teach, before they be chosen: here is preaching and Church preaching and praying, and yet there is no Pastor. And yet this will abide the measure of the golden reed.

7. He adds, “*We desire to see such a Church action, as Act. 2. where 3000 were added in one day.*

Answ. We also join our desires with his, and should be glad to see such a day, for we see not unwarrantableness then, nor would be now, if all circumstances did concur.

The 8th is answered in the 3d.

The 9th which tells us of an Encouragement to be good stewards of the manifold grace of God, we see it warrantable to provoke each man to traffic with his talent.

But that all, who enter, are sworn to attend public prophecy, it happily may be found in *M. Rathbones* curranto, which he picked out of some man's letter, who writ he could not tell what: nor could he read happily aright what he wrote. For I know no such custom of the Churches of Christ amongst us.

10. "*Here are Church acts, and the power of the keys exercised, in preaching, praying and discipline, and yet no stewards nor officers of the house who have received the keys.*

Ans. That of preaching and praying hath been answered in the *sixth*. And if by an act of discipline, *any act* of the power of the keys be meant, its then plain, there may, an act of *that* power be put forth without any officer. For an officer, and so other members may be admitted, and in case rejected and excommunicated by the Church.

89

CHAP. VIII.

Wherein the Precedency of a Church, as it is Totum homogeneum, is handled.

WHEN we look at the Church, as *Totum essentiale*, we attend two things in it

1. How *constituted* in the causes of it.
2. How *qualified* and adorned.

The first hath been dispatched in the fore-going Chapters, wherein we have endeavoured to prove, That *visible Saints* are the only true *Matter*, and *Confederation* only true *Form* of a visible Church.

We are now to enquire after the second, *viz.* such *qualifications*, which are of special weight, and do in an especial manner *belong to the Church* under this consideration.

Qualification then is either in regard of the

- Order or *precedency* of it before
 - Officers
 - or
 - Presbyterial Church.
- Excellency* of it in
 - Power.*
 - Privileges.*

Touching this *Congregational Church*, if we look at the Order and *Precedency* of it, we have two Questions that offer themselves to our consideration.

1. *Whether a company of believers*, thus visibly consociating themselves, are truly called, and are in truth, and indeed, a *Church*, in the phrase of Scripture, *before they have Officers*.

The trumpet here gives an uncertain sound: and therefore we cannot tell well where to fallen, M. R. his expressions are so full of variety. Sometimes he seems to speak the same with us: sometimes to be of a differing mind. One while he lays the weight

90

upon a ministerial Church, as including officers therein. Another while he seems not only to deny the Church, thus considered, to be *Totum organicum*, but to deny the Church to be a Church, without Officers.

To avoid therefore all offensive mistakes, we shall in short set down, *what we conceive* to be the truth in this case: and so we shall occasion Mr R. more fully to explicate his mind.

When the *Church* is called *Ministerial*, that word may be attended in a *double consideration*.

1. *Generally*, as implying *any delegated power*, in the exercise of any *Church-acts* in way of subordination under Christ, and by power and appointment from him. Thus a number of believers or visible Saints now consociated, hath power of *admission* of new members, and *election* of Officers, according to the order of Christ, and in case the officer chosen shall prove heretical and obstinately wicked, they have power to reject him, and make him no officer unto them.

All these are granted by M. R.

But these are *acts of Church-discipline largely* taken, and acts of power. For to *give a key of power*, and to take away a key of power, argues power in so doing, according to the institution of Christ.

How far the Church may upon just grounds, and for just cause proceed to excommunicate, we shall afterwards enquire.

2. Ministerial is taken more *strictly*, as it seems Mr R. would by his expressions make us conceive: then it implies an *Office-power*, or *power of Officers*, and so it calls for Ministers, *i.e.* Officers.

And in this sense it should be without sense to affirm, That the Church should be *Totum organicum, without organs*: That the Church should consist of *Ruling officers, and Ruled-people*, when it is without all officers.

These things being premised, our apprehensions are thus laid down.

The Church of Visible Saints confederating together to walk in the fellowship of the Faith, as thus, it is *Totum essentiale*, It is *before* all Officers.

91

Argument 1.

God hath set Officers in the Church, 1 Cor. 12:28.

Therefore the Church is before the Officers.

As the setting of the candle in the candlestick, presupposeth the candlestick. The Church is the candlestick, *Rev. 1:20*. The Officers are the candles.

M. R. answers, “*God hath put and breathed in man a living soul: Therefore he is a living man, before the soul was breathed in him.*”

“*Friend, The logic is nought.*”

Reply, A friendly warning is good: but the *Logic may be good* also, for any thing that is here said. For, It is said, *God made man of the earth, i. e.* The body of man of the earth; and he breathed into the nostrils of that body, or into that body so made by that mean, *the breath of life*. And I suppose, to affirm, the body was made before the soul was infused, that the *body*, which is the subject to receive the soul, must in nature be *before the soul*, is *very good Logic*. And thus the companion holds betwixt the *Church*, as *totum essentiale*, and the *Officers*, But to take *man* in a proper sense, as an *effect* consisting of *body and soul*, and to say in propriety of speech, *God breathed life into an effect that had life*, God put a form into an effect that had a form, no law of language will admit such an expression, much less the rules of reason bear it. For the form is put into the matter, and is there in nature before the effect exists. It neither is, nor can be said to be put into the effect.

Besides, Here is yet a further advantage to the cause in hand, in that the Church is not only the subject in which these Officers are, as *totum essentiale*, but by virtue of her choice, she is causal of the Officers call: and therefore in reason must be before them.

M. R. answers secondly, "*The Church is the Candlestick, not simply without candles and lamps: the Church ministerial is the Candlestick, and the Ministers the candles: and by the candles setting in the Church, the Church becomes a ministerial governing Church.*"

Reply, It's cross to all men's apprehensions and expressions, that the *Candlestick* should be no longer a Candlestick, then the candle is in it; why do work-men sell them for Candlesticks, o-

92

ther men count them so, buy them for such, before they put any candles in them? Is not a *subject* truly *affectum ad arguendum*, affected to argue a *separable adjunct*, and so truly called a *subject*, though his *adjunct* be not *there*, and be actually disposed with him? What kind of Logic this is, let the Reader, that hath any logical judgement in him, judge.

As if one should say, It is *not a Corporation* of Aldermen, or free-men *before the Mayor* be chosen. It is true, it is *not a complete corporation* of Mayor and Freemen, unless there be both: But that hinders not, but they be a *corporation of Free-men* united amongst themselves, though there be no Mayor. Nay, they *must* be a corporation, *before* they can chase a Mayor: and therefore they must in reason and nature be before him. A man *cannot* be a *husband*, before he have a wife, yet he may and must be a *man wooing* a woman, before he can make her a wife.

Argument 2.

If the Church be not a Church without Officers, then as often as the Officers die, the Church dieth also. Nay, when the Church shall have just occasion (as such its possible may be) to reject her Officers for heresies, or gross villanies, When they *reject* them, do they therefore *destroy the Church and themselves* in so doing, when they labour to preserve themselves, nay use the means for their preservation?

Both a Corporation, when it puts out a wicked Mayor out of his place and privileges, Do they therefore destroy their own liberties, and nullify their Corporation by that means, which is the especial way and mean of their safety and comfort?

One would think that such Arguments were sufficient to cast a cause, carrying such sensible evidence with them, and yet M. R. strength can turn aside all.

He answers, "*When the shepherds are removed, the tents cannot be called, the shepherds tents: and persecution doth often deface the visible face of a ministerial Church: and to remove the Candlestick is to remove the Ministry, as to take away eyes, and ears, and hands from the body, is to hurt the integrity of it.*

2. "*All communion ministerial, whereby we are a body visible, 1 Cor. 10:16. eating one bread, may well be loosed, when Pastors are removed.*

93

Reply. When the shepherds are removed, the tents cannot be called, *The tents where the shepherds are*, yet they may be called, *The tents fit to receive them*, and in point of that fitness, they are the same they were before they were chosen, and remain the same.

It's true, to *remove the Candlestick* is to remove the Ministry; because the Ministry and Ministers have their *dependence* upon the Church. Destroy the man, the *whole*, you destroy the *parts*. Put it holds not contrariwise. It is true, in a *Ministerial*, i.e. an *Organicum totum*, when you take away any part, you lame the *integrity* of it; but you do not destroy the *essence* and *nature* of it, as *totum essenziale*. Socrates may loose a limb, an eye, an hand, and so he is *not* an *entire man*, consisting of such members, yet he hath *totam naturam & definitionem hominis*, in regard of his *essential causes*.

That which is added, is yet more beside the cause; For its granted on all hands, That where *Officers* are not, there is no communion in the Sacraments. Is there therefore no Church communion? Such consequences come not within the compass of the cause.

We have done now with the first Query, and made it clear,

That this Church is before, all Officers, and may be without them.

The second QUESTION now comes into consideration.

Whether there be any Presbyterian Churches in the New Testament of Christ's appointment and institution, or only Congregational?

94

CHAP. IX.

Of the Nature and Being of a Presbyterian Church.

THE *Qualification of the Church*, as *totum essentiale*, consisted in the Order and *Precedency* of it, in regard of her true Officers, and that we have now dispatched in the answer to the former question. Consider it now, as it stands in comparison and *competition with that*, which our Brethren call a *Presbyterian Church*; and here we shall take in the second question. Which, however it fall far lower, if we look at the proper place; thereof, yet because it fits our purpose in hand, and the laying open of the nature thereof in this place, will give light to that which follows, we shall use this *Crypsis of method*, to make our next enquiry about IT: and this *inquiry* may be referred unto four *Heads*.

1. Wherein the *thence* of a *Presbyterian Church* consists, and how made up.
2. Lay down some *grounds*, which may *clear* the right *discovery* of such a *constitution*.
3. *Reason* from such grounds *against* it.
4. *Answer* such *examples* as carry some semblance at the first *appearance* touching it.

Section 1.

A Presbyterian Church remits, and ariseth upon three main principles, which are as the *pillars* of its special *constitution*.

1. There must be *several* Congregations, made *entire* of such members, as Christ hath appointed, to make up an *integral*

body, of *Officers* which rule; and *people*, which are led and ruled by them.

3. *These Congregations neighbouring together*, so that their communion may be accommodated with more ease, and encourageable convenience, and the scandals that may prejudice and taint by their infectious example, may be more easily cured and remo-

95

ved: And *such a number* of them should enter into *combination* each with other in the concurrence of *common government*, which may relieve the *common good* of all.

3. *These so combined*, are to send their *Rulers*, according to mutual agreement, to manage the great censures of *Christ*, and determine the emergent doubts and difficulties that may arise amongst the combined Congregations: and to such *dispensations* and determinations all the *several Churches* combined are to submit, as to *acts of jurisdiction*, proceeding from such, as are set over them in the Lord for that end.

These Elders and Presbyters of these combined Churches, thus assembled, are called, *A Presbyterian Church*: because *this Representative body* is made up only of Presbyters and Elders.

And of this we are now to enquire, and to lay down such grounds, as may clear the enquiry and discovery of such a constitution: and these are as followeth.

Section 2.

Ground 1.

There is no power of jurisdiction,^a but that which ariseth from the power of Order, which stands by the appointment and institution of Christ.

By power of Order, following the expressions of the School, Papists, and other Writers, I understand nothing else, but *Office-rule*, at which they all look.

And *jurisdiction* to be the exercising of that, as fit object and matter of things and persons are presented. For the very nature of the terms gives in testimo-

ny to this truth, *Executio juris*, or, *Dictio juris*, the Authoritative proclaiming or executing of this kind of power, being *jurisdiction*. This act presumes a Ruler, and that an Office, and a Call to a place of power, fit for that end and purpose.

And hence the *School*, when they will

^a Jurisdiction when it is taken in the largest sense, it hath a respect sometime to the fraternal power of the community, which they may and do put forth according to their place, and the privilege Christ hath licensed them with. And therefore they are said to judge, 1 Cor. 5. (whereof we shall entreat fully, when we come to the proper place thereof, but I intend tint intbh place,) and therefore when I speak of the power of the community, I call it judgement, following the phrase of Scripture.

2. There is jurisdiction official, the specification whereof lies in this, that take it in the peculiar manner of dispensation, it issues only from the office, and can be acted, but by an officer, and so I here look at it, as ever having an eye to order, which in the phrase of the *School*, carries an office with it.

96

give their understanding leave to exercise the liberty of reasonable men, according to the rules of reason, they confess as much, as this amounts to, and may necessarily be collected and maintained from their own principles.

For *Scotus* and *Thomas*, and with them their followers, 4. *Sent. dist.* 18, 19. define the power of the keys by binding and loosing; and in the binding and loosing all jurisdiction,^b (in their sense,) is contained: and this presumes a key, a place and office, unto which the person must be called; a power wherewith he must be invested, before he can put forth those acts.

So *Capreolus* and *Durand: Capreolus*, 4. *Sent. distinct.* 19. *conclus.* 1. *Potestas consiendi, & potestas clavium est unum & idem.*

Only when they would gratify their great master the *Pope*, and do homage to the Church of Rome, they then devise a way to put out the right eye of their reason, and to crook the rule and cross their own principles, that they may promote the primacy and plenitude of the power of the *Pope*.

They would, The *Inferior Priests* to have the *power of the keys*, and *this power of order* to extend it self (*quantum est de se*) to *absolve* all; and therefore *Christ* saith indefinitely, *quorum remiseritis &c. whosoever sins &c.* But the use of this power must be presupposed according to that commission granted to *Peter*, and so the *Pope* ordinarily, that he may extend it, or refrain it as he will.

So *Durand: Per ordinationem Ecclesiae factum est, ut quilibet sacerdos non possit absolvere: (ubi supra contra secundam conclusionem.)* Thus men are forced to turn the edge of their reason against an acknowledged truth, and that against *ordinationem Christi*, to maintain *Ordinationem Ecclesiae, & tyrannidem Papæ.*

But whatever they conceit, the evidence of the truth is so undeniable, that it will constrain the understanding to yield to that which is here required. For this Jurisdiction (in the sense I take it) in the exercise thereof, either requires one called or authorized by office: or else any without this authority may do it. But none is a Steward unless set over the Family. Governments are not in the Church, unless they be appointed by *Christ*, 1 Cor. 12:27, 28. yea the blind Pharisees could grope at this in the darkness of their delusions, as appears by the question they put

* I take here what serves my purpose in hand, to wit, jurisdiction in a narrow sense, but mean not to take all that they give, as intending to include the exercise of all power thereby.

97

unto our Saviour. By *WHAT AUTHORITY dost thou these things*, and who gave thee this Authority? So that the putting of this *Jurisdiction* and *Rule* i.e. *Authoritative* or *Office jurisdiction* (whereof we now speak) into the hands of any, who are *not appointed* to the *Office* of rule, is merely the usurpation

of that *Man of sin*, or a *preparation* to bring him in; or a *remainder* of him, not fully cast out, not the native and natural institution of our Saviour, the *Lawgiver of his Church*, and therefore you shall observe,

Mat. 21:23.

What ever may promote the plenitude of the Pope's power, and bring the last resolution of all thither, It is so given to some of his creatures in eminent place, that in issue it may be confined within the compass of his Triple-crown. Hence the Bishop, which is the Popes *vice-gerent*, he will dispense his power to his poor underlings by such *pittances* and allowances, that the poor Snakes may be trained up by their daily experience to acknowledge, where the treasury of this power is stored up, and whether they must go to fetch it.

Hence First, He must be made a *Deacon*, and allowed to *read*, but not *preach*; to administer *Baptism*, but *not* the *Supper*; not that one Sacrament is of greater eminency then the other: but that the servant must know, they have no power further then they have his allowance.

At the next turn he is made a *Priest*, and to that he hath fresh writings, and fresh Seal, and fresh ordination. And when that is attained, yet he cannot preach in any Assembly besides his own, but he must have a *license* and allowance for that. And *all this ad placitum*.

And therefore when all is granted, he must *do none* of these, *if his Lord Bishop* be *present*, and will officiate in his own person. So much power the Bishop hath over so many Parishes, that by this means his power being received from the Pope, the fulness may be derived from him, and returned to him again in a ready way.

But (as I said) *this is the Pope's usurpation, not Christ's institution*.

Hence the second ground I lay down, is this.

There is no Office in the Church, but only such which are appointed by Christ; and therefore there is no Jurisdiction or rule can be exercised, but only by the officers of Christ.

98

The first part of the conclusion hath been cleared before.

1. *Officers and Offices are Coronation mercies: gifts which proceed only from the Ascention of Christ. Eph. 4:11, 12. When he ascended up on high,—He gave gifts unto men, some teachers, some Pastors, It's Christ's prerogative royal to bestow such gifts.*

2. *They are proper means of his worship, and therefore it is only proper to him to enjoin them.*

3. *It is in his hand only to bless and succeed them in their spiritual dispensations, to the attainment of those supernatural ends. Mat. 28:20. and therefore it appertains to him alone to appoint.*

The inference of the second part of the Conclusion is clear, from what was formerly proved.

All jurisdiction must issue from an Order or Officer.

But there is none, but Officers of Christ allowed in the Church. therefore no jurisdiction spiritual, ecclesiastic, can be exercised, but by an Officer of Christ.

And therefore Surrogates, Chancellors, Arch-deacons, Titans, Officials, Vicars-general, Abbots, Monks, Friars, Cardinals, Jesuits, &c. which are hatched and spawned, by the pride and luxury, ambition and tyranny of that Man of sin, as vermin and strange creatures out of the slime of Nilus; They are none of the Orders and Officers of Christ. And therefore have no authority by any tight from him to exercise any jurisdiction in his Churches, or amongst his people.

Ground 3.

Hence, He that is now called, and appointed an Officer according to God, and the rules of the Gospel, as he needs no other power, but that of his Office, to authorize him to execute it, So there is no power, that can by rule and right hinder him in the due execution thereof.

For it is in Christ alone, as to appoint the calling and Office; so to lay out the bounds and limits, to specific the several actions and operations thereof, therein required; and to exact the performance thereof. Therefore they must attend to teaching and exhortation, Rom. 12:7, 8. They must rule with diligence, take heed to

themselves, and to the flock, Act. 20:28. They must bind up the broken, recall the straying, tender the weak, Ezek. 34:4.

True, by violence and cruelty they may be oppressed, persecu-

99

ted, imprisoned, and by strong hand hindered from doing their work, and then God calls for *suffering, not doing*; otherwise, *Whether it be better to obey God or man*, let any judge.

Hence, These two, *Order or Office, and jurisdiction*, are not members or *species* of power, put in way of *opposition* one against the other, but are *subordination* one to the other.

Hence, There must be an *Office before the jurisdiction*, or *Rule* issuing there-from.

Therefore, *where*, there is *no office*, there is *no right of Rule* or *jurisdiction*, as such, whereof we here speak.

Hence, They, who have the *same, or equal Offices*, they have the *same and equal Office-rule* or *jurisdiction*.

Hence, What ever is *added, beside office*, it adds *no jurisdiction* or *rule ecclesiastic* at all to any.

From these grounds thus laid, I shall take leave to dispute.

Argument 1.

If the Churches combined have no more power, then they had before they were combined; then they can exercise no more jurisdiction then before: and therefore have no Presbyterian power; are not distinct Presbyterian Churches.

But they have no mere power after their combination, then before.

Therefore no Presbyterian jurisdiction: and so are no Presbyterian Churches.

The Assumption, where the doubt only lies, is thus made good.

They who have no more offices not officers, then they had before, they have no more jurisdiction; as in the first ground.

But they have no more officers; because each send their own.

Therefore they have no more power.

Argument 2.

If they have jurisdiction, then, either over all the Churches in the combination, or only over some.

Not over some only in the combination, for that is contrary to their institution and definition of a Presbyterian Church. Therefore they must have jurisdiction over the particular

100

Churches; it may be ten or sixteen more or less in the combination.

But this they have not.

If they have jurisdiction over all these, then are they Officers, Pastors. Teachers, Ruling-Elders, in office to them all. For there must be an Office, and so Officer, before jurisdiction, as in the third ground. There is no jurisdiction exercised, but by an Officer; as in the second ground.

But to say they are Pastors of them all, is to make a road and ready way for Pluralities, Tot-quotes, Non-residencies, &c.

The proof of the *minor*, namely, If they have jurisdiction over all, then are they Pastors and Teachers, &c. This *M. R. denies*.

“Though they rule many Congregations, jet they do not hear that relation of Watchmen and proper Pastors to everyone of these Congregations, that a Pastor of a particular beareth to his particular flock. l. i. p. 325, 326.

Thus *M. R.* becomes like *Naphthali*, gives us pleasant words, but I fear they are but words, 1. Then we will see how they will accord with himself. 2. *How with truth.*

1. His own Words, lib. 2. 335. are these.

“We think the relation of the Eldership to a whole Classical Church, is not founded upon an office different from the offices of Pastors and Elders, which they have and are clothed with, in relation to their particular Congregations; but authoritative acts of the same office.

Whence, I would reason,

If the relation of the Eldership to a Classical Church be founded upon the same office that a Pastor hath to his particular Congregation; then the Elders bear that relation of Watchmen to a Classical Church, which a Pastor doth to his particular flock. For where there, is the same office of Pastor, there is the same relation of Watchman and Pastor, the one issuing from the other.

But M. R. affirms the first: namely, that the relation of the Eldership to a Classical Church is from the same office, which Elders had in relation to their own.

Ergo, They are proper Pastors to the one, as to the other.

Again, They who put forth authoritative acts which issue only from proper Pastors, as in that relation, and in regard of the office,

101

they are proper Pastors to such, upon whom they exercise such acts, otherwise they had no warrant to put them forth.

But that also he affirms.

II. We shall secondly enquire, how it suits *with the truth.*

These authoritative acts, which are put forth, issue from him, either as a Pastor, or its no Pastor, Ruler or no Ruler:

If as no Pastor, then acts of jurisdiction, and those authoritative, and supreme ways expressed and exercised by one, who is no Ruler.

And this M. R. and all men gain-say.

If they proceed from him, as a Pastor, then as a Pastor of his particular, or as a Pastor of another Congregation.

Not as a Pastor of another Church, beside his own. For then one man may have two Pastoral offices, and two Churches, which is contrary to Scriptures, and all sound Divines.

Ergo, They must proceed from him, as he is Pastor to his own particular flock, Quod suit demonstrandum,

Again,

If he put forth such acts as a Pastor, then those upon whom he puts them forth, either are his flock, or are not his flock. His flock they must be, if he be a Pastor and shepherd to them; for that the nature of relation requires.

If his flock, then either the same, he first had, his Congregation, or another.

The Churches combined cannot be his Congregation, because these are many and distinct. Ergo, He must be a Pastor of many flocks: namely of his particular, And these also. And so there is a ready way and road, for Pluralities and Tot-quotes, Quod suit demonstrandum.

And let the Reader COMPARE these expressions?

“It is true, they are called the Elders of the Presbyterial Church of Pergamus, but there is a general and DIFFERENT RELATION from that which each Pastor doth carry to his own flock. lib. 2. p. 326. lin. 46.

And these words, p. 333. the three last lines.

“The Relation, of an Eldership to a whole Classical Church is founded, not upon a different office from the office of Pastors and Elders, which they have and are clothed with, IN RELA-

102

“tion to their particular flock.

How these will suit, we cannot see, without some help from M. R.

Consider we now the DIFFERING ACTS that are in the Eldership of a Presbyterian Church, from a Congregational, as M. R. lays them down.

Difference 1.

“The Presbytery are Elders to the Classical Church κατὰ τι, not in things proper to each Congregation, but in things common to all, or in that which is the proper object of Government; to wit, those things which rather concern the consociation of the thirty Churches, then the thirty combined Churches in particular, lib. 2. pag. 326.

The practice of the Classis opposeth this expression. For take a private offence, admonish then the offending party. 2. Upon not hearing, take one or two.: 3. The offending party persisting, let him bring it to the Church.

This is proper to the Congregation: Yet by Classical principles, the particular Congregation must not admonish: For that Church, that must speak to the Offender, in case he do not hear, that Church may cast him out. So the words, Mat. 18:17. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be as an Heathen.* But the Classis allows not this.

Again,

Suppose the party be admonished by the particular Congregation for this his private fault, thus persisted in, and yet shall continue to be obstinate: This obstinacy, is, *Res propria*, to this

Church, Why may she not now cast him out without a Classis? For this pertinacy did *imotescere* only to the Church.

“If it be said, When he is cast out, the neighbouring Churches must shun and avoid him, upon knowledge given.

I answer, so must the Churches of another Classis, of another Province; and therefore there is no more need the one should have a hand in the censure then the other.

The second *Difference* M. R. adds (p. 326.) is this.

“*The Presbytery doth rather take care of the regulating of the acts of Governing in all these Churches, then the Governed Churches.*

Ans. They express their care in these judicial acts, and that

103

directly and immediately upon scandals and scandalous persons in any Congregation under the Presbytery, *both censures of Admonition and Excommunication*; as also in the direct decision, and so removing, at least stopping any error of any member arising, *so that they fall upon the Church to be governed directly.*

The third *Difference*.

“*The Elders of the Classical Presbytery are Elders to all these Churches, as the Elders themselves are in Collegio Presbyterali, and properly, as they are in Court.* So he.

But I *assume*; The Elders *there*, are proper Pastors of their own particular Congregations. Therefore they must (if at all) be so here.

That these differences do not in the least measure shew a different relation from that which each Pastor doth carry to his own flock, appears thus,

Those acts which a Pastor puts forth in his proper place to his proper flock, those cannot shew any different relation in that office.

But all these actions specified, a Pastor doth put forth to his proper flocks, when he acts as such a Pastor, Instance.

A Pastor in an Island, where, *as a Pastor* he cannot teach, admonish, excommunicate, but *in cætu Congregational*, not severed from his Church (as we say) or his Consistory, or *Collegio Presbyterali* (as they say) yet this doth not hinder, but he puts forth these acts in relation to his proper flock. Therefore if an Elder in a Classical Presbytery put forth the like actions, these do not prove, nor

can hinder, but he may still be to them as a Pastor to a proper flock in those regards.

Difference 4.

“The Presbytery hath a Church relation to all these thirty Churches not taken distributively, but collectively, as they all are united in one Church classical, under one external Government.

Answer.

1. *If the Presbytery put forth acts of jurisdiction upon those Churches distributively, as they are severed; then they have a Church-relation to them distributively considered. For jurisdiction issues from Church-relation, and indeed from Church, office, else it could never be exercised.*

But that their practice evidenceth, for they admonish, censure, several persons of several Churches.

104

2. *These Churches taken collectively, are nothing but a Classis, or so many Presbyters meeting together: and to say they are Elders over Elders, and exercise Jurisdiction over them, hath been conceived absurd in the like case by Mr Rutherford.*

That which M. R. adds in the next place, p. 327. As

“Elders of an Independent congregation are not Elders of their single congregations, being separated from their Court, and extra collegium Presbyteriale.

This Assertion at first sight seems a Paradox. For if their office remains the same, when separated as well, as when assembled, when in the Court and Congregation, as out, & contra. Then their relation holds, and their jurisdiction.

At verum primum.

It’s true they never put forth public acts of jurisdiction, but in the Court, nor act of pastoral teaching and administration of Sacraments, but in assembled Church: Doth any therefore conclude, That they are not teachers, nor have both Jus, and Power of teaching, when they are separated from the Assemblies?

Difference 5.

“Classical Elders in the Court have power of jurisdiction in relation to this Presbyterial or Classical Church: but they have

not properly an ordinary power of Order to preach to them all, and every one. 327.

Answer.

This jurisdiction issue from *the same office* of Pastor, *then* they have *power of order; and that to preach.*

But that it so issues, hath been shewed, and is also granted.

M. R. adds.

“The Elders of a particular congregation have power of order, and power of JURISDICTION without the Court: but they have not power of CHURCH-JURISDICTION, but in the Court. For there is a difference betwixt power of jurisdiction, which Elders have as watch-men, and a power of Church-jurisdiction which Elders have not, but in foro Ecclesiæ.

Answer.

If they have the *same office*, whence all these acts of jurisdiction arise, as well without the Court, as within; *then* they have *the power of jurisdiction*, as well without the Court, as within.

105

It's true, they cannot *exercise some acts* of jurisdiction, but in Court; no more can they put forth the acts of *public preaching* and administering Sacrement, but *in foro Ecclesiæ*. Yet I never yet heard any man affirm, That they had no power to do these, when they were not *foro Ecclesiæ*, as though their entering into the Assembly should add this power.

That example of the *great Sanhedrim* toucheth not this cause, or else destroys it, if it be paralleled in all the particulars of it. I will suit it with a more sensible pattern every way alike. A *Justice of peace* in the Country, or *Burgess* in a Corporation, are chosen to be members in Parliament, the one a *Burgess*, the other a *Knight of the Shire*: Here are now *two* special places or *Offices distinct*, and here we can see a plain and open difference. And if M. R. will grant the like, that when a *Ruler* of a Congregation is appointed a *member of a Classis*, he hath a *new office* distinct from the office he had in the Congregation, we shall then know where to find this Classical mystery, and discover the crossness of it to Christ's Government.

He adds lastly.

“I distinguish the proportion; If they be Elders in these common affairs, which concern government in general; then are they Elders in feeding by the Word of knowledge, and in governing in all the particulars which concern the government of each Congregation: that I deny, says he.

Answer.

1. It's obvious to each man's apprehensions, that every Elder and particular Governor in his Congregation, as he hath *the nature of an Elder in general*: so out of power he can, and doth put forth *general actions* that are *common to other Elders*, and so also meet with those general things which concern Government in general. For where the act is, the object must needs be in its proportion, and all this he doth without any Classis in his particular station. For the species determines the act of the *genus*: as *Socrates* confines the acts of human nature to himself.

2. It's well known, That the *Classis meddles with the particular offences of particular persons in all particular Congregations*, even such which are *as special*, as any Elder in an Island doth meddle with in his own place.

3. If all acts of jurisdiction, whether they be *authoritative*

106

preaching, as well as *authoritative governing*, and that in particular, as well as in general, issue from *one* and the *same office*; why there should be the *office over all*, and towards all, and *not the same act*, no word warrants.

4. It's as undeniable, There be *general acts in preaching and watching*, which are common to all Congregations, which the Classis nor do, nor can dispense conscientiously, because they cannot attend them. Nor yet will it suffice to say, That he was Pastor to the Catholic Church before, for then before this combination he had as good power to exercise jurisdiction, as any who be in the combination. But *M. R.* his own principles will not permit such an Assertion: For he affirms, *That one Congregation hath not power over another, one Classis over another*; and therefore these Pastors and teachers are *Officers* by an *especial appropriation*, which *elders* out of the circuit *are not*.

Argument 3.

That coarse which divides the things which God hath joined together, and ought soever to go together, that is unlawful.

But to sever jurisdiction and teaching, is to part the things that God hath joined together. For both issue from the office of Pastor and Teacher, and if one be required, by the same reason may the other be exacted: and yet the Presbyterian combination *severeth* these. The *first part* is past denial.

The second I shall thus make good.

What acts and duties the office of a Pastor requires to a flock; those acts and duties an officer or Pastor is bound to put forth.

But ruling and teaching belong to the office of a Pastor and Teacher, because they have the power of the keys, and to them it appertains to use all these in binding and loosing, as the flock shall require: And these cannot be fully used in binding and loosing, but by *teaching and ruling*, Act. 20:18. 1 Pet. 5:1, 2.

Again, Those *actions* of their office, which are of necessity required to *procture the end and good of the flock*, those they must put forth.

But *both* these of *teaching and ruling* are of *necessity* required to *attain the end of their office*, and that is, *The gathering and perfecting of the Saints*, Ephes. 4:12. And this will not be attained, but by the use of all these to their best advantage; both teaching and ruling being serviceable, according to God, for the quickening of

107

the soul in the ways of grace, and the preventing and purging out of all that leaven of sin, which may be prejudicial or hurtful to that work of the Lord.

To this M. R. answers many things, *l. 2. p. 329.*

“At Grand-fathers and Fathers do bear a relation to the same children divers ways: both are Fathers, but both are not begetting fathers: So also do the Classical Elders, and Elders of a Congregation bear divers relations to the flock.

Reply.

If they have such relations to their flocks as Grand-fathers and Fathers, *then, as a grand-father cannot be it father; or a Father, a Grand-father, to the same child, so an Elder can-*

not be a proper Elder, and a Classical Elder to the same Congregation.

These relations of Grand-father and Father come from several grounds, from which the relative respects issue. But *classical* and *proper* Elders issue from *one* and the *same office*, which they have, and are clothed with, in relation to their proper flock, l. 2. 333. yea his words are express. "*Elders proper and classical have not two offices, but only they perform two acts of one and the same office.* lib 2. 334.

Lastly, he answers.

"*The judicatures of Classis and Congregation do not differ formally or specifically, but only in more or less extension of power,* lib. 2. p. 338.

From *whence* to my understanding, such *collections* seem fair and to follow undeniably.

If there be *one office* in the constitution, then there is the *same definition of an office* belonging to the Elder of a *Classis* and *Congregation*: then the *same causes*, then the *same election and choice*. Then *what* he doth by virtue of his office *to one*, he is bound to do *to the other*. Then *what operations* he putteth forth in *the one*, he can put forth in *the other*.

Again, If they differ but in extension, then *vis intrinseca* and incentive is *the same* in the *Elders* of a *Congregation*, as of a *Classis*. Therefore there is no *specific* act, that the one puts forth, but the other can put forth, as occasion shall require. For, *Gradue non variant speciem*. Therefore in case there be objective matter presented for *Ordination* or *Excommunication* in a *Congregation*, they can put forth such operations: for they have

108

the *same intrinsecal and intensive* power, and in *that* are *all the causes* of these operations seen, when a fit object is presented.

Those expressions that in the *Court A family at Jerusalem*[^], Act. 15. *they are Elders in relation to the whole Churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, and the Gentiles, collectively taken in these dogmatical points: And the same Elders were in special manner Elders to the congregations of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, taken distributively.*

The *Reply* is, The Elders did the one *as Counsellors*, they governed the other *as Rulers*, as we hope will appear in its proper place.

But that other, to wit, *l. 2. 330.*

“*By that same official power, that a Pastor teacheth his own flock, viva voce, by vocal preaching as a Doctor, he teacheth other Churches by writing.*”

This is an *invention*, I confess I never heard, nor saw before, and whether ever it saw light or no, I cannot tell: only I suppose it will not be offensive to make some enquiry after it, if it be but for mine own information.

Clear then it is, He teacheth other Churches by writing.

But that this, thus teaching of Churches comes from *the same official power* that he teacheth *his own flock vivâ voce*, is questioned upon *these grounds.*

1. *It crosseth the nature of the office.*

For, first, That *official power* by which he *preacheth* to his proper flock, he received *by election* from the people, stands bound to them, may be rejected by them in case of delinquency notorious.

Secondly, By that official power, he *can require* all his to *hear.*

Thirdly, In case they gain, say offensively, *to censure.*

If his *Writing* proceeds out of that power, then by virtue thereof he could challenge and require them *to read it*, and *consure them for not reading.* Nay, upon this ground he should not only have power over the Churches *within the Presbytery* or Classis, but *over those*, who are under other Classis, nay other *Provinces, Nations, &c.* Nay the case may be that he may have official power over *all the Churches* in the world, for they all may be taught by his books and writing: *yea*, those that are *infidels*, and yet have

109

but knowledge of the language, they may be taught by this, and why may he not be Pastor to perform acts from his office to them all?

1. *It misseth that right ground of power:* for if this power proceed *from his office*, then it is some where required, that *each man* should as well *print*, as *preach.* For to preach *vivâ voce* is required of every Pastor, out of his office: but if printing issue from

the same office, the one should as necessarily be required as the other: and hence, what he preacheth he must print: for he is bound to teach his people *vivâ voce*, by virtue of his office, and if his office calls for this, he is bound to this also, as well as to that: but that we find writ in no Gospel that I know of.

3. *That which another may do with as much authority and more;* I mean authority of truth, as being more able, yet being out of office, That cannot belong to the power of an office.

When it was asked, Whether are the Classical Elders, Ruling Elders, of Teaching Elders to the classical Church?

M. R. answers p. 330. *“They are both, and they are neither in divers considerations. They an teaching Elders in all the Congregations distributively taken: They are ruling in all collectively taken. They are teachers κατὰ τι, in some reserved acts, not constant teachers. Its true, he that is a ruling Pastor, is also a teaching Pastor, but not to that same flock, always.*

The Reply is,

When we enquire, *What kind of Elder a Classical Elder is*, we are told, that they are Elders *teaching* in all Congregations *distributively*, i.e. take classical Elders, as they are Congregational Elders; and that is all one, as to say, *No classical Elders, and then they are teaching Elders*: for so far as they have reference to their proper flocks, they were teaching Elders before the combination, and so all that is gained, is this, *A classical Elder, as he is no classical Elder, is a teaching Elder*; and so there is not a *distinction*, or divers consideration of a classical Elder (which should have been the term distinguished) but a *non-consideration* of him, *as such*.

Further, It hath been often said, That these acts of the Elders, issue from one and the same office: now where there is *one* and the *same office*, there is *one* and the *same officer*,

110

and so the *same power* of teaching and ruling, and the *same duty*.

Lastly, We have here that for granted, which before we concluded, *That a person may have many flocks*: he may be a *teaching Pastor* in one, and a *Ruling* in two or three, or thirty: for it's

affirmed, That a Ruling Pastor is also a Teaching Pastor, but not to that same flock always. Therefore he may have many flocks. And so the Lord *Bishop may be a teaching Pastor in the Cathedral at Canterbury, but a Ruling Pastor in all the Province collectively taken.*

Obj. *He arrogates this alone as one.*

Ans. But shew a rule of Christ, why the Elders may not give that to him, and liberty to take many to help him, as well as you join many to concur with him in that work.

I believe *he* hath no power to take many with himself to rule a Province of 30 Churches, besides his own; And I believe you have no rule of Christ to join many, to rule many Churches, beside their own particular charges. A shepherd ought to have but one flock: one is as much as he can rule, one is as much as he hath authority to rule. *Relatorum unum uni tantum.* It's lastly added, p. 330.

“Neither is this true, because power of jurisdiction is founded upon power of order, Therefore teaching should be every way commensurable with ruling. For the Eldership convened in Court, and only formalitèr in foro Ecclesiæ, in this Court hath Church power of jurisdiction, in a Congregation, and in this Court they govern: But the Eldership in this Court neither doth preach, nor can preach.

Reply.

Ruling and teaching appertain to the Pastor *in suo more*, and as his peculiar properties, and therefore they are made a description of them, *Rom. 12:7, 8. with 1 Tim. 3:5.*

2. *His flock will need,* and every shepherd should do the one, as well as the other.

3. Without *both* he cannot fulfil his Ministry, and attain his end in procuring the good of his flock commended to his care. Therefore the reason alleged here, and propounded formerly, hath no eviding force in it.

For the Elders, *if Pastors, and in office, when from the Court, then have they Church jurisdiction cut of the Court, But the first is true.*

111

Add hereunto also, That all public censures ought to be dispensed *in the Congregation*; and *there*, I suppose, its not only possible that the Elders *may* preach, but they *must* preach also.

Argument 4.

That which lays a burthen upon teaching Elders, Which God never said, nor are they ever able to discharge, that is not suitable to-God's will and Word.

But this Classical course doth so.

The *Assumption*, which only can be questioned, is proved by M. R. his words, who imposeth an office-care upon one over *many* flocks, when as *one is sufficient* to improve *all* abilities of the *most able* Minister on earth: And therefore the Apostle *appointed Elders in every Church*, and charged them to attend the *flocks*, not *flock*.

Besides, I had thought the *loathsomeness of pluralities* had been not only hissed out of the world, but abhorred of all conscientious men.

M. R. that he might remove the loathsome distaste, wherewith this reason loads the cause, he labours, *Clavum clavo pellere*. And therefore would bear the world in hand, That *the way of watching over sister-churches*, and other Christians of other Congregations (*which we and all the World allow, as that which piety and Christianity, the law of Religion and Reason require*) to be as *dreadful, for onerous, careful, laborious, watchfulness in way of conscience as to be bound thereunto by way of office*.

To which I say, GOD FORBID.

His *Reasons* are mainly *two*.

1. "*We have a divine command, that we be our brother's keeper, and this watch calls for like onerous, laborious cure, as if we were in office.*

2. "*We make the ground and foundation of governing, a classical Church, to be that bond of love and union of one body of Christ,*

and this bond of lovely and brotherly consociation commands and ties, us to do no more in governing and helping other sister-churches, then if we had no further warrant to promote their edification, then the alone relation of brotherly consociation.

The sentence is somewhat imperfect, and that it may reach his purpose, I think it must be thus expressed. The bond of brother-

112

ly consociation tieth us to *do much*, as if we had no further warrant then this: for to say, that brotherly consociation tieth us to do, is *true*, in governing sister churches, then brotherly consociation can do, is *true*, but wholly *impertinent*, and of no proof to the point in hand; and wholly misseth M. R. his scope, which is to compare the bond and burthen betwixt brotherly *consociation* and *office-imposition*, as if that there were a parity betwixt them.

For REPLY, we shall examine, 1. the truth of the *Assertion*, And 2. give answer to the reasons alleged for it.

1. Touching his *Assertion* it self, we shall oppose *one* that is professedly contradictory thereunto.

Assertion.

There is not the like cause, onerousness and labour required in duties of Christian watchfulness in a brotherly way, as to do the duties to others, to whom we are found in way of office-relation.

And *this imparity* appears, partly, in the *preparations* required to the services; partly, in the *execution* of them.

1. For *preparation* to the work of *teaching*, which the Pastor and Teacher are to attend, by their places, *labouring in word and doctrine*, (that as good stewards they may lay in provision old and new, and be able to divide the word of truth aright) they are to bestow their *whole time* and strength, and that constantly to this end. Therefore they are enjoined to *attend to exhortation and teaching*, the main bent of their daily studies must go that way. They must search to know the state of their flock, *Search the Scriptures, and study pleasant words*, which may with most plainness, and profit, and power convey the truth to the understanding of the meanest under their charge. And therefore *they must not be entangled in the affairs of this life*. They must lay aside *the attending of tables*, and give *themselves to the word and prayer*. The Apostles professed to take this course (though extraordinarily gifted and assisted) as occasion did require.

If the Apostles laid aside the care of the poor in dispensing the treasury, because that would hinder the work of the Ministry; if there had been any work of *like* care and onerousness, *Why should they not have laid aside that also?* I cannot see it: and therefore they judged not the exercising the acts of Christian helpfulness of this nature.

¹ Tim. 4:13, 16.

Eccles. 12:10.

² Tim. 2:4.

Acts 6:4.

Acts 6:2, 3, 4.

113

In a word, to make preparation for the work of the *Sabbath*, and the public dispensation and administration of Christ's holy things, if the improvement of time and strength be constantly required, if *brotherly consociation* required the *like care*, and laid the like onerousness upon a Pastor in Christian duties of love, they were no more able to discharge both, then to *Pastors to two or three Congregations*, which all men confess to be cross to God's command. But blessed be God it is far otherwise. His ways are full of mercy, wisdom, pity and goodness, and he exacts no more of his people, then in an evangelical way they are able to perform.

And therefore *in our Christian watch*, I am bound only to administer *occasionally*, rebukes, counsels, comforts and exhortations, as I meet with brethren of other Congregations, and I see their occasions require it, so far as God puts present ability or opportunity into my hand, all which labour and burthen is lighter then the nail of the little finger, compared with the body of that care and burthen, which concerns a Teacher in office towards those, to whom he is bound by that relation.

2. Look we again into the *dispensation and execution* of these services, the *imparity* also will appear plainly.

If an officer hear of a scandalous course of such, who be his sheep, he is bound to make diligent search touching the truth thereof, and upon proof made, he is bound to convince, and admonish: If he shall not hear, to take one or two; if not hear them, then to complain to the Church, of such a delinquent.

But thus I am *not bound* to bestow my time, and employ my care *with all Christians*, with whom I shall meet, in the compass of the *same Classis, or the same Province*: for it is impossible, I should so do. If I hear of many scandals, that many have given in several Congregations, Countries, nay, as the occasion of travelling and merchandizing may require; a man shall be forced to see many in many places: Must now the traveller or merchant lay aside all his business, and deal with all these? Or in case he return home, the pressures of his employments calling him thither, Must he needs go into *France, Germany, Holland*, to proceed against such Delinquents? I suppose each man sees the absurdity without spectacles. It's impossible any man should attend such a proceeding. And therefore, blessed be our Saviour, who never

115 [114]

required if, never laid such a burthen upon any to practise in the manner; but hath provided in his infinite wisdom, a nearer course, which may be followed, with comfort and convenience: *He hath appointed guides in every Church*, i.e. *Ruling Elders*, who are *eyed wings* to the people, over whom they are placed; they are at hand, they are by office appointed to deal in such cases, and they live and converse one with another, have charge over them, and authority put upon them to that purpose, and are set apart from other entanglements to attend the improvement of all ordinances, for the good of those under their charge, that their evils may be seen, searched and reformed.

Nor let any man think to case this inconvenience, by saying, that a person is a *proper Pastor* to the one, and a *Pastor κατὰ τὴν* to the other removed: for *this device*, like a warm hand, strokes the sore, but will not cure it. For by this *it is granted, that pastoral care is far more onerous and laborious, then Christian and brotherly care in some sense*, which is now our question.

2. It's affirmed in the place, and often expressed by M. R. That there is but *one*, and the *same office*, whence all this watchfulness issues towards all. And therefore as it hath the same bond, so it requires the same service: And therefore all such conceits are meetly coined, to *cousen men's* consciences, and so to keep them quiet, but they will never got at the great day of account.

For the question will be, *Hadst thou the same pastoral relation to the one as to the other, at thy sheep?* If thou stoodest bound to them as thy sheep, by the same Office and Call, the needs of both thou wert bound to supply, and the good of both thou wert in like manner bound to promote, *Ephes. 4:13, 14.*

3. But lastly, M. R. his own expression will not admit any such consideration, as this: for he intends the comparison betwixt *brotherly care and pastoral care* to a man's proper flock. For his words are these,

"I clear it in this, namely, That there is as great care and onerousness, in foro Dei, lies upon a brother, as upon a Pastor, in the watching for the good of a brother. A man is a gifted preacher in a Congregation, in an Island, there is no other gifted of God to preach the Gospel, but he only: I would think, at a brother, he were under as great an obligation of care and laborious onerousness

114 [115]

"of conscience, to bestow his talent for the gaining of souls by preaching, though he weere not called to be their Pastor, as if he were called to be their Pastor.

The case is here evident, that Mr. R. his intendment is to compare the *cure of a Pastor over his proper flock*, and *brotherly care over Christians together.*

And here also I must crave leave to *differ* wholly from Mr R. his opinion. For it is granted, that this gifted person is not called to preach, nor will the people in the Island so acknowledge him: Therefore they are not bound to maintain him; Hence I should rather think thus,

He that useth his general calling so, as that he destroys his particular, he useth it disorderly: For these are in subordination, not in opposition.

But so to preach (being gifted, as in the example given) *is to use his general calling* (for he doth what is done out of Christian charity) *so as that he distroys his particular: For he must of necessity lay aside the attending tables, i.e. his worldly occasions: that would and did take his time and strength, if he come to bestow himself in his preparations and dispensations in a Pastor-like, manner, i.e. as Pastors use to do.*

Besides, To do as much in a general way of charity, as that which amounts to the work of a particular calling, is *to confound genetal and particular callings*, which God, and rule have distingnished.

When M. R. saith,

“I desire to know what the naked relation of authority or jurisdiction addeth to this care and onerousness in point of labour by preaching the gospel.

It’s easy to return, That *Jurisdiction implies an office*: an office doth not only add a special bond, but requires more service with the greater improvement of time, and strength, and constancy therein, as it hath appeared before.

2. The *two Reasons*, which M. R. propounds for proof of the conclusion, have not solidity enough to settle the understanding of a man seriously judicious.

The frame of the first *Reason* of M. R. is this,

“If we have a divine command to be our brethren’s keepers, then

116

“our watch in that regard tarries and requires as much care and onerousness as office-watch.

Answer.

The *consequence* is to be denied, as no way suitable to the rule of truth, as it hath appeared at large in the former enquiry, and this one thing is also enough to make it palpable. I am bound by that divine command to keep many brethren from danger, with whom I occasionally meet with once or twice in my life: and therefore can relieve them no more: Am I therefore bound by my office to watch no more, nor lend no further relief to such as be committed to my care? Will it go for good pay at our appearance before Christ, to say, I am bound by office to watch no more over the people left to my care and custody, then I am bound as a Christian to be my brother’s keeper, in a Classis or Province? Many of them I could never see, or very seldom lend any succour unto in all my life: Therefore I am bound to do no more to those that are under my charge: If I occasionally meet with them, to do good occasionally to them, but never to bestow my time and strength constantly to attend

their comfort, to bind up the broken, to recall those that go astray, and to heal and help the feeble. The second Reason comes out of the same mint, and in form its thus.

Reason 2.

“If the foundation of governing a classical Church be the love and union of the numbers of one body of Christ: Then there is at much care, onerousness and labour, which is required in brotherly consociation to help, at the care and onerousness, which it required in office-help, or that which is required in the jurisdiction, which comes from officers. The first part is true: Therefore

Answer.

The Proportion deserves a *denial*, as *not* having a semblance of truth in it. *Because I love* all such as are consociated with me under one National Synod, whom I never had a sight of, never came to speech with all, with whom I could never meet to do good to them, or receive any good from them in converse: That *therefore* I should stand bound to put forth the like onerous, laborious care for their spiritual good, as a person that stands charged with them in *way of office*, one would certainly conclude and readily, either those officers do too little, or else I am bound

117

to do too much, more then I possibly can attain unto.

The officers must do too little, if they should discharge an office towards such, whom they never saw, nor knew; never did any good to them, nor received any good from them.

Or else *I should be bound to do too much* (more then its possible I can attain unto) If I should stand engaged to comfort, counsel, direct, reform, and proceed in censure against such for their evils, which officers must do by Christ’s appointment, being sent to gather and perfect the Saints, when I shall never converse with thousands in the nation, nor they with me, until my dying day.

Our 5. Argument.

If they be Pastors overall the Congregations in the circuit, then they were new chosen by the several Congregations, or not.

If they were not chosen, then a Pastor may be a Pastor by an especial appropriation to a people, of whom he was never chosen, which is cross to the rules of the Gospel, and the nature of the relation.

If they were chosen by them all, then each of them is bound as much to all, as the first people, and therefore as much to preach and perform pastoral acts to the one, as to the other. 2. Here is really non-residency brought in. Nor will it satisfy, they are Pastors *κατὰ τι*, for if they stand in the same relation of a Pastor's office to a Classis, as a Pastor doth to his own flock, then they must be chosen thereunto, and are Pastors properly, for so Pastors are to their own flock.

But each Pastor in the combination stands in the same relation of a Pastor's office to a Classis, as a Pastor doth to his own flock.

Both propositions are M. Ruter. The major, l. 1. p. 56. l. 2. 201, 102.

The Assumption or second part. Lib. 2. 329, 333, 338.

“Mr R. tells us, l. 2. p. 344. That they are called Elders at Ephesus, i.e. of every Church in that combination, in that sense, that Kings are called Kings of the nations, not because every King was King of every nation: for the King of Edom was not the King of Babylon, yet, in cumulo, they did fill up that name, to be the Kings of the nations: So are Elders of Jerusalem called, in cumulo, Elders of all the Churches Jerusalem collectively taken. And as it followeth not, that the King of Edom (because he is one of the Kings of the nations) is elected to the Crown of Chaldea by the voice of the Nobles: so it is not a good consequence, such a number are called

118

“the Elders of the Church of Jerusalem, therefore the several Churches should choose them and submit to them.

Reply.

It is true, these are good words, but it is as true, they do not touch the cause in hand, much less confute it, if they be rightly considered.

The Kings of the nations are so styled by way of distinction, because of the special rule they have, distinct from the rule which is erected in the Church: And the fair and familiar meaning is, This King is Ruler over those people that are within the compass of his nation or territory: another over his people, and so every one over his own particular subjects, and hath no Kingly rule at all in another's kingdom: so here the Elders of the Churches are and may be so called, because they feed and rule within

their particular Congregations, but exercise no rule in *another's Church*, no more than the *King of Edom* doth in the *Kingdom of Chaldea*: and therefore the members of one Church, as they did not choose, so they should not submit to the rule of the Elders of another Congregation, no more than a *subject in Chaldea*, as he did not choose, so should not submit to the *King of Edom*; by this expression our cause is confirmed, not confuted.

M. R. adds,

"If all the Kings of the nations did meet, in one Court, and in that Court did govern the nations with common royal authority and counsel in those things, which concern till the kingdoms in common, then till the nations were bound to obey them in that Court. And when they do consent to the power of that common Court, tacitly they consent, that every one of these Kings shall be a chosen King of such and such a kingdom."

Reply.

These are words which darken, and by a mistake mislead the reader from the mark, but rightly discerned and searched into, do nothing make for the cause; for, when it is said, *they meet in Court*, and *govern the nations with common royal authority*, this authority was a *new superadded authority*, which came not from the *King of Edom*, or from that royal office (let me so speak) of the regal power he had *there*, for *then* it should have belonged to *none but him*. But this is a *common royal authority*, and that was another authority wherewith, *not only he, but all* the rest of the confederate Princes were inverted, as well as he, and that

119

was *wholly distinct* from that Kingly power, that each King had in his own kingdom, and was received, when by the choice of the people or the Parliaments in all the kingdoms, they set up all those confederate Princes: Suppose the *King of Edom*, *Babylon*, *Emperor of Persia*, *Prince of Transylvania*, *Duke of Florence*: &c. this one and joint power of confederate Princes, to act in such a manner, in such things, with such limitation, as distinct from that particular princely power they had in their own territories. This is the truth in the example, and let M. R. parallel this in the case in hand, and *we shall soon come to an agreement*, namely,

That the Elders who had special office, and the power of it in; their proper charges, yet when by the combination of all the Churches they are to meet in a Classis, and have power put upon them to act in such things and in such a manner, which they never had before; this is *not now an office of Pastor, but the power of a Commissioner*, wholly distinct therefrom; and that is a *human creature* of man's devising: the Churches dealing therein, as the *civil states* do, who have allowance, and they in this case take, allowance to add and institute *new places* and *new powers* in the Church, so that they were *all* chosen *Commissioners*, but never a one of them was a *Pastor*, which is that which M. R. will not allow, and yet this frame is not able to, gainsay it.

The issue then is, had they been *Pastors*, they must have been chosen and maintained, which was the consequence of the reason, and stands untouched, upon that supposition. But they are, *Commissioners*: And that his words intimate, which the nature of the thing forceth unto, that *they promise tacitly obedience* and subjection to every one of the Kings of the nations, not simply *as* they are *Kings* in relation to such a kingdom; that is, by *parity*, and proportion of *reason*, the people promising subjection to *Elders*, not *as to Pastors*, but *as to Commissioners*, which are *human treasures of man's devising*.

Argument 6.

The Classical Church consisting of so many Elders in a Church. representative, meeting together, to exercise Jurisdiction by joint concurrence: therefore the acting and issuing of determinations and censures, must either be carried on by the joint agreement of all, or else of the major part: for if the fewer or lesser number might cast the balance in cases propounded, then the weaker should overbear the stronger (for they have all equal power in

the Commission to the work) and then some few of those to go on one side, and many on the other side, if the fewer should have the calling voice, then the lesser weight should carry the scales against the greater, which is irrational. Again, upon this ground, the part should not only over-rule, but destroy the whole, which is absurd. Whence then it is plain, that the

greater part hath the power in their hand, to pass sentence in way of decision, as when it is past, to put it into execution.

But what if the *most* have the *worst* cause, and err in their judgement and practice?

The answer is, While the fewer do protest against their proceedings, they quit their hands of sin, and that is all they can do: but the sentence must take place: only if there be a way of an appeal left they may take the benefit thereof in their opportunity.

These premised, which cannot be denied, I thus *reason*.

That course of government, which nullifies the power of the Elders and people of the Congregation, and their proceedings in a righteous way, that is not a power of Christ.

But this doth so: as instance,

The greater part of the *Classis* may sentence a member of a particular Church to be excommunicated, *when the Elders and all the people judge* and that truly, *not to be worthy of that censure*; here the power of the Elders and people which act in a way of Christ is wholly hindered.

To this M. R. answereth, That,

“Desire, the power of the greater Presbytery in this case ought to be swallowed up of the two voices of the Elders of the Congregation.

1. But this we have heard is cross to all the orderly proceedings of Christ, and rules of reason, that the *weaker should overbear the stranger, the part, the whole.*

2. This lays open a gap to *endless dissention*; for upon this ground, some *few* will say, we have the truth on our side, and therefore your votes, and expressions, though the apprehensions of so many, should give way and are to be swallowed up by our argument, and must therefore never appear in sight more.

Lastly, *Who must judge*, which party hath the better end of the staff, whether the *fewer* or the *greater* number be in the right? either the greater party must judge, or else there must no judgement pass at all, and so it will be in the power of a few to

Argument. 7.

From the former ground I reason in the seventh place.

That course and proceeding which cannot attain his end, is not appointed by our Saviour, whose wisdom fails not, nor can be frustrate in its preparation.

But the Classis excommunicating, and the people and elders of the Congregation refusing to submit thereunto, their excommunication would be of no force, for they would still maintain communion, and they could not relieve themselves, let them have their full scope to exercise all their Church-power to the full.

Argument 8.

This jurisdiction they now exercise, either issues from the power they *had before their combination*, or from some *new power* they have received *since* their combination.

Not from the place and power they had before the combination, for M. R. maintains if, as a principle, "That one Congregation hath not power over another: and reason evidenceth as much. For why should they or how can they, challenge any power over one, but they may challenge power by the same ground over all?"

If this jurisdiction issue from some new power, That must proceed from some new order or office received from their combination. For Jurisdiction issues from order, as in the first ground, and no jurisdiction in the Church can be exercised without an Office appointed by Christ, as doth appear by the Second ground.

But there it no order or office added to them at all, for they were Pastors and Teachers and Rulers before the combination, and there be no other officers appointed by Christ.

And therefore this place and power put now upon them, is (I fear) an invention of man.

Before I leave this place I shall offer *some* considerations, collected from the former disputes, to the judgement of the Reader, that he may relieve me and himself, in his most serious thoughts in secret.

122

1. A Pastor of one Congregation hath not power over another, for one Church hath not power over another, therefore the power he receives must not come from the office of a Pastor, for that he had before; and yet *lib. 2. p. 133*, it's said, "*This power issues from one and the same Office in the Congregation and in the Classis.*"

2. "*A Pastor as he stands in relation to his Congregation, and in reference to the Classis, hath not two, but one Office, p. 329, 333. And yet they are elect to the Office of a Pastor in the Congregation. l. 1. and lib. 2. p. 201. But not elect to the Office of a Pastor in reference to the Classis: lib. 2. 345.*"

Which (say I) is very strange, since there is one and the same office.

3. "*The powers of a Congregation, and of a Presbytery, are not formally nor essentially different, lib. 1. p. 332. Where powers differ not formally, say I, their operations differ not formally: and yet the Pastor, he doth not, he needs not, be cannot, watch, over the Classical Church, he cannot preach to them constantly, they be not constant teachers to watch for the souls of them all. lib. 2. 330. Archippus is not an elder so as he hath to answer to God for their souls. lib. 2. 236. They are denied to be Elders in feeding by the word of knowledge, lib. 2. p. 327. But this, I say, to preach, watch, and seed, Elders do and must do, by venue of the essence of their office. Therefore they have acts formally differing;*"

And therefore have powers formally differing.

4. "There is one and the same office which Elders act by, in a classical and Congregational way, *lib. 2. 329. If there be (say I) one and the same Office, then it relates after one and they same manner, then to the Classical and Congregational Church after one, and the same manner; If then the Congregational Church be their proper flock, so is the Classical Church their proper flock. Qua sunt idem inter se, illa sunt idem tertio, And if one and the same office, then it's received at one and the same time.*"

But these are denied in this dispute. "*The Classical Church cannot bear relation to one man, as their proper Elder, lib. 2. 344, 345.*"

5. *Power of Jurisdiction proceeds from, the power of order.* l. 2. 329, 330.

And therefore, say I, they who give no office, give no power.

123

But the combination of Churches gives no office to Elders, who were in office before they combined.

Therefore they could give no power.

And yet *the dispute saith it doth*, and the doctrine of a Classical Church must of necessity maintain that principle.

Either these are mazes and mysterious twistings, or I confess I am much mistaken.

Lastly, I would entreat the serious Reader to observe, what *depths there lie hid in this device.*

1. A *Paster* may be a Pastor in relation to a *Church*, and yet *never be chosen.* For a Classical Elder is to: and why *may not a bishop be so?*

2. *Would you see a person* that hath the formal essence of a Pastor, and yet *never did, nor is bound to preach?* so a Classical Elder is to his Classical Church, and why *may not a Bishop also have the like?*

3. Would you see a person, that hath the Office of a *Pastor to teach*, but must have no power to rule in chief acts of jurisdiction? *behold it is the poor Pastor of a Congregation*, preach he may, and administer the Sacraments he may in his own Congregation; But the Classis keeps the key of Jurisdiction, they must send in his censures, excommunications. And why *may not a Bishop do so, if ye will?*

4. Would ye see a person exercise *Jurisdiction over Churches*, and yet *not be bound to preach* to them? behold the Classical Pastor doth so, And therefore *why may not a Bishop rule a Diocese*, and preach only at his Cathedral?

It is all that can be said, that many are joined with that one in joint power to do this.

True, But what if the Elders met in the *Classis*, should give power to *one man to take many to himself*, and exercise all the Jurisdiction without them, not as a Moderator only, to order the actions of the Assembly, but as having the power of a Judge.

HE IS THEN A PERFECT BISHOP.

And I desire a rule of Christ from the Churches in the combination, to convince the Elders meeting of an error for choosing one amongst themselves, and putting upon him the Jurisdiction of a Judge, *which will not condemn themselves for choosing many Elders of other Churches, and invoking them with Jurisdiction*

124

of Judge-like authority over so many other Churches, beside their own.

For *if* they have liberty to institute and commit *a power to many* which Christ never appointed, why may they not have the same liberty to institute *a power*, and commit it to one which Christ never appointed?

For when it is affirmed and confessed, that one Congregation hath no power over another, therefore if they receive this power over other Congregations, It's not the Office of a Pastor or teacher that gives that power, for that they had completely when they were officers but of one Congregation.

Therefore the power they receive from, the combination must be no office-power.

Therefore it must be some other power, beside that.

Therefore Combination gives some power to many, beside the power of offer, that Christ hath not appointed, and that is a human invention.

And why may they not give the like power *to one man?* and let him take *Surrogates, Deans, Arch-deacons,* and *Chantellers* to himself: this is but a human invention, as the other.

In a word let M. R. give me but *one place of Scripture*, or one found *reason* for it.

1. *That a person may be a Pastor to a people, by whom he was never chosen.*

2. And that he may be a *Pastor* (as the Office of a Pastor is appointed by Christ) *to such, to whom he neither can nor should preach constantly.*

3. And that he is bound to exercise *Jurisdiction of censure*, and decision of doubts to such, to whom he neither needs, nor indeed is bound *to feed by the word.*

4. Or Lastly, that the Churches may give power to a man or men that Christ never appointed.

And I shall profess I will willingly yield the cause. But they must either make good *the three first*, or else prove the latter, or the the pillars of the Presbyterial Church will fail.

Section. 3.

We have now done with *one sort of grounds*, whereby the con-

125

stitution of a Presbyterial Church may be discerned.

We shall add *another*, and *thence* also *dispute*.

It is then confessed on all hands, and granted often by M. *Rutherford*.

“*That a Church in an Island may dispense all the Ordinances of God, of Ordination and excommunication, because it is a Church properly so called.*

1. “*In that it is a little City, and a little kingdom of Jesus Christ, having within it self power of the word and Sacraments.*

2. “*And also that it is a Church, and hath the essence of a Church, to which agree the essential notes of a visible Church Now preaching of the word, and administration of the Sacraments, are essential notes of a visible Church.*

From *this ground* I would thus reason.

If a Church in an Island may dispense all the censures and all the ordinances then every particular Congregation may.

But the first is granted.

Therefore the second cannot be denied.

The *Proposition is evidenced* many ways. *Where* there is the same-power appointed to the same ends, there may be and indeed ought to be the same operations. *But* in every visible Congregation rightly constituted, there is the same power, and that appointed to the same ends.

This second part admits no denial, because sense and experience give in testimony. There be all the Officers which Christ hath appointed in the one as in the other.

All are enjoined to put torch *all their operations*, and to fulfill the work of their ministry, and the duties of their calling, one as the other, and the end *is the same in both*, the gathering, and perfecting of the Saints.

The Proportion is proved from that principle of reason, that *operari sequitur esse*, The operation answers the constitution.

The *third ground formerly* laid, confirms the same.

Where there is an Office or power appointed by God, there needs no other power, but the Office, to authorize to the work; and it requires the performance of it.

And lastly, If the power be the same, and the end the same, then the power must be *frustrà* and in vain, if it should not be

126

put forth to the end. And the power should be wronged, and the initiation of Christ also, if it should be hindered in the attaining that end.

And let any man shew any power, right or ability, that a Church in an Hand hath to dispense any Ordinance: and it will clearly appear every particular Congregation hath as much, For,

1. All the dispensations of such a Church issue from the *intrinsic power* of the Rulers called by Christ to the work, and so it doth in all other Congregations.

2. *If neighbourhood of other Churches, be but a separable adjunct*, it can add nothing to the constitution, and so to the operation of the Church, for the nature of such adjuncts touch not the essence or constitution of the thing in any measure.

But neighbourhood is but a separate adjunct, as experience and common sense can testify; because either death, or dissention may take away some Churches, and nullify them, and yet some particulars are preserved.

3. *Suppose* a Church gathered and erected on a continent in the wilderness, and is there alone. If this Church could act all these censures, and dispense all Ordinances, before any other was planted by them: and if those that come after, do abridge them of that liberty, *they have power over them*: but power they have none, for one Congregation hath not power over another.

4. *Besides*, Those operations which a Congregation puts forth, out of the authority of the Office and Officers, which they

have received from Christ, and for which they are called, those operations ought not to be abridged.

5. *Nay*, If the Officers and Offices remain the same, they ought not, they cannot be abridged. Where the same intrinsical power of constitution according to God remains unaltered, there the operations remain the same.

Obj. “*If it be said*, they should submit to a combination of Churches, as well as combine as members of a particular Congregation.

Answ. This is, *Petere principium*, To beg the question.

2. Suppose they will not, then the other Churches cannot exact or command that, no more then a particular Congregation

27

can command me to be a member.

3. They ought not so to combine as to prejudice the operations of that power, which they have received of Christ, and which they are enjoined to put forth accordingly. And let there be any warrant shewed out of the word, that any person or Church hath power to hinder the operation of a Pastor or ruling elder, in any one act of his office, more than in another.

And Lastly, It hath been proved, that the addition of any thing besides an Office adds no power or right of Jurisdiction. Ground third *supra*.

6. If the *ground* of the combination be of no force, nor carries any validity with it. Then the combination and classis falls with it.

But the ground which is given, is a mere fallacy, and hath no validity in it, Namely, “*The preventing or curing the taint and pollution that a scandall will bring by the nearness of cohabitation.*

That this is no ground it will thus appear.

If the scandal in an ordinary course may, and will fall out among those that are nearer, then many in the combination; then this nearness is not a sufficient cause of it.

At primum: As in case members trade among people of another Classis, and give scandalous example there.

2. They who live at the outside of the combination, are nearer the Congregation of another Classis then their own.

3. The Scandal given, it goeth far and wide into the provinces and nations also.

Besides, the righteous proceeding according to the rule of Christ in a particular Congregation is a cure appointed to remove the polluting and infecting power of the scandal, be it done never so far off, or never so near.

Section. 4.

The *third sort of grounds* taken from the *nature of a Church*.

1. *A Church in the Gospel is never used only for Elders.*
2. There cannot be a *Definition* given, that will *agree* to a *congregational* and *Presbyterial Church*.
3. If the Congregations *be species specialissimæ* of a true Church, then there can be no lower *species* relutting or arising from them, as this doth,

28

4. If every Congregation hath all the *Integral parts* of a Church, then it is an *entire* and *complete* Church.

But it hath all sorts of Officers, as Rulers and People ruled.

5. If the Classis *add no other Officer to them*, then they add *no new power* of such Jurisdiction, because that issues from them.

6. Every *Integrum* is made up of his members, therefore *in nature they are before*, therefore *Churches before Classis*. Therefore *what each have they receive from them*, therefore *they have no Officers but from them*, therefore *both Ordination and Jurisdiction come from them*.

Section. 4.

How far a particular Congregation is bound to meet in one place.

Our practice here will be the best *exposition* of our *opinion*, and that is usually thus.

In case the *Congregation* grow too *big*, and therefore be forced to swarm out, Or in case they *transplant* themselves from one place to another; So that, part be forced to go before to make preparation for those that follow, we then send *one Officer* with the *smaller* Party, and the greater number remain with the rest: and yet are all but *one Church* in our account, and under one Presbytery of Elders, chosen Rulers of the Congregation.

But when the Congregations are *fixed*, and they established in peace, and *settled* with support about them, there should be *no more, then may comely and comfortably meet together, to partake of all Ordinances, the use and benefit of the labour of their Officers.*

Hence an *Answer* may be easily accommodated to the *examples*, which *M. R. brings*, for the evidencing of a *Presbyterian Church*.

1. That of the *Apostles' Church* will in no wise suit his end, or serve his turn, or make good the question. For to make up a *Presbyterial Church*, there must be *many Congregations, many Elders appropriated* to these Congregations, which have power over *their own only*, and not over others: These must combine, and upon the combination these Elders must assemble, and dispense their censures, and set down their decisions. But there were no Elders appropriated to their several charges

129

and Churches, which had power only over them. And *such Elders the Apostles could not be*, because though they had *all* power in them, yet *they had no power limited*, for that did *implicare*, and contradict their Apostolical commission.

The rest of the examples, *Antioch, Ephesus, Rome*, though it were granted, that upon their greater growth and increase, and so want of Elders, they might meet in divers places *for the while*, these might still be under one Presbytery, their Officers in a distinct manner attending upon them. And therefore *Gersom Bucerus* his answer suits here, *Quis aded ineptire sustinuerit*, &c. that because they met in divers places they were under divers Presbyteries or Elders.

2. It doth not appear out of any text, nor any evicting argument gathered therefrom, that (setting aside the Church of *Jerusalem*) they should need meet in several places.

3. Let it be considered, whether by *Church*, many Churches may not be intended, *as Saul made havoc of the Church*, i. of all the faithful members of *all Congregations*.

Having discovered the constitution of this *Presbyterial Church*, we are now to consider of

CHAP. X.

Such Arguments as M. R. allegeth for the confirmation of a *Presbyterial Church*, Answered.

WHich we shall suddenly dispatch, because we have held the Reader somewhat with the longest in this debate.

His first argument is taken from the Church mentioned in *Mat. 18.* and his reason is this. *“If Christ alludeth here to the Synedry and consistory of the Jews, with which his hearers were well acquainted: Then a Presbyterial Church of Elders collected and combined from many Congregations, is here understood.*

“But our Saviour alludes hereunto the Synedry and Consistory of the Jews.

Therefore A Presbyterial Church is here understood.

Ans. Both the Proportions may safely be *denied*: nor is there any evidence that can evict the certainty of them: for as M. Robinson says well, *The manner of our Saviour’s proceeding is so plain and obvious to an ordinary apprehension, that it may easily and familiarly be perceived.*

The alluding to the Jewish *Synagogue* would add little light to the process now propounded: Should our Saviour mean a *particular Synagogue*, they had *not the power of excommunication* in their hands: for the Church of the Jews was a *national Church*, and unto *Jerusalem* the males were bound to repair three times in the year: and if they were *not cast out from hence, no excommunication could be complete.* For they had their liberty thither to appeal in weightiest matters, and the delivering a man to the Devil was a matter of great conference, that could befall him, and therefore he would in reason see the through trial. And to say, that our Saviour alluded to *the national Church* of the Jews, is to confound the government of *the Gospel*, with that of the Law.

131

2. This were to send a *general counsel*, not to a Classis yea to send him thither, where he was not like to find relief: for the plaintiff might be dead and buried, before the Council could be gathered.

3. The direction of our Saviour points out apparently some standing *Tribunal*, and that *at hand*. Such a Church whereof *both the parties were members*: That when two witnesses could not see down the offender, The Lord Christ raised an *whole Church*, as the body of the army, to overbear his obstinacy: I would willingly see how a Church in an Island, a solitary Church upon a continent, or haply two Congregations sitting down together, or how the first Church at *Jerusalem*, *Act. 1:23*. could take any warrant to exercise any act of discipline against an offender from this place; or from any word of the Gospel, *UPON THIS GROUND*.

Lastly, It doth not follow the allusion had been to a Classis (for there were none but a national Church) but rather to a Consistory suitable to the Synagogue.

The *Proportion* also admits a just denial: for an *allusion* is only a similitude: and the *similitude* may lie in some particular, beside the *quality* of the Judge, as thus. As the offender that would not hear the supreme Judge was cut off, so look you must at the particular Congregation, as the chief tribunal; and therefore he who will not hear her speak, let him be cast out and accounted as no member of the Church.

And that the relemblance could not lie in the *Judge*, this seems to evidence it; because the Judgement in the *Sanhedrim*, was *mixed* (as the phrase intimates, *Deut. 17:12. 2 Chron. 19.*) partly of *Ecclesiastic*, partly of *civil Judges*, who, as the case did require, had their hands and voices in the verdict, which carries no relemblance in our Church-work.

Argument. I.

“*The Church of believers convened together is still a Church met together, for hearing the word and receiving the Sacraments, But this is a Church assembled not to prophesying or praying, but to rebuking and judicial censuring.*”

Answ.

The Church meeting together, though the scope be for prayer

132

and prophecying mainly, yet *not only*: For they may be jointly attended, the administration of *all Christ's* holy things may, nay most properly should then be attended: as when the preaching of the word is ended, the censures also may be administred: nay, unless some peculiar casting circumstance require the contrary, they *should so be*.

Argument. 3.

“The Church here spoken of, is such a superior and judicial feat, as ought to be obeyed in the Lord, under pain of excommunication. But a multitude of believers are not such a judicial feat.

Answ.

The *Minor* is the question in hand, and indeed part of the conclusion to be proved, namely, whether a particular Congregation, be the highest tribunal, or a Classical Church. And *M. R.* takes *one part of the conclusion to prove the other*.

If the Congregational Church be not highest, then the Classical is.

The *Minor* would have been proved, and not propounded nakedly.

Argument 4.

“Whatever Church may excommunicate, every Member there-to of convened with the Church may inflict all inferior punishments.

“But all the members convened cannot inflict lesser punishments, as women and children cannot rebuke openly.

Answ.

The consequence is feeble, as shall appear from the *nature of delegated public power*, which is committed by Christ to *persons capable* thereof, which women and children are not; the women for their *sex*, Children for *want of exercise* of their *understanding*, being excluded.

Doth any man reason thus, because *people have power to choose their Officers*, therefore women may put in their voice in election?

If the *Body of a corporation* may put out a Major upon just de-

133

sert, therefore *women and children*. No, the wise God provides that the votes and judgements of these should be included in the *male* and chief of them, and in them they should be satisfied, and therefore the *Wife is appointed to ask her Husband at home*.

Argument. 5.

“*These to whom the essence and definition of a ministerial Church, having power to excommunicate, doth necessarily belong: these and these only, are understood under the name of the Church, But so it is, that the essence and definition of a Ministerial Church having power to excommunicate, agreeth not necessarily to a great Company of believers assembled Churchways.*”

Answ.

Both the proportions with a fair interpretation admits a denial, as being clearly false.

1. The *proposition*. Because a Church neither as *Totum essential* alone, or as it ariseth to be *Totum integrale*, is here only understood. But the second sense and signification is here firstly attended; because both *people*, and *elders* have their power, *parts*, and *places* in this work in a right order and manner: when there be Elders, they must lead: but when there are none, the Church can exercise many acts without them, or can elect them, and with them exercise all the rest. So that when it is laid, a *Ministerial Church is here understood*, the word *ministerial* admits several significations; either Ministers without the body *exclusivè*, and that is false: or the *Ministers with the body inclusivè*, Now a *Ministerial Church* in the fairest sense aims at both. In the *first* sense the Proposition is false, in the *second* it doth not conclude. To whom the essence and definition of a Ministerial Church, *i.e.* a Church of Ministers without the body having power to excommunicate doth necessarily belong, these and these only are here understood. This is false, and *M. R.* himself will refute it, *lib.* 1. p. 226.

2. The *Minor* involves many things in it, and therefore it only troubles. For when it's said, *The essence of a Ministerial Church*,

to whom power of excommunication appertains, agrees, not necessarily to a company of believers.

134

Here be three things

1. There is a Ministerial Church.
2. This hath power to excommunicate,
3. This agrees not to believers.

1. It is confessed, and hath been largely proved, that by believers of a visible Church, we mean such, who are so visible to the view of charity, though not such in truth. And therefore I wonder that M. R. should again trouble himself to prove that which no man denies.

2. That these believers combined are a Church before they have guides, and have power also to excommunicate, that we hold. But they have not *a ministerial* power taken in the *narrowest and strictest sense*, as here; they have not formally the power of Office, *potestatem Officij*, yet *potestatem judicij*, the *power of judgement* they have, as after shall appear.

Argument. 6.

The Sixth Argument refers to *former proofs*, and we also refer to *former Answers*.

Argument. 7.

The Seventh Argument taken from *Paræus authority*, That *there can be no complaint to a multitude*, needs no answer, being evidently, experimentally false, how often, how ordinarily are complaints made to Parliaments?

Argument. 8.

“If the house of Cloë complained of an open fault to the holy Apostle Paul to crave his directions and help in way of reformation, having authority in all Churches then complaints must be to Elders only, and excommunication acted only by them, and secondly, The Holy Ghost gives direction and rules about receiving complaints to the Eldership. Tit. 1:13.

Answ.

1. The consequence is denied. For Cloë might have made her complaint to *any one of the members of Corinth*: but chose rather to do it to the *Apostle*, because his Apostolical power would be helpful in that case.

2. When there be *Elders* in a Church, all the complaints *must*

135

be made to them, and the causes prepared and cleared, and then by their means they mud be complained of to the Church. Thus *Paul* adviseth *Titus*, to hear complaints with the Elders, and by the Elders to complain to the Church. Now to reason, complaints must be made by him, and Elders to the Church, *therefore they must be made only to them, and not to the Church*, is a very weak consequence.

3. It's granted by Divines there can be no proceeding to *excommunication*, but with the *tacit consent of the people*, therefore to them the complaints of the evils must be made by the Elders.

4. I would know, in case *many Brethren* have just occasion given by the *elders in a Church of an Island*, whether may they complain, and to whom, if not to the *body of the people*, and they must know the complaints, before they can give consent to the censure.

5. Suppose there be *gross and heretical doctrine* preached by *Officers*, for which the people may justly reject their Pastors, in case they will not recant, and be humbled, as all confess: whether must the people reject their Pastors for such evils, and never speak to them? or if the evil must be required, and called for to trial, may not a *complaint* be made to these people, before they come to examine and try?

Nay suppose all the elders *but one*, in a Congregation should be delinquent, dwelling only by one other Church, should the complaints be carried to the *one Elder*, and not be carried by him to the whole body, whtn it is prepared?

Argument. 9.

“*That Church is here understood to whom the keys were given, Mat. 16. But they were given only to a Classical Church there.*”

Answ.

The Minor is barely affirmed: and therefore it sufficeth for the while to deny it, the proof shall be given in the proper, place.

Argument 10.

“*The only apparent argument against this interpretation is weak,*

136

“*and therefore this sense must have no strength in it.*

Answ.

Both the parts fail, For 1. That is *not the only apparent* argument that is here remembered, which either is or hath been given by persons of a contrary judgement.

2. If that was weak, yet it doth not follow, that the different sense is clear, and the interpretation strong: because there may be many better reasons rendered happily then there were yet alleged.

But let us attend the evidence, whereby it is proved, that the word *Church* in the new testament is *sometimes taken for Officers only*: M. Ball seeing the strength of the reason coming down the Hill upon him, which at least might, and indeed doth cast such a strong suspicion upon the cause here propounded, leaving of it alone, desolate, destitute of the least loving look of the allowance of any text, that might be a second in the field. The good man, according to that sagacity and sharpness of dispute, wherein he excelled, bestirs himself, and mutters up all his forces seeks far and wide to win some consent, but at last all comes to this, That a man *may suppose some such thing here*, but cannot get one place to speak professedly for him.

And to say the truth, were the word *Ecclesia* rarely used, and that the thing it self had been out of ordinary consideration, it had been a fair plea to have said, the Scripture is very silent touching this subject, and the word seldom used: and therefore no marvel there wants consent. But when the thing is so often, so ordinarily handled in all the Evangelists and Epistles: the very word commonly, constantly treating about the same subject, and yet it should never be taken in the new testament in this sense, It gives a shrewd suspicion, and such as cannot be wiped out, nor comfortably borne, that the sense is here fathered and forced upon the place, but is not the natural and native meaning of it, but some changeling put into the room.

Let us then hear what M. R. adds. *Rev. 2. The Angel of the Church of Ephesus, &c. Here Angel stands for the whole Church,*

and the whole Church is wrote unto under the name of the Angel of such a Church, which may that be demonstrated: because not only the Ministers, but the people, who have ears to hear, are commanded to hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.

137

2. The thing now questioned, and to be proved, is, whether the word *Church* is put for Elders. Now I would fain know, whether *M. R.* or any man can say, that the name *Church* here is taken for Elders only, all the passages of the text, all the quotations tell us the contrary, therefore here is not a syllable or a shew of any thing to evince it.

When the whole *Church* is wrote unto, and the *Epistle* super-scribed to the *Angel*, this intimates something touching the signification of the name *Angel*, but nothing at all touching the name *Church*, so that the thing is wholly mistaken.

Beside, that which *M. R.* would, touching the *Angel*, will hardly down with any discerning man. True it is, that by *Angel* many may be intimated, the word being taken collectively, as, *The Angel of the Lord pitcheth his tents about the righteous*. This sense hath good Authors, and good reason: but that the whole *Church* should be understood in that word, will hardly stand with the context: for see how strangely and harshly the words will sound. To the *Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, i.e. To the *Church of the Church of Ephesus*; I suppose a man will find little reason in such Rhetoric.

A second place is, *Act. 18:22. Paul called in at Jerusalem and saluted the Church*. It cannot be thought in reason, that the Elders only were there saluted, nor by that word intended, because it appears by the next verse, that the Apostles scope was to confirm the hearts of the Disciples in all this voyage of his, and therefore had an eye unto the weakest; and those that wanted his sweet refreshing: and in all probability the *Church* hearing of his arrival, assembled to give comfortable entertainment, and so to be comforted by him.

The rest of the Answer is not only that which we grant, but the most rigid of the separation prove, that in the old Testament the Hebrew and the Greek word used by the Septuagint is so understood: and therefore it is granted, without any loss to the one, or gain to the other.

Argument 11.

“The Church that the pU»tiff must tell, that Church is to admonish publicly the offender. But that it the Church of Elders, 1 Thes. 5:12, 13. 1 Tim. 5:20. Luk. 10:16. for they only

138

“are to receive public complaints, and to rebuke publicly, as Tit. 1:13. 1 Tim. 5:19. 1 Tim. 4:2.

Answ.

This hath been fully answered in the eighth, whether I refer the Reader: only remember he any, that by the order of Christ, the Elders are to receive the complaints, and to prepare them for the Congregation, and then they are to report them unto the people, and they to hear and receive them, and they are to pass a Judicial sentence, the Elders leading the action in an orderly manner, and taking their consent thereunto. Therefore the incestuous Corinthian was said to be rebuked of many, and to be judged of them also, and that not only by the judgement of discretion, for so they might judge those that were without, yea they are required legally to forgive him, and therefore they did as legally and Judicially bind him.

Lastly, What will M. R. say of his expectants, who preach publicly, and therefore do instruct and reprove publicly, as in 1 Thes. 5:12. 2 Tim. 4:2.

Argument 12.

Thq twelfth argument hath received its answer before, arising out of a mistake which hath been often spoken to, because neither women alone, nor children, will make a Church, nor have any public power put into their hands for that purpose.

Argument 13.

The Thirteenth Argument is propounded, as though there was no great weight laid upon it, and therefore I thought to pass it by wholly at the first: yet upon second consideration, I conceived it not amiss to intimate a word to remove a stone out of the way, though it be so small, that any man who could stir his foot, need not stumble at it.

The probability here presented is this,

“That Christ could not well mean a viable Congregation of people and Elders convened, 1. Because if they did convene to

139

“worship God in spirit and in truth, they meet in Christ’s name, but there is some other thing required that the excommunicating Church meet for the actual exercise of discipline: for besides meeting in Christ’s name, there is required that they meet with Paul’s spirit and the rod of discipline: so that Paul’s spirit, as an Elder, is required, who hath the power of excommunication, as requisite to this meeting.

Answ. 1.

Whenever the Church meets in Christ’s name, she hath Christ’s power to execute all acts of discipline as well as doctrine, having her right constitution.

2. It’s clear in the text, the Church might and should have cast out the Incestuous Corinthian without *Paul’s* provocation, nay without his knowledge, or content by sending, and therefore the Church is blamed, in that she did not so.

3. The holy Apostle for their provocation to the work, and encouragement in it, expresseth his consent, that his spirit concurred with them, and did give full approbation to their proceeding.

4. This his spirit doth not dispense the excommunication, nor give them power to do that which they could not do before, but encouraged them to go on in the work which they had formerly neglected, and was so necessary to be performed.

140

No pages 141 to 184.

185

CHAP. XI.

Touching the first Subject of Ecclesiastical power, where the Nature of it is discovered, and the Arguments brought against it answered.

BEFORE we can propound the state of the controversy, in which the stress lies, and add such

proofs as may be suitable to settle that which we conceive to be the truth, we must of necessity crave leave to preface something touching the nature of Ecclesiastical power in the general, and lay out the several parts and branches of it, wherein it is expressed, and may best be perceived by an understanding Reader; because this will give light to that which follows, and will daily help to discover the mistakes of such arguments which are brought to darken this truth. Ecclesiastical power made known unto us usually in Scripture under the name of *Keys*, the sign or adjunct being put for the thing signified, the ensign of authority for authority it self.

This power is double,
 Supreme and Monarchical,
 Delegate and Ministerial.

1. The *Supreme and Monarchical* power resides only in our Saviour, can only be given and attributed to him, and to none other: He is the King and Law-giver of his Church, the Head of his Body, and the Saviour thereof. He alone hath *the keys of David, openeth, and no man shutteth; shuts, and no man opens*: He must have all power both in Heaven, and Earth, that must possess that place of Head-ship, execute the office and operations thereof; and that none but *Christ* hath, and therefore none but he can have the privilege, what ever is pretended to the contrary: And of this we do not inquire in this place.

Rev. 1:18 and 3:7.
 Isa. 9:6.
 Phil. 2.

2. There is also *a subordinate and delegated power*, which is proper to our present disquisition, and it is nothing else, but *A right given by commission from Christ to fit Persons, to act in his house, according to his order.*

By *right*] meant a *jus* or ἐξουσία which according to *God cer-*

tain persons possess in their external administration, issuing from such special relation, which attends them in their condition, unto which they are called, and appertains to no other, unless they be in like estate, and this is given by *Christ*; so that

they have no right, but by allowance from our Saviour; they have no more, it goes no further, is no other, then what he appoints: he gives laws, and sees limits how to bound it, and they may go no further then their commission will carry them out.

We add, its given [*to fit Persons,*] because those are here intended, who according to *God* are only capable thereof, to wit such Persons who are made able to receive this power, and to put forth the practice thereof; and hence Women, because of their sex, and Children because of their weakness, and mad Men, because of their distempers, are disabled, and so excluded this privilege.

1 Cor. 14:34.

And upon this ground it appears how all such consequences, with which we meet so often, conclude just nothing. If power be in the Church of believers, then Women and Children might exercise it: So Mr. *Ball*, Mr. *Rutherford*. This inference comes from a false supposition, and so the conclusion falls to the ground; for that is taken for granted, which ever was, and for ever ought to be denied, that Women and Children were fit Persons appointed by *Christ* to manage this power, which is cross to the letter of the test, and contrary to the opinion and profession of us all, and therefore I here mention it that the Reader may look at it, as not worthy the consideration whenever he shall hereafter meet with it.

It is lastly said, [*they must act according to Christ's order;*] for *God* is not the *God* of confusion, but of order; and therefore as all power is from *Christ* committed to the Church; so it is both received and exercised in that order which *Christ* himself hath ordained. The whole Church is an Army terrible with banners: The whole Army is in daily fight, but all the the parts do not fight in the same manner, but each Person keeps his place & positure. The power is in the whole firstly, but each part knows his rank, and acts after his own order and manner; The Officers in theirs, and the members in theirs; The whole acts some things immediately, something mediately; but all is acted by it, or by power received from it.

This power, for explication sake, is thus distinguished;

187

It's either a power

In *many*, when combined and this is *potestas*

Judicii

Domitionis

In *one*, when given to him; this is *potestas Offici*.

1. The power of *judgement*; the whole may be and doth act in admissions and excommunications: for the reason is alike in both. *Ejusdem est recipere, rejicere*. To invest with privileges to cut off from privileges: The Apostle speaks, All, as an act of all. 1 Cor. 5:12. *yea judge them that are within; cast out therefore from among you*. (i.e.) From amongst the Body and Members of the Church, (Tho incestuous person was not only among the Elders,) and they are bidden to cast him out; the words carry a causal power with them, *ἐξ ἀρεῖτε ἐξ ὑμῶν cast out from among you*, v. 13. and this is called *judgement* by the *Holy Ghost*, which is the ground why we keep that expression.

2. The power of *gift or election* is that which the people have, as the corporation hath power to choose a Major, and to give him authority to do that which they themselves cannot do: So it is with the Body of a congregation, who do elect and leave the impression of an Office upon men gifted, though they be not such formally themselves, nor can be said to labour in word and doctrine to be rulers, to dispense Sacraments; only what this giving is, is to be understood with a grain of salt, and requires a wise and wary explication; and therefore this power may be attended,

1. In the rise and reason of it.
2. In the manner how it is communicated,
3. In the first subject or *πρῶτον δεκτικον* in which it is received.

1. The *rife* of this power, and the reason, why it is necessary to be attended in a Church constituted, will specially appear, if we eye the *end*, which always steers the action among such as be Agents by counsel.

In all combinations there is and will be some common end; That end must have means to attain it, to these means and rules each man must bind himself to attend, & in case he do not, to submit to another, to be directed and reformed, or else to yield to the whole, that he may be confuted and removed therefrom. For otherwise the end cannot be attained, nor the means at-

188

tended with profit, or any powerful success in reason.

For if each man may do what is good in his own eyes, proceed according to his own pleasure, so that none may cross him or control him by any power; there must of necessity follow the distraction and desolation of the whole, when each man hath liberty to follow his own imagination and humorous devices, and seek his particular, but oppose one another, and all prejudice the public good.

In the building, if the parts be neither mortified nor braced, as there will be little beauty, so there can be no strength; Its so in setting up the frames of societies among men, when their minds and hearts are not mortified by mutual consent of subjection one to another, there is no expectation of any successful proceeding with the advantage to the public. To this appertains that of the Apostle, *Every one submit unto another.*

Mutual subjection is as it were the sinews of society, by which it is sustained and supported.

Hence every man is above another, while he walks according to rule; and when he departs from it, he must be subject to another.

Hence every part is subject to the whole, and must be serviceable to the good thereof, and must be ordered by the power thereof.

Salus Populi suprema lex,

It is the highest law in all Policy Civil or Spiritual to preserve the good of the whole; at this all must aim, and unto this all mul the subordinate.

This *potestas judicii* appertains to all, as

ἐλεγεω, Math. 18:15:

Κρίνειν, 1 Cor. 5:12.

both which expresse acts of proceeding in a judicial manner.

Hence each man and member of the society, in a just way, may be directed, censured, reformed, removed, by the power of the whole, and each may and should judge with the consent of the whole: this belongs to all the Members, and therefore to any that shall be in office, if they be Members. They are superior as Officers, when they keep the rule: but inferior as Members, and in subjection to any when they break the rule. So it is in any corporation; so in the Parliament. The whole can censure any part.

189

This ground being laid,

That *Objection*, in which many place so much confidence, is easily answered and the mistake thereof is made manifest.

If the people should censure the Pastor, then there should be Pastors of Pastors, and the sheep should be Shepherd, not sheep.

Answ. The consequence is feeble, as appears from the former ground; because the People judge not as Officers, but as Members of the whole, to whom by virtue of the common Laws of combination, they have subjected themselves in case of delinquency to be ordered for the Common good.

The feebleness of this *Objection* will more fully appear, if we take it in the like. Take a *classis*; suppose the several Pastors or many of them offend, the rest admonish and proceed in censure against them: the *Objection* grows on as strongly; here be Pastors of Pastors.

Nay yet further, let it be supposed, which is possible, that all or most of the Pastors offend, and the *Ruling-Elders* with the rest, according to the allowance of *Christ* proceed against them (be it for Heresy or Error broached and maintained) here the inferior do censure the superior, those of one *order* judge such as be of a superior.

2. The *rise* of this power appears from a principle laid in nature. Its a staple rule, which claims entertainment without any gainsaying.

No man by nature hath Ecclesiastical power over another; by constraint it cannot be imposed regularly, as in part we have formerly heard. For coactive power expressed by outward constraint and violence, is cross wholly to the Govern-

ment of *Christ* in his Church, (*Whose Kingdom is not of this world.*)

And therefore from his own inference, worldly power, and worldly weapons, he wholly rejects, and none of his Churches are to use: these swords are to be put up. The Arms of the Church are holy and spiritual ordnances, they look at spiritual ends, reach the spiritual man, the conference, by spiritual (and therefore so far moral) censures.

As nature gives not this power, so a Civil Ruler should not impose it. What ever is done here in the constitution of Churches, is done by an Ecclesiastical rule, not by a rule of policy,

190

What ever is dispensed by an Ecclesiastical Rule, a Civil power cannot dispense it: because that is his sphere in which he moves, and acts only within that compass his end being [[?????]] ἐυπολιτευσῶμαι[[?????]]

If then nature gives not this: nor Civil authority imposeth this: it comes not by constraint; therefore it must come by mutual and free consent.

And the very nature of the practice speaks as much. Why doth this or that man combine with such in such a place, and not with others in another coast? its merely out of mutual and free consent on both parts. For as I have no power to press in upon them, further then they will admit me: no more have they any power Ecclesiastic over me, unless I freely submit and subject my self thereunto.

If a Christian convert should come from *China* into a Country or City, where there be multitudes of Churches set up, according to the rules of the Gospel: none of them have power to compel him to join with any one more then another, but be may freely choose that which is most suitable to his own heart and affection, and may be most serviceable to promote his spiritual edification.

From all which premises, the inference is undeniable, *So far, as by free consent their combination goes, so far, and no further, the power they have one over another reacheth:* because this is the foundation, upon which it is built, and the root upon which it grows, which I desire may be attended, because we

shall be forced to have recourse to this principle in our future proceeding.

II. *The second thing to be enquired, is, The manner how this is communicated.* Those who are thus met together, having power dispersed among themselves, they voluntarily consent to unite this their power, and to devolve it upon one to whom they will submit, walking by rules of Christ, and confining himself within the compass thereof. So that this right of rule, thus united and devolved upon one, is *Officium*, or the right of Office properly so called. *Christ gave some to be Pastors, some to be Teachers,* He alone, out of his supreme and regal power, doth furnish them with graces and abilities, appoints the work, lays out the compass thereof, the manner of dispensing, and the order and bounds of their dispensation.

Eph. 4:11, 12.

1 Cor. 12:28.

191

The Church by voluntary subjection gives them this united right of rule to be exercised over them, and this is their outward calling by which they are warranted to act, and to put forth their abilities and Ministerial authority over such a people.

And hence again, it is more then plain *That men may give a call and power to such and such to be Pastors, and yet themselves not Pastors.*

The inference is undeniable, thus,

A divided right, which is in many, is not an united right yeilded by many, and devolved upon one. A divided power is not an united power.

A Pastor's power, or power of Office, is an united power from many. The peoples is a divided power, lying in many combined, and therefore not the same.

Hence the power of *Judgement* is not the power of *Office* and therefore the Fraternity may have the one, when they have not the other.

Hence, The *Elders* are superior to *the Fraternity* in regard of *Office, Rule, Act, and Exercise*; which is proper only to them, and not to the Fraternity.

The people or *Church* are superior to the *Elders* in point of censure; each have their full scope in their own sphere and compass, without the prejudice of the other.

No man conceives that the place and office of the Major is prejudiced because the corporation can for just causes censure him, though not any nor all of them can exercise his office.

No man conceives the place and power of a King prejudiced, because a Parliament for just reasons can proceed against him.

No man thinks that the honour and supreme Privilege of an Emperor is impeached, because the Princes and States can depose him, in case he falsify and break the fundamental laws of their consociation and agreement,

Hence, The censure of excommunication for the act is common to Elders, and Fraternity: only for the manner of managing of it, its peculiar to the Elders to be leaders in that action; and thence it is, They are called, ἡγουμένοις Heb. 13:17.

These things are now laid down by way of explication: the probation and proof shall be brought in the proper place of it presently.

193

Hence again, they do not give the power (which formerly they had) away from themselves, and cease to be what they were, as in civil offices, and amongst civil persons it usually falls out. A man sells his office, and ceaseth to be what he was before he sold it. It's not so here; but by voluntary subjection, they give an united right to another, which none, nor all of them ever had *formaliter*, but *virtualiter* only, & therefore the power of Judgement over each other they keep still, and can by that proceed against any that goes aside, though he was an officer.

Its true, The Officer may by a superior united right, call them together, they cannot refuse. He may enjoin them to hear, they may not withdraw. He may enjoin them silence, if they shall speak disorderly or impertinently, he may dissolve the congregation, and they must give way while he delivers the mind of Christ out of the Gospel, and acts all the affairs of his Kingdom, according to his rule; and as it suits with his mind; he is thus above the whole Church: but in case he err and transgress a rule, and becomes a Delinquent, he is then liable to censure, and they may proceed against him though not *by any pow-*

er of office, for they are not, officers, but by *power of judgement* which they do possess.

SECT. II.

The third thing to be inquired.

Where this tower is seated, as in the first subject, and there M. Reutherford his arguments expressed in Lib. 1. Chap. 1. of his Discipline are weighed and answered.

This controversy touching the first subject of the power of the *Keys*, is of all other of greatest worth and weight, and therefore both needs and deserves most serious search and trial, that if it be the good pleasure of the Lord, we might come to a right understanding thereof, and thereby a ready and certain way might appear to clear and settle our proceeding in most of the things that follow.

We shall to this purpose crave leave to speak something for explication, something for confirmation of that which we do conceive to be the truth; which is this, namely,

The power of the Keys is committed to the Church of con-se-derate Saints as the first and proper subject thereof.

To remove the distaste, with which the minds and hearts of

193

most have been taken aside, as touching this truth propounded, it will not be unseasonable, nor unprofitable, by some plain and short explication, as by some purging pill, to remove that malignant humour of prejudice, which hath eaten so deep into the apprehensions of men, that they are not willing to give any welcome entertainment to this part of Christ's counsel.

We will endeavour to scatter such fogs, which would keep the Reader from the full sight and assent unto this way, by the following proportions.

PROPOSIT. I.

That *the power* of the *Keys* is *seated in the Church* as the proper subject, is *no novel opinion*, and new coined device of later days; but hath been of old professed and maintained, and that by men of able judgements in all ages: so that it hath antiquity and authority to honour it, as far as that honour will reach.

This I propound, not, as placing any casting or convicting power in this evidence. For a cause is not the less true, because of late discovered; but only to stay the stomachs of such, whose expectations are not answered in any opinion, unless it be mouldy with age. We will suffer ycares to speak a little in this behalf.

The place of those that *Peter* sustained in Matth. 16. to them the Keys were given.

But that *Peter* speaks in the name and sustained the place of the Church; the testimonies and authorities of several of the ancient, and those of great esteem, are plain; as *Origen*, *Hilary*, *Augustine*, frequently, expressely, pregnantly, together with troops of our Divines, who with one consent give approbation hereunto; as any may read in *Parker de poli. Eccles. Lib. 3. c. 2, 3.*

That I may save mine own labour, and suffer every man to receive the praise of his own pains.

Nay Mr *Rutherford* yields thus much, *Lib. 1. Cap. 2. Pag. 21.* ‘*We oppose Fathers to Fathers*, saith he. So that the Fathers by his own confession write for this.

Again, Master *Rutherford* speaking touching excommunication, thus writes, *Lib. 1. pag. 49.* *Here grave Beza, our Divines, Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger, Melanchton, Bucan, Paræus, Rivetus, Sibrandus, Junius, Trelcatius: The Fathers, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Nazianzene Chrysosthome, Ambrose, Theodoret*

194

Thophilact, require all to be done, plebe consentiente.

And why should their consent be required, if it was merely matter of complement, If the Elders should do it, or indeed could do it without them. For if it be in the people’s power to hinder the excommunication from taking place, then the Elders only have not a power given them of Christ to manage this: unless we shall lay that imputation upon the wisdom of Christ, that he shall appoint a means of Reformation and purging the Church, that in an ordinary course cannot attain its end, which is deeply prejudicial to his faithfulness, wisdom, and power. And therefore *Peter Martyr* is peremtory and definitive in his expressions touching this point. *Loc. Com-de excommunicat. Sect. 9. Unde concluditur, non absque consensu ecclesiæ quempiam excommunicari posse.*

PROPOSIT. II.

The Keys of the Kingdom by way of Metaphor signify all that Ministerial power by Christ dispensed, and from Christ received, whereby all the affairs of his house may be acted, and ordered, according to his mind, for the attaining of his ends purposed and appointed by himself. All that power; and therefore all such means as are sufficient to open the Kingdom of Heaven to such as stoop thereunto, or to shut the Kingdom of Heaven against such, who will not come under the authority thereof, is called Keys.

The Key of Royalty is in the hand of Christ, who is the head and King of his Church. The *Key of Charity*, as it is sometime called (but very improperly) is in the hand of all believers, when out of Christian love they send some help unto such, with whom they meet, to further them in the ways of life, but have no power in a Judicial way to proceed against them in case they refuse, because they are not in a visible Church. The *Key of subordinate power* which only such, and all such have, who are combined in a special Corporation, and come under the external government of the Scepter of Christ in the Gospel: such have good law, (as we use to speak) to proceed against any, that will not stoop to the rules, and be ordered by the laws of that Kingdom of his.

PROPOSIT. III.

Where these Keys of subordinate power are seated, as in the first subject: these are communicated by means of *that*, to all other, that partake thereof.

195

Firstly in the Church, and by virtue of the Church, they are communicated to any that in any measure or manner share therein. Heat is firstly in fire, as its proper subject; and therefore if it be found in any other thing, it is by reason, and because of fire. The Iron or water is hot, because they have fire in them that heats in them. The faculties of sense belong firstly to the sensitive soul, and they are never found in any subject nor act by it, but only where the sensitive soul is. So it is with this delegate and subordinate power, it is firstly in the Church, and its communicated to none, acts in none, but by

mean of her. Whence its clear, that it suits not the rules of reason,

1. To cast some part of the power upon the people firstly, some part of the power upon the Rulers: As though there were two first subjects of this power, which the letter of the Text gainsays, *To thee* I will give, not *To them*: *To thee*, as representing *one* state or condition of men: *To thee* bearing the place of *Elders* or sustaining the person of *believers*. And therefore to answer the scope of the question, we must lay forth *what* is meant by *Keys* in the general, and then shew *to whom* that power belongs, and by their means is communicated to others in order and manner as Christ hath appointed.

2. That conceit is more wide from the mark, if any shall make but one first subject of this power, and yet have others to share in this power, and not by means of that: for this is indeed to speak daggers and contradictions. As if all power could be said to be in *one* firstly, and yet to be as soon in another, as in *that*.

PROPOSIT. IV.

The power of the Keys take it in the complete nature thereof, it's in the Church of believers, as in the first subject, *but every part of it is not in the same manner and order to be attended for its ruling in the Church; but in the order and manner which Christ hath appointed.*

It's in her radicallyo and originally, as the cause subordinately under Christ; and it may there be acted by her *immediately*, as *potestas judicii* in admission of members in the absence or Ministers, in censuring by admonition, for each man is *a judge of his brother*; and there is a judicial way of admonition, when the parties are in such an estate, that *in foro externo* they can make

196

process *Juridicé* against each other. So also there is *potestas doni*, as in all elections, they are acted by the joint approbation of the people.

Or else it's *from her communicated unto some particular and special members*, and exercised by them, having received it from Christ by her meanest all the Officers of the Church have their call and receive external right of their administration from her.

As *sensitiva facultas* is *originaliter in animals*: but is acted and communicated in the proper specifications thereof, according to the order and method of natures proceeding. The soul doth not see but by an eye, makes an eye and sees by it. So the Church makes a Minister and dispenseth word and Sacraments by him.

And because the name Minister hath been in common life, especially applied to Rulers, therefore a Ministerial power is put for power of Office, and so Ministerial power is only in Rulers. But as it comprehends all power delegated from Christ and subordinate to him, then it's as large as the power of the Keys in the general.

Whence it is evident, according to the double acceptation of the word, there may be a *power Ministerial in the Church of believers generally* taken, and yet a *power Ministerial only in Rulers* taken in a *narrower* sense, namely, the power of Office is only in the Rulers *formaliter*, in the Church *radicaliter*, & *causativé*.

The *power of judgement* is in the *Church* formaliter, and in the *Rulers* directive, they out of an *Office-power* leading the whole proceeding therein. And that for these reasons.

Arg. 1. Is taken from that received principle, which is confessed and yielded on all hands. *Ejusdem est instituere & destituere*. Whence I should thus reason.

They who have power to censure and depose their Officers, in case of Heresy or other iniquity persisted in, they have power of judgement formally seated in them over such, This Proportion admits no denial. They who can take power from another, they must of necessity have a power above that other in that regard.

But the *Fraternity* have power to censure and so to depose an Officer, in case of Heresy or iniquity persisted in: for they gave power to their Rulers by election; therefore in case of De-

197

linquency, they may and can take it from them upon the principle formerly received, therefore they have power of judgement seated in them.

Arg. 2. If it be in the power of the Church and fraternity to admit members, Its then in their power to cast them out (which

is an act of judgement) when just cause is given, and they justly deserve it. For admitting in, and calling out carry alike parity and proportion of reason, are of the same and equal extent and issue from the same ground.

But it is in the power of the Fraternity to admit members, as it appears in the admission of Officers, before any can be, received into the Church.

Arg. 3. Either the people have power to put forth a causal vertue in passing the judgement and censure upon the delinquent, or else it belongs to their place, and is their duty only to consent.

But this later cannot be granted. To consent to evil, and say *Ames* to an unjust censure is sinful, and so not their duty: But the sentence given by the Elders may be unjust.

To say they may and should dissent, will bring as great inconvenience unto the cause upon their grounds. For if they may and should dissent from the unjust sentence passed, then according to rule and reason they may hinder the execution of the sentence of Excommunication; for if they will jointly keep communion with the person, whom they will cast out, the Elders cannot attain their end in the sentence. Therefore they are not appointed by Christ to execute the sentence alone; unless we shall say, that Christ appoints means, which cannot attain their end, and that in an ordinary course (for this may ordinarily fall out) which is to blemish the wisdom and faithfulness of our Saviour in managing the affairs of the house of God.

Arg. 4. That Church which is meant in *Matth. 18*. That Church hath chief power in censuring any who are refractory, as the letter of the text gives in evidence.

But by Church there is not meant the Presbytery alone. Assumption proved.

That which crosseth the rule of righteous proceeding appointed by Christ, that is not Christ's meaning in the text.

But to understand it of the Presbytery alone, crosseth the rule of the righteous proceeding appointed by our Saviour.

198

That which stops and disannuls the last part and degree of the process appointed by our Saviour, that crosseth his appointed proceeding in the censure.

But this doth so, as shall appear by a double instance. Suppose three Elders in the Church, and they all under offence have been convinced in private: one or two witnesses have been taken: and yet they will not hear; what can now be done? The Brethren, who are offended must tell the Church, *i.e.* the Elders, that the Elders have offended, which was done before, and which to do is irrational, to make the guilty party a Judge in his own cause,

Again, suppose two of the three be offenders, and these two will not hear the first or second admonition, then the aggrieved party must complain to the Church, *i.e.* to the third Elder, and so one should be the Church: or else this last degree of procede should wholly be disannulled: both which are contrary to reason and the wisdom of Christ.

Arg. 5. If the *power of judgment* be in the *Rulers* only, then it is either in some of them, and by them derived unto others: or else it belongs to all equally by the same commission; there can be no third way devised.

But neither of these can be granted as true. To have rule given to one by him to be delegated to all others, As to have one cheif (as namely *Peter*) and to have all other to repair to him, and to derive the power from him, is apparent Popery.

And it cannot be delegated to all equally by the same commission: because those, who are equal in commission, are equal in power, for those two keep pace one with another, and are of equal extent.

But its confessed, that all the *Rulers*, who dispense the *Keys*, have not equal power. The Teaching Elders are in degree and office both differing from the Ruling Elders, and superior to them.

Arg. 6. Let me add this as a sixth reason.

The Church mentioned *Matth. 18.* hath power to proceed in Excommunication, against what brother or brethren will not

hear it. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be at an Hea-then.*

But the Rulers alone have not this power. As instance,

199

Suppose that one of the Rulers should complain of the body of the fraternity, touching error in doctrine and wickedness in life. In case they will not hear the Rulers, the Rulers may, nay should Excommunicate them, (*i.e.*) Three or four Rulers 400 or 500. brethren: which if granted, it will thence follow, these Rulers should not only censure the Church of the fraternity, but destroy themselves also, as Pastors and Rulers. For where there is no Flock, but all scattered, there is no Shepherd. But being lawfully Excommunicated, *ex concessis*, there is no Flock, but all is scattered: therefore their office as Shepherds is destroyed.

Besides it is observed by *Ames*, that a Church or body of a people combining, cannot be excommunicated; because then a Body having and retaining its essence, should be cast out of it, which is impossible.

SECT. III.

Let us now see, what be the Arguments which Master *Rutherford* propounds for the confirmation of his Tenet: *That the Officers, those not of one Congregation, but of many, have the power of the Keys conferred upon them, as the first subject.*

‘That it is not to beholden, which is not written.

‘But it’s not written, either expressly or by good consequence, that all the faithful lay hands on men for Ministry, as *Titus*, *Paul*, and the Presbytery do, 1 *Tim.* 4:14.

‘Or where all the faithful bind and loose and receive witnesses Judicially against Elders, as *Timothy* and *Peter* have authority to do.

Answ. This first, and his second and third Argument touch not the Question as it is stated, and may in a right sense be granted, without any prejudice to the cause; for the sum of all the three Arguments amounts to thus much, That *Office-power* is *formaliter* in some select person, who hath ministerial spirit and gifts: and this we all grant. Nor can Master *Rutherford* shew any sober and judicious professor or writer of Reformation that

maintains the contrary. *Parker, Ames, Robinson*. This last in his most rigid times of sharpest Separation, thus professeth, ‘That the Government of the Church before the Law, under the Law, and in the Apostles times, was, and so still is, not in the multitude, but in the chief; and then he adds, it never came into their hearts to deny this only (as he saith) it is one thing to go-

Justif. Separ. p. 234.

200

vein the Church, another thing to be the Church. Its confessed then by all, that Office-power is in the hands of some select persons: but it doth not thence follow, The power of the *Keys* is firstly in them.

This general answer was enough to put by, what is said in these three first Arguments. But for more full satisfaction, we shall take a more special survey.

1. Office-power, is but a little part of the power of the *Keys*: like the nibble of the *Key*: and therefore that may well be in Officers, and yet the power of the *Keys* not be firstly in them, but in such, who gave that power and gave that office to them; and therefore had a power before, theirs did give what they have, and can take away what they have given.

2. Not only the Officers, but Offices also, are included in the *Keys*, as being of that ministerial power by which that Kingdom of Heaven is opened, and the Gospel dispensed: and both Offices and Officers, as all ordinances are Christ’s gift to his Church *Ephes. 4:11*. *He gave some to be Pastors and Teachers*, and not only for his Church, but to his Church, as Master *Rutherford* confesseth with *Chrysostom*, and shall be afterwards more fully disputed. So that these suppose the Church to be before both, and to have the power of both.

5. Nay, I confess, I cannot conceive, (If any man will give but way to what reason will readily lead unto,) but that he must be constrained to acknowledge, that they cannot be attended under the respect and relation of Officers, to whom the *Keys* be promised; for these are Mr. *Rutherford* his words.

‘*These Offices, that essentially include both the power and the exercise of the Keys, be given to some select persons*. Therefore they are given to some that are not Officers; therefore those cannot

undergo the relation or respect of Officers, to whom these Keys are promised. For how unpleasant, and I suspect also untrue, is such a construction of our Saviours words: *To thee, who bearest the place and person of an Office, I will give an Office. Thou who art an Officer, shalt be made an Officer. Thou that hast an Office, to thee I will give an Office,* and yet this must be the sense of the Text, if *Peter to thee I will sustain the place of Officers here and not the place and room of the Church of believers:* For to them it is given, to invest fit persons with such power of office, that so they may from Christ and by delegation from them execute it,

201

according to the limits laid out by CHRIST.

4. If this complete power of binding and loosing be given to the Officers firstly: then either as Teaching, or as Ruling, in the *special work*, or else as Officers sharing in the *general nature of rule*, which is affirmed of them both.

If this power belong to Teaching, *qua tales*, then to infer from Master *Rutherford* his own ground: *Quod convenit καθ' αὐτὸ, convenit ἀντιστραμμένως*, to them *as such*: then *only* to the *Teachers*, or only to *Rulers*: But that is a confessed falsehood.

If it belong to them as *Rulers*, in regard of that *common* or general nature of *Ruling*: Then is there the equall and same power in both, *Teachers* and *Rulers*: For the general nature is the same and equal in both. But that also is untrue.

These things premised, let us take a taste of the particulars.

“If all the faithful may not lay on hands, (as Titus and Paul;) nor receive witnesses judicially (as Peter and Timothy;) Then they are not the first subject of the power of the Keys.

Ans. The consequence is false, even from his own grounds. For the ruling Elders cannot so lay on hands. Nor so receive witnesses judicially, as the teaching Elders do: and yet they have the power of the Keys.

Object. 2. *“To whomsoever Christ giveth the power of the Keys, to them he gives a Ministerial Spirit, by way of Preaching, and special embassy to entertain sin.*

Ans. This is also unfound upon received principles. For the ruling Elders to whom the power of the keys is given, yet

have not this Ministerial gift, by way of special embassy to bind and loose.

Nor doth the answer which is here suggested, satisfy, *Pag. 9.* “when it is affirmed, *That the power of Preaching is not given formally to ruling Elders, yet it is effectually in the fruit given to them.*

1. For they who receive the power of that same Commission, & consequently both the same and equal power, they must have it *formally*, as well as others. But the first is true, and hath been proved.

2. The *power of preaching effectually* cannot be said to be given to him; who hath no causal hand in that. But so it is here, this power effectual hath no causal hand in it: for the explication evidenceth as much, in that it is said, “*There it a Judicial and autho-*

202

ritative application of it in the external Court of Christ. For this application of the word thus dispensed, implies, that the preaching is issued and ended.

3 *There is a judicial power* in making application of the word preached by any of the Members, who have power to admonish and reprove judicially.

Master Rutherford his fourth Argument.

“*The Church is complete in its Government, suppose there be no power of the Keys in the community of believers. And therefore it’s superfluous to place them there,* pag. 10.

Ans. This was the *Assumption* to be proved; but the proof is wholly mistaken, and the contrary to that is expressed: to wit, *In case believers have power to Excommunicate, &c. Then the Eldership is void and a fixed finger, and there is no necessity of exercise of Keys its Elders.*

But to answer to his words when they come not home to the proof of the proposition denied. *Though the people have potestatem judicij,* yet there is necessary, that the *Elders should have potestatem Officij.*

Arg. 5. “*The multitude of believers must have this power either from heaven or from man: If from heaven, then from the law of nature, or some divine positive law.*

Ans. It hath appeared before in *Matth. 16.* and *Matth. 18.* That there is positive institution and appointment of our Savi-

our to this purpose. But when it is added by him that *it is not found in the New Testament that Christ hath made all Rulers, and hath left none over other in the Lord.*

It hath often been said, and fully opened before: To have power of the Keys is one thing, and to be Rulers and guides is another: even as far differing, as to say, the Court of Aldermen, or a Common Council can proceed against the *Major*, being a Delinquent, and yet none of them are in the place and office of a *Major*.

And hence this overturneth not the order established by Christ, because the members and body have this power, and put forth the act, not as Officers, and *πρόισταμένως*, but as members of a Corporation mutually Covenanted to submit each to other in case of Delinquency, and mutually to judge each other, though in the manner of the dispensation of the censure, as touching the leading of the action, as guides, according to their place and

203

Office, that is proper to the Officers; which is the *Answer* to the *seventh*.

Hence also there is a peculiar authority of *Office-power*, which is *not* in the *flock*: and yet *there is a power of judging*, which is in the *whole*, and is part of the power of the Keys: and these two thwart not one the other, which is the *Answer* to the *eighth*.

Arg. 6. & 11. These two turn much upon the same hinge, and may receive answer upon one and the same ground, being rightly opened.

Arg. 6. Pag. 12. “*If the power of the Keys be given to believers, as such, under this reduplication: then all believing women and Children have authority over the Congregation. For a Quatenus ad omne valet consequentia; and all should be Pastors.*

Arg. 11 “*If the power of the keys be given to believers as believers, then all and only believers have the power of the keys. Quod convenit καθ’ αὐτὸ convenit ἀντιστραμμένως. But this is false, because many believers may be excommunicated and that justly, in which case they remain believers, and yet have no share in the Keys.*

“*Also many have the power of the Keys, yea be Pastors, and yet have no faith. Joh. 6:70. Matth. 7:21.*

Answ. It is something strange to me, that Mr *Rutherford* confessing that those against whom he writes, do constantly acknowledge, that *there is no more, but an unblameable profession of Faith required, to interest a man by way of Charity, to be accepted as a visible Saint, and as a member of a Congregation,* and yet so usually and frequently to suppose they required sincerity, or else there would a nullity follow of their membership.

I shall shortly recall what hath been recorded upon proof, and so expedite an easy answer to all that is said. Such visible Saints, which combine in a holy Covenant one with another, and are allowed by Christ as fit to receive delegated power by way of Commission from him: these are the subject of this Ecclesiastical power. So that it is not believers, as believers, that have this power, but as believers Covenanting and fitly capable according to Christ's appointment, that are the first subject of this power. For believers that are as scattered stones, and are not seated in a visible Church or Corporation, as settled in the wall, these have not any Ecclesiastical power, according to which they

204

can be proceeded withall, or can proceed with other in like condition with themselves. Beside, these believers are such in Charity who come into visible combination, not such in reality, from these grounds which have been formerly proved and now repeated.

The Answer, is evident. This power is given to *such believers,* who are counted fit by Christ and capable, which women and Children, deaf, and dumb, and distracted are not. And therefore the consequence of the fixed Argument fails in the first branch. *The power of the Keys doth not make a Pastor,* and therefore its false in the second branch.

Again, though the rule of Master *Rutherford* *Quod convenit καθ' αὐτό, convenit ἀντιστραμμενως* fails much, according to the Fundamental Laws of Logic, which he will easily find upon second thoughts, and so the bottom of the Argument breaks wholly under him: I shall notwithstanding let that pass, and speak to the matter, wherein there is a worse mistake, because the question is wholly missed.

Visible Saints and believers accounted according to the rules of Charity, are the subject matter of the Church: and therefore when they are justly excommunicated, though in God's account and by

virtue of that secret seed of Grace, they may be Saints inwardly, yet before their recovery, they are not Saints visible, to the rational eye of Charity.

Again, close hypocrites, as *Judas*, may be unbelievers really, and yet seemingly appear to be Saints. *Is it I Master* say all the Disciples fearing themselves as much, as suspecting *Judas*. And therefore the profession is sufficient to keep such in their Office, and to evidence that all their actions are valid, which they ministerially perform.

Arg. 9. “*If Christ give his Keys, he gives answerable gifts to use the Keys. But such gifts, he doth not give to all believers.*”

Answ. Such only are to be members of the visible Church, who are in charities judgement visible Saints: and those who are such, they have received an anointing in some measure, as that they will hear and can discern the voice of Christ, and will follow him, and submit to him. Such are able to discern false Doctrine and false Teachers: such are able to choose themselves Pastors, as being able to relish the favour of spiritual administrations, and to feel what Key will best open their lock: can see and discern what courses be sinful and scandalous, persons obstinate and per-

205

tinacious therein. If such have power to reject false and erroneous teachers, as well as choose them, they have in reason power and skill to discern scandalous offenders and to reject them. This is not an *Office-calling*, but *calling to be a member* of a spiritual corporation, which is Mr *Rutherford* his first demand: and therefore there needs not the tongue of the learned for this work: nor a spirit to come upon them in more then an ordinary manner to discharge this judgement. And their carelessness in not watching, not *purging* is reproved, 1 Cor. 5:2, 3. So Master *Rutherford* hath all his demands satisfied in so many words.

That which is further added by way of inquiry:

“*God never calls to a place, but he leaves rules and directons for to order and guide themselves answerably thereunto: But the Word hath no Canons how the people should order the Keys.*”

Answ. The places are express, the directions plain, *Matth. 18:17.* *If thy brother, &c.* wherein the Lord doth as it were put the ringer to the fescue, and point out all the several passages touching their proceeding, even from the first to the last.

And as in one peculiar duty of admonition, wherein the greatest both danger and difficulty lay, the Lord is pleased to point out the way, and to put it almost pad question: the like proportion should be held, and constantly attended in the other duties of brotherly love, *to build up each other in their most holy faith,* 1 *Thes.* 5:11, 12, 13, 2 *Thess.* 3:14. *Heb.* 13:17. *Rom.* 16:17. *Observe those that cause dissensions among you, &c.*

The last dispute of Master *Rutherford* issues from that so ordinary and often mistake, in not differing the *power of judgement* from the *power of Office*, and confining the power of the Keys unto too narrow a compass, as though the authority of Office was there only to be attended, when it hath appeared, that it is of far larger extent: whence the consequence is very feeble.

“If God require such abilities and qualifications in Officers, which he doth not in all believers, then the power of the Keys is not in the Church. I say, this consequence hath no colour in it, because the power of the Keys is of larger extent then the power of Office, and thence it is, where the other is not, and requires not so great abilities to the managing thereof, as the other doth, which is of greatest eminency.

The 10. *Arg.* Which would blemish this opinion, because it

206

makes the *Government* of God’s house *Democratical*, is reserved to another place, where our answer shall attend it; only for the prtsent, we shall record that staple rule.

The Government of the Church, in regard of the *Body of the people is Democratical*: in regard of the *Elders Aristocratical*; in regard of *Christ*, truly *Monarchical*, And it’s such a compound of all these three, as that a parallel example to the like perfection, is not to be found on earth.

SECT. IV.

We have now done with these Arguments which west id in Mr *Rutherford’s* first Book; there be four more mentioned, *lib.* 2. *p.* 9, 10. to the 14. which now we shall endeavour to address an answer unto; and they are taken from *Matth.* 16. Touching which place, let these two things be attended in the entrance once for all, because we shall be constrained to have

recourse unto them, in the consideration of the Arguments following,

1. It's affirmed by Mr *Rutherford*, p. 9.

“The Keys are given to Peter, as representing the Church-Guides especially, though not excluding believers, giving to them popular consent: and not to believers as united in a company of persons in Church-Covenant, excluding the Elders.

These are his own words, which if we compare them with our former explications of the first subject of Ecclesiastical power, it will appear to any that will lay aside prejudice, That *we so give the power Ecclesiastic to the Church of believers radically, that by their means we communicate the power of office to the Elders, and do seat office-rule formally in them.* So that they are not excluded from having power, but not to have it first, but receive it from the Church; who under Christ, and according to his appointment, convey the same by an outward call unto them.

2. Let it here also be remembered, which is yielded on all hands, that by keys in this place, not some, but all delegated power is to be understood, which is appointed by Christ, as sufficient to attain his end of binding and loosing, opening and shutting heaven.

These things præmised, the Arguments as they lie in order propounded by Mr *Rutherford*, l. 7. p. 9. are these,

‘To that Church are the keys given which is builded on a rock,

207

as an house, the house of wisdom, Prov. 9:1. The house of God, 1 Tim. 3:15. Heb. 3:4. by the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles: by Doctors and Teachers, whom Christ hath given for the building of his house, Eph. 4:11.

“But this house it not a company of professing believers united by a Church-Covenant, and destitute of Pastors and Teachers.

“Therefore such a Church is not here understood.

He proves the assumption.

“The Church of believers combining in Church-Covenant, but wanting their Pastors and Teachers, is not wisdom's house, nor builded by Pastors, and Doctors given to edify and gather the body: but they are only the materials of the house, yea wanting the

Pastors, they want ministerial power for pastoral preaching and administering the seals.

Ans. The assumption fails: and all the proofs are not able to prop it up from falling to the ground. For they are but bare affirmations of many particulars; which either are so many untruths, or mistakes of things that have some truth in them. As,

1. It is untrue, that combined believers in Church-Covenant, wanting Pastors, are not wisdom's house, since we have formerly proved that *such a Church*, taken is *Totum essentiale*, is before officers, and maybe without them, and what can be more plain, when the Scripture affirms, *Act. 14:23. That the Church by lifting up of hands did make and choose them Elders?* in reason they must be before their Elders. When *Paul* chargeth the *Elders to watch over the flock, over whom the Lord had made them overseers*, he implies, there is a flock distinct from their overseers; when the Church rejects her officers as heretical doth she then destroy her self, and cease to be a Church, because they cease to be officers?

2. It is untrue, that believers thus covenanting are only the *materials* of the house; when we have formerly proved, that *such a confederating company*, hath the *materials and formals*, required to the constitution of an house. If *combination* can make a *Presbyterial Church*, why not also a congregational Church.

3. It is a mistake and not a full explication, of that which hath a truth in it. *i.e. That wanting Pastors, they want the power of edifying the body of Christ*, which is required in a visible Church, For the answer is, when they want *Pastors*, they want

208

that power that *Totum Organicum* hath to edify: but they want not that power, with a Church, taken as *Totum essentiale*, should have to edify it self: but it hath power to chose officers, and so to provide for pastoral preaching and administration of the seals by their means.

Lastly let Mr *Rutherford* tell us, how God set *Teachers in the Church*, if Teachers are before the Church.

Obj. 2. "*To these are the keys here promised, who are stewards of the mysteries of God, 1 Cor. 4:1. servants of his house, 2 Cor. 4:5. who are to behave themselves well in God's house, 1 Tim. 3:15.*

who are to cut the word aright. But a company of Believers in Church Covenant, and destitute of officers, are not stewards by office, therefore to such a company the keys are not given. The Proposition is proved by the allegation of several testimonies of Scripture and consent of interpreters; the *clavis*, a key, signifies office-power. Isa. 22:22. Isa. 9:6. Rev. 3:7. Rev. 1:18. Rev. 9:1.

Ans. If by *stewards* we must understand those who are described and intended in the places quoted, 1 Cor. 4:1. 1 Tim. 3:15. &c. It's certain the *Ruling Elder* must have *no key* of binding and loosing, opening or shutting: for all those places do properly intimate the *Teacher's* and *Pastor's office*.

1. The proofs, brought here for confirmation of the proposition, do not touch the thing at all, for which they are brought; or else they reach not the Conclusion in the right and full meaning, which they should have confirmed; Most of them make nothing to the purpose, as Isa. 9:6. Rev. 3:7. Rev. 1:18. all which speak of the supreme and *monarchical* power of Christ, and therefore do not in the least measure look at that *Stewardly* and delegated power of which we speak, and the texts speak, and the proposition speaks in express terms, for which they were brought.

So that there remains but one more (*Isa. 22:22.*) to be considered; that also comes not home to the conclusion, which was to be settled: only proves that which no man ever (I think) denied, that *key* in phrase of Scripture, sometime signifies a power given to a *Steward*.

But what is this to the place *Matth. 16.* or our purpose? for this may be granted; that *key* sometime signifies a *power* given to an *office*, and yet by *keys* here are not meant that power

only, much less a power firstly delegated to them. And if the *Reader* be pleased to recall some things formerly propounded, this will readily appear. By *keys* is here meant *all power*, which serves for the *shutting* and *opening* the doors of the house (*ut supra*) but beside a *stewardly* power, there is requisite for this end, a power of the *spouse* and *wife* of the family; to *her* it is the Lord *Christ*, as *her* husband, hath given power to admit into the family, and reject as just occasion shall require; and in

such cases, and for such ends to judge also; because such acts cannot be done without judgement; to *her* it appertains to call the *Steward* to his place, and put him into his place, and so to put a key of office, by election into his hand.

The issue hence is this.

To those are the keys here promised first, to whom *firstly* and *originaliter*, though not *formaliter* all power belongs; but to the spouse of Christ, the Church of Covenanting Believers, all power *originaliter* belongs; for she can admit, reject, and judge, *she* can call to office, and put in office: and therefore though all power be not *formaliter* in her, yet all comes *originaliter* from her.

And this hath been the opinion and apprehension of the most judicious in all ages, which makes me wonder why Mr. *Rutherford* should thus write, “I think while of late, never any Interpreter dreamed, that in the text, *Matth.* 16. *The keys of the Kingdom* were given to all believers, understanding believers for the *Church*; I say, I wonder he should thus speak; when that man of a large and multifarious reading as Mr *Rutherford* is, cannot but know otherwise, if he will but recall what he knows; nay let him recall and remember what he wrights. *l.* 1. *p.* 21. *we oppose fathers to fathers*, speaking of this point, and therefore confesseth, that the fathers spake and writ so.

Object. 3. “To these in this text doth Christ give the keys, to whom he giveth warrant and official authority for the actual exercise, to wit, of opening and shutting. But this warrant and official authority of binding and loosing Christ giveth to Peter only as representing Teachers and Elders, therefore he only gives to Peter this official power, I will give to thee the keys, &c. there is his power, and authority granted: and whatsoever shall be bound in earth, shall be bound, &c. there is his warrant for the exercise of the act of his power.

210

Ans. This Argument labours of the like disease with the former, and the conclusion, in a fair sense, may be yielded without any prejudice to our cause, or hazard to the question controverted betwixt us, namely, That only to *Peter*, as representing the place of Teachers, is the *official authority* of the keys gi-

ven, (as will appear in the things premised in the entrance.) *Officers* may have this *official power formally*, and yet the power of the keys may be *originally* in the *Church*, and this office-power *virtually* proceed from them.

2. The Proposition is apparently false, to wit, To them the power is given firstly, to whom warrant and official authority for the actual exercise of the keys is given: I say this is false; because 1. *the power of the keys* is far larger then *office-power*: as to admit, reject, &c. 2. There is power before *office-power*, which virtually communicates and conveys it to the officers, who are made partakers thereof.

When it is added. *‘Now if the keys be not given to Peter, as to a Pastor, then Peter and Pastors by this place as Pastors, neither have the keys, nor official warrant to preach, and to remit and retain sins; and if by this place they have it not, we desire to see a warrant from Christ, before he went to heaven for Pastoral Preaching.*

Answ. Though the *keys* be not firstly given to them there, yet here they may have good warrant for their *office-power*, because the Church, who hath received power to admit, reject, judge, choose and refuse, doth by Christ’s allowance and warrant call them to that place, and invert them with that office. Again that *Commission Matth. 28:19. Go preach and baptize, John 20. Whose sins ye remit they are remitted, gives* warrant abundantly to that work of preaching.

Mr. *Rutherford* lastly addes *p. 12. ‘To bind and loose are acts of official power: and of Pastors, Rulers, Feeders: I prove the Antecedent, because To bind and loose by all Interpreters, Augustine, Cyril, &c. and the evidence of Scripture, is, by public and pastoral Preaching to remit and retain sin, But pastoral preaching doth not belong to believers.*

Answ. *Binding and loosing*, look at them as in the place, and in their largest sense, they comprehend the exercise of all the acts of the keys, or Church power, which may attain this end: and the seals are not only by public *preaching* (for then the

Ruling-Elder should have *no key* to bind or loose) but also by *admonitions, excommunications, admissions*, which as we have formerly proved, issue from a power of judging, common to the

people with the Pastor, and not appropriate to the Pastors only. Lastly we so give the keys to the Church, that yet she doth not exercise any act of *Office-rule* without Officers, whom she calls to that end.

Object. 4. “*If Christ neither in Matth. 16. nor in Matth. 18. doth say, that the Keys, for the act of the keys, (to wit, binding and loosing) are given to the Church of believers without their Officers, then neither place proves it, But Christ doth say it, therefore the text doth not bear it.*

“*That Christ doth not say it, he proves; because speaking of the Church in the first part of the verse, he changeth his proof, I will give to thee, not to the Church. But it’s answered, The promise is made to Peter, because he gave a confession of Christ, in the name of believers. To this Mr. Rutherford replies. If the keys be given to believers, so Covenanting; I ask, whether they be given to them, a true or a false profession intervening, as the nearest cause of the gift of these.*

We answer, if by false profession, such a one may be meant, which may agree unto hypocrites, covertly such, yet appearing outwardly unblameable, we grant it.

To this Master *Rutherford* replies. “*Then the keys are not given to believers, because they are believers, and united unto Christ as his Spouse. 2. then this Author saith amiss, that the Church instituted by Christ is a company of godly men, whereof Peter was one. 3. Our brethren prove the keys to be a part of the liberty of the redeemed ones: but counterfeit professors are not such.*

Answ. All these consequences issue from that so often and ordinary mistake of *visible Saints*; and if the Reader shall remember how to rectify his judgement in the right understanding thereof, the answer will be easy and familiar, namely: *visible Saints*, which are members of the Church, they are externally united to Christ; and not internally *always*: they are faithful and godly to the judgement of Charity, but not in reality and truth: they are redeemed visibly, not inwardly and efficaciously.

It’s added lastly by Master *Rutherford*, “*That Christ speaketh*

212

“to Peter, as one representing the Apostles, and not as to one representing all believers, is clear, first, because by the confession of our brethren, binding and loosing are denied to many that make Peter’s confession, thou art Jesus the son of the living God, as to believing Women and Children, and many out of Church-estate.

Answ. When Master Rutherford makes that the conclusion he would confute, that Christ speaks not to all believers in the person of *Peter*, we affirm the same, and that he knows, and in many places expresseth; and therefore it was sufficient to lay aside the consideration of all his proofs: yet that we may not leave the place void, we shall speak shortly to the particulars.

Let it then be remembred, that *Peter* speaks in the name of a community of Disciples believing and professing the faith with one joint consent and agreement, for the words are plain and differencing, *Matth.* 16:15. *But whom say ye that I am? Yet in way of difference and distinction from those some and others mentioned in the foregoing verses, Some said, he was John Baptist, some Elias, others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets.* These here understood by *some and others*, were in reason not unbelievers only, but many believers also, and yet in a differencing way our Saviour adds, whom *say ye* my Disciples, who have walked in the profession of the Faith? *Peter* in the name of these thus having confessed the Faith, and upon that joint confession now instituted a Church by Christ, in the next words, in the name of these, (I say) *Peter* answers; and therefore not in the name of Women and Children, which is Master Rutherford’s first Argument.

Object. He adds. “*If believers as giving Peter’s confession and builded upon the Rock, Christ, by this place are made a Ministerial Church by Christ, and gifted with the power of the keys: then the official power of preaching and binding and loosing should be made as stable and firm from defection, as the Church of elect believers,*

Answ. The Assumption is denied: for as it hath been often said, The Church here, to whom the keys are firstly given, though they have a *virtual power* to call men in a right order according to Christ, unto Office, yet they have not *formally*

Official power: nor is the one, I mean *the Official power*, of like stability with the Church. For the Church may be without

213

them, and in case they fail, as in great Apostacies and univerfal declinings of the Churches, they may, and yet the *visible Church* never did, nor can, so totally fail, as all our Orthodox writers, and Master *Rutherford* confesseth.

Object 3. “*Those to whom Christ gives the keys, do represent the person of Christ, and who despiseth them despiseth Christ, and he that honoureth them, honoureth Christ, which is evidently spoken to the Ministers of Christ, Matth. 10:40, &c. Now Scriptures never make all believers Ambassadors in Christ’s room &c.*”

Ans. The representation of Christ as his *Stewards* and *Ambassadors*, belongs only to such who have *Office-power*, and are *Rulers* in his house, and this power is but *part* of the power of the Keys here mentioned: and therefore the Church may be the subject of the Keys firstly and originally, and virtually communicate *Office-power* unto her Ministers, whom she calls, though formally she hath not that power, nor so dispenseth it, and therefore the Proposition is to be denied as apparantly false: namely, those to whom Christ giveth the keys here in *Matth. 16.* those represent his person, as *Ambassadors*, because the Spouse had a power in the family before the Steward was entertained in to the family by her.

Object. 2. “*Those to whom the keys are given, do authoritatively forgive and retain sins, and their acts are valid in Heaven. But the Church or company of believers, wanting their Officers, by no Scripture can authoritatively forgive.* When it was answered, that believers out of Office may forgive. *2 Cor. 2:10. He replies that the place in the Corinthians is controverted, and we doubt not (says he) but if the same nature, with the power of excommunicating 1 Cor. 5:4.*”

Ans. That phrase of *Authoritative forgiving* being a little cleared, the stress of the Objection will readily be taken off.

The word *Authority* in the ordinary, speech is sometime taken for *power*, and lies in equal latitude with it: but in its proper signification, as in this place, it’s put for *Ruling* and *Office-power*.

Retaining this sense, which must needs be intended, and the expressions of Master *Rutherford* in this place intimate no less: The proportion admits a ready answer by a rational denial. There is a *power of judgement*, which the *fraternity* have, and they

214

forgive judicially. There is a power of *rule and Office*, and the *Officers* forgive *Authoritatively*, as Rulers. Of the first, the place of the *Corinthians* is understood: for any other of other Churches, or such as were of no Church, might, and indeed should have forgiven the incestuous person, *charitatively*, out of charity, as Christians; but its spoken here in reference to his former *censure*, and so for his *receiving* in again, and those in a Church only must, and indeed can do this.

The like and same answer suits the 5 Objection, merely issuing from the same mistake, as namely, when he says,

“*To those only are the keys given, who having Paul’s spirit, which is a spirit Official to preach and excommunicate, may convene and deliver to Satan.* Ans. The distinction of *judicial and Official* power fully discovers the falseness of the proportion, and preserves the power in his first and proper subject, according to former explication.

We have now done with all the objections, which we meet withal, touching the *first subject* of Church-power in Master *Rutherford* his *second book*; unless it be those which fall in with a fresh disquisition of the *Catholic visible Church*, where we shall attend them. Only before I pass from hence, I shall crave leave to offer some things to consideration touching this 16 of *Matth*. A place upon which all sorts have pressed in first or last, to claim some privilege to themselves. *The Pope* will needs have all power belong to him as *Peter’s* successor: *The Prelates* they claim the next place for preeminence as peculiar to them; *The Elders* and *Officers* of Churches conceive it best suits their ministerial condition, and now at last the *Fraternity* lay in for some allowance to themselves, and that they were looked at, in the first intent of Christ. My purpose is only to propound some things, that may occasion some wise-hearted to settle the meaning of the text by undeniable evidence; we shall therefore make our approaches upon the sense of the place, by the propositions following.

Proposit. I.

Key, being *an engine of power*: by *keys* in the plural *all* delegated power for the ordering of the affairs of the Church, is here understood, as the use of the keys expressed in the words doth fully evidence. For all power that the Lord Christ hath

215

betruſted his Church withall, aims at this end, to open and ſhut, *bind and looſe*.

PROPOSIT. II.

These *keys* and power muſt be given to a *ſingle ſociety* (as Mr *Rutherford* is wont to ſpeak) *i.e.* to a *ſort or condition* of men under ſome *ſpecial* relation. *To thee* as a ſingle ſociety, not to them.

PROPOSIT. III.

This *ſingle ſociety*, under ſuch a relation and reſpect, *ſhare* alike in equality of this power promiſed to them, the reaſon is this: Thoſe which have the ſame commiſſion ſhare alike in the ſame and equal power, becauſe the power they do poſſeſs and partake of iſſues only from their commiſſion, but there is but one and the ſame commiſſion given to all: *I will give to thee &c.*

PROPOSIT. IV.

This ſingle ſociety here related unto, *cannot* be the *condition of Rulers*: becauſe to the perſons here intended *all* power is given. But *all* power is not given to *the Rulers* firſtly. For there is a power before the power of Rulers, to wit power of election, and ſo admiſſion into their places, And that both theſe acts imply a power, is thus made plain. An office is a *key*, and conſequently comes under the *power of the keys*: and to give that key implies a *power*. 2. If excommunication argues a power, then alſo admiſſion doth the like, in that there is a parity of reaſon on both ſides: one gives that, which another takes away.

Again, ſhould the *condition* of an officer or an elder be related unto, It muſt be either the *Teaching-elder* alone, and then the *Ruling-elder*, and his power is excluded: or if the *Ruling-Elder* alone muſt be meant, then the power of the *Teaching-Elder* muſt alſo be denied: and then how can *All* power be here meant by theſe *keys*? Nor can the *general nature of a Ruler*,

as belonging to both teaching and ruling be attended. For then both *teaching* and *ruling* should have the same equal power, having one and the same commission, but that the word and all wise hearers deny.

PROPOSIT. V.

Hence this power of the *keys*, cannot be given to one *single society* of men formally in all the kinds of it, because it requires several *kinds* of subjects *formally* different: As some *Ruling*, some

216

Teaching, some *electing*. Hence it follows undeniably, These keys, and the power signified by them, must be given to such, who have some of this power *firstly, and formally, and originally* and *virtually* can give the rest of the power, which so given, may be fully exercised in all the acts of binding and loosing, according to all the necessities of the Church and intendment of our Saviour Christ. And this may readily be accomplished and easily apprehended to be done by a Church of believers: They can admit, elect; this *formally* belongs to them: and officers being elected by them, the whole government of the Church, will then go on in all the operations thereof, and be fit to attain the ends, attended by our Saviour. The first thing which was of difficult explication, is thus dispatched.

The second wherein the greatest stress lies in this iniquity, is, *Whether the Church mentioned in that text, be the visible or invisible Church.*

After many thoughts floating in my mind, what might be the meaning of our Saviour, one expression of Mr. *Rutherford*, l. 2. p. 10. made me recall former considerations. His words are these.

“Though the building of this Church on the Rock, Christ, may well be thought to be the inward building of the Catholic and invisible Church in the faith of Christ, yet as his promised to the Church, to the which Christ promiseth the keys of the kingdom of heaven, it can be no other beside external and ministerial building by a public Ministry.

Which expressions occasioned me to recover many of those debates, which before had been stirring in my bosom, whether

the Church there, might not in a safe sense be conceived to be the *visible* Church: and all things weighed, my apprehensions came to be inclined and biassed that way, and that for this reason, until better reason appear.

That Church is here meant, which is built upon the rock. Christ by the visible confession of Peter, as explicated immediately before.

But the invisible Church is not built by a visible profession, such as Peter's was.

This second part or Assumption will find ready acceptance, by reason of the opposition betwixt visibility and invisibility.

For the Proposition that is made good, by the meaning of the

217

words; *Thou hast made a confession of my self a rock; and therefore art called Πετρος and upon my self, so confessed, will I build my Church.*

The main argument that makes against this interpretation is this. That Church is here understood, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. But against the visible Church the gates of hell hath prevailed. Therefore.

Ans. The visible Church is attended in a double respect.

Either as this or that particular congregation.

Or else as a *Church universal* existing in the particulars.

And in this latter sense, it is taken in this place: and then it is a sure and confessed truth, *That the visible Church doth not fail*; and this is the judgement of all the orthodox, as Mr Rutherford grants, *l. 2. p. 107.*

And in this sense, (*salvo metiori judicio*) is that place to be understood. 1 *Tim. 3:15. that thou mightest know how to behave thy self in the House of God.* This house is the *visible Church*. For 1. *Timothy* is instructed how to demean and carry himself in it; therefore he must be acquainted with the house, and the occasions thereof; and to demean himself suitably thereunto, which is inconsistent with invisibility. 2. This direction was to continue to all succeeding officers, even to the end, and that in all their particular charges: and therefore must be a *pattern of a Church*, or a *Church* as existing in its particulars, which Christ will have while the world continues, For *Eph. 4:12, 13.*

There must *be Pastors and Teachers*, until all the faithful be gathered *into the unity of the Faith*, and *acknowledgment of the son of God*, Dr Ames. *Medull*, l. 1. c. 31. 37.

CHAP. XII.

Touching the Catholic and visible Church. To the ministry and guides of the Catholic visible Church hath the Lord committed the keys, as so the first subject.

BEfore we come to the scanning of this great controversy, which hath exercised the hearts and pens of the most learned in this age, we must of necessity clear the terms of the question, in a word or two, that so

218

the breadth and scope of it may be laid out in its full bounds and limits; least otherwise we be at a loss, when we come to apply our selves to special difficulties, which will appear in the particular arguments which come into consideration.

1. By *key*, as we have heard, we are to understand, *a power delegated from Christ, to dispense and administer the holy things of his house*, according to his own will, prescribing an *order* to that end: the *keys* being an *ensign of this power*, and put by a *metonymy* for the *subject*, the power it self.

2. What is meant by *the Catholic and visible Church*.

When I had read over Mr. *Rutherford* once and again, I was at a stand in mine own thoughts, to determine certainly what was his proper intendment. I profess in a word of truth, I would not willingly misconceive his meaning, and so wrong him and the truth, but the variety of his expressions forced my apprehensions also to vary; *sometime* his words seem to cast this *Catholic visible Church*, upon the *general nature of a Church*, or a *Congregation* taken in the *common nature* thereof; and this I could willingly embrace, Thus many of his phrases seem to sound.

“*To what principal subject hath the Lord given reason and a faculty of discoursing? is it to Peter or John? No, no: It is for and to the race of mankind: the case its so here, l. 2. p. 291.* So speaking again of the same matter. l. 2. p. 293. *So he giveth by order of nature to his Church in general.*

Sometime again his expressions seem to intimate an *Oecumenical council*, which is the *Catholic Church representative*.

l. 2. p. 304. It doth not follow: because the Catholic, representative, visible Church, is the first subject of the keys, &c.

Lastly sometimes his expressions seem to point out a Catholic visible Church, in the integral nature thereof, as an integrum arising of it of all the particular congregations as the members thereof. This kind of difference his words intimate. l. 2. p. 311.

“General councils are neither necessary to the being, nor to the well-being, but only to the best-being of the Catholic Church; here he apparently distinguisheth a general council from the Catholic Church in this debate.

The like phrase is found. l. 2. p. 304. Which of these doth most suit with his meaning, I cannot (to speak ingenuously) peremptorily define. The law was old, Cum bonis bonè agier o-

219

portet. I confess my thoughts have inclined me most unto the second, as that he intended an Oecomenical Council, because when he comes to apply himself to some of the objections which are made, his usual discourse in the full current runs that way. Though, if I might have had my secret desire, I could have wished he had intended the first: because therein we should come near to an accord.

That I may deal sincerely in regard of the truth, and inoffensively, in regard of so worthy and learned a man as Mr Rutherford, I shall take leave to set down my apprehensions, such as they be, touching all these senses, thus explained; let the truth prevail, and the Reader judge.

Taking the Catholic Church in the first sense, as eyeing the nature of the Church in general.

It's that which suits in a great part with our opinion and apprehensions: we shall therefore gather in upon the right explication of this truth, by the conclusions following.

1. Conclus.

When we say a congregation of visible Saints covenanting to walk in the ordinances of the Gospel, is the prime and original subject of the power of the keys; I suppose it is obvious to common sense, that as we do not, so we cannot understand it of this or that individual congregation, as though they only had it, or none but they, or as though they had it firstly, and all from them: this, I say is obvious even to envy itself. For what meaneth those cla-

mors of *Independency*, which are cast upon our persons and opinions, if we should hold that one particular did depend upon another? And in that we maintain this as a truth, that every particular congregation hath *equal* power with another, and *complete* power, *taken with all his officers*, to the exercise of all ordinances, we do by such an Assertion profess that this power is common to them all, and therefore cannot be proper to any, but only in the *individual* and *special* determination thereof.

The issue is this then, *That the power of the keys belongs firstly to a congregation of covenanting believers, not as this congregation, but because a congregation of such*, and thus I do conceive (*salvo meliori judicio*) that of our Saviour is to be interpreted, *I will build my Church*, taking a *visible congregation of visible covenanting believers*, as that which is a *pattern* and a *samplar*, (as I may so speak,) which leaves an impression upon all the parti-

220

culars as *common unto all*, and is *preserved in all*: and it will never fall out, but there will be some or other particular, in which it will be preserved, as we shall speak afterward, when we come to the special scanning the place; and in this sense it is, the Lord Jesus never wants a *visible Church*, on earth, though *this*, or *that* visible may, doth, and will fail, as we see by plentiful experience and proof out of the word, in those famous congregations of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, &c.

2. Concl.

A Congregation of Covenanting visible Saints, being a GENUS to all the particular congregations, which are partes homogeneæ or species thereof: hence it follows.

1. *That a congregation doth firstly communicate its whole nature to every particular Church*, and with that all the power and privileges that did appertain unto it, it doth equally and indifferently bestow upon them. As it is a received rule in reason. *Genut est totum partibus essentielle*. And therefore doth communicate his whole nature firstly and, equally to all his *species*, and all those properties that did appertain to his nature by it and with it, it conveys to all of them indifferently.

2. And from this ground it is, *That each congregation hath all Ecclesiastical power that is seated in the general nature of the Church*, each particular assembly hath as equally and completely conveyed to it, as any other; and can act all of it without the other. As this and that particular man, as *Tho. John, Jeremy* hath all the nature equally, and completely communicated to them, and can put forth the operations of that nature fully of themselves, and without the help of any other.

3. Hence *Catholic Church* (in this sense) *is never to be seen, but in particular congregations, nor yet ever exerciseth its power and operations alone (or seorsim) but only in the several Assemblies*, Genus nec existit, nec operatur nisi in speciebus. The nature of *Animal* is only to be seen *in homine & bruto*. The nature of *man* it only acts, only exists, in particular men. Hence the nature of the *Church Catholic*, or general, comes to be determined and confined to its particular, and being determined, it only acts in that: and is regulated by that particular in which it is, and to which it gives its constitution, together with the special or individual nature in which it is. The old rule was.

Genus cum forma constituit speciem.

I will take leave to exemplify for the help of the meaner sort;

221

whose apprehensions meet not with these in their ordinary road. This *Corporation* is a special kind of a Corporation: This man and woman are husband and wife, or their contract is a marriage contract. Here *Corporation* taken in the general nature for the body of a people combined in a civil way for civil ends; *this general nature*, and whatever privileges are so proper and peculiar, as that they cannot be separated therefrom, both the general nature and all such privileges are truly attributed to & affirmed of *this and that particular corporation* as the general of the special, and this general comes to be determined and *specificated*, by the *individual and formal combining of this* special company of persons: and *that* makes it *this corporation*. And that *general nature* as it comes to be conveyed to this particular, *is confined to and acted only* by the power of that particular: so that though *this corporation hath the general nature which is common to all*

corporations, yet have they not power nor privilege, but in their own place.

So that marriage contract, which is general to all of that sort and condition, it comes to be determinedly the particular contracting of these, added to the general: whence it is evident, that beside a marriage covenant in the general, there must come a particular contract betwixt this man and this woman: else they will never be man and wife; still the rule holds, Genus cumformâ constituit speciem. The general nature of marriage contract, comes to be determined only in this particular, so that he is a husband only to this woman, this woman is wife only to this man.

And hence by the way, the weakness and fallacy of that conceit will easily, be discovered, *That profession in the general, should make a man a member of all particular Churches on earth.*

Hence fifthly, from the first; ground it follows,

5. *That each particular congregation is complete and independent, for the exercise of all acts and dispensations belonging to a congregation or Church, without any reference to any other congregation, because they are distinct species, which firstly and equally participate of the nature of the genus, and so of all those privileges that equally, and indifferently appertain thereunto.*

6. *Hence again, the general nature of a Church, as it is preserved, so the full good, in the full Latitude thereof, is promoted*

222

and advanced by the particular Congregations, which are the species thereof; for this is a collection which naturally and necessarily follows and flows from hence.

7. *Hence a Classis (which ariseth from particular congregations, and yet not from all, but from some, and that from some members of particular congregations, sent out for counsel-sake, to consider what might be useful in the behalf of the Churches) it can be no species of a Church: for a particular Congregation is species specialissima, whence it comes, the nature of the Church in general, and of the species in particular are complete, without any such a Classis; and therefore all Church-power, and the exercise thereof is full and complete in point of Jurisdiction without it. And therefore Jurisdiction cannot be firstly there, because if the*

nature of a Church be complete without it, then the power and Jurisdiction of Church-government is complete without that, and not first in that.

Upon these grounds thus laid and debated, We shall address an *Answer to all Master Rutherford his Arguments*, unless they fail under this conclusion in the sense formerly explicated.

I.

“First, *he would have the Apostles to receive the Keys in the name of the whole Catholic Ministerial guides. Because they must stand in the place and room of a single society, when they received that Commission, whose sins ye remit, shall be remitted.* Joh. 20.

Ans. 1. The *Apostle* in that Commission were *extraordinary* persons, and were sent into all the world, to lay the foundation of the Gospel, by an Apostolical power, and *in this sense they have no successors; nor did they stand in the room of any.*

2. When they did supply the room of a *single society*, I demand, *what society was it?* Neither of *Ruling Elders*, nor of *Teaching Elders*. It must be a *single society*, and *one* relation they must undergo; what ever will be affirmed, will be prejudicial to his cause. For if they were in the room of *Teaching Elders*, then *Ruling Elders* have by this Commission *no right* to the *Keys*. If they supplied the room of *Ruling* only, then the *teaching Elders* must *claim nothing* from hence.

Again, I would willingly know, when they supplied the

223

room of either of these, whether they supplied the room of *all* of them, or of *some* of them? If of *all* of them, whether *severally* executing their Offices in their places, or *combined together* in a *Classis* or *Synod*?

If it be affirmed, (which cannot be denied with any reason) that they supply the room of these as they be *severally* executing their Offices, (For their Authoritative preaching is one part of binding and loosing) then each particular ruler may bind or loose, excommunicate and absolve in each particular Congregation, as well as in a *Classis*.

Nay because they are *first Elders* in the *particular congregations* before they be in a *Classis* or *synod*, and there *succeed the Apostles as Rulers*: then they may be, nay *must be there*, the *first subject of the Keys*, because *there* they *first* succeed the Apostles in binding and loosing by *official Preaching*.

If it shall be said, the *Apostles* represent *Elder*, as they are *conjoined* in an *Oecumenical council*. This belongs to *some* only: for *all Elders* never met in an *Oecumenical council*. Beside this is not *proper* to Elders, for *brethren there* meet also: whereas this relation the Apostle here supplies must be *common* to *all that single society*, and *only* to *that* single society, whose room they sustain.

The naked truth is, *the Apostles here*, as in *Matth. 28:19. Mark 16:15.* are *extraordinary men*, whom *none succeed*. And as they are *ordinary Presbyters*, or supplied their place, *so* they supplied the place of *Deacons*, 6:1, 2. and had *virtually*, and so could exercise, the power of *all Officers*. And therefore lastly when they supply the place of Elders, this shews what an Elder should do in his order, and according to his place, but whether *he* be the *πρωτον δέκτικον* of Church power, *this* evinceth not; but in *no* manner or measure evidenceth any thing touching the *combination of Elders*, or *their power*.

Before we address a particular *answer*, to the *Arguments* next ensuing, we must recollect some former considerations that the Reader may carry them along as his Compass to steer by.

1. The common nature of Church and Officers only exists and works, and is preserved in the particulars.
2. The complete being and power of Churches or Elders

224

in the full compass and Latitude of both, thus existing, includes not only the *common*, but the *peculiar nature of the individuals together with the general*: And therefore if we look at them, as in consideration severed from their individuals, they only exist in *our understanding*, whereas the *reality* of their *natures* only exists in the *particulars*. There must be a *particular combination of a people*, beside a combination in general, before the *full* and

complete nature of a *Corporation* will be *existing*, or can be so conceived. The like may be said of other free contracts.

3. Hence the Lord never sets up Churches or Officers, gives power to them, and requires the execution of power from them, but ever the Lord looks at the *particular* in the *general* & the *general* as *determined* in the *particular*: The *Reason* is, because the *existing* and *working* of Churches and Officers is *only* to be seen, as it only appears, & is expressed in the *individuals*. As when God makes an *Officer* by election, erects a *Church*, it's a *particular Church* and *individual Officer*; therefore the individual *there* first exists, and the *general* in the *individual*.

Hence lastly upon the same ground, and for the same reason, as the *general* is divided into his particulars, so the *generals* are *preserved* in them. All *visible numbers* exist in *particular Congregations*, and are *perfected* by *Ordinances* therein.

Let the Reader take these particulars with him, and they will pilot him so, as he may see his passage through all *Objections* that shall be presented in his way.

The second and fourth Objections are these.

I pray you consider, that Christ's intention, in giving the Ministry, is not for a Congregation of 40, 50, 100, as if he intended to impawn all power therein, but intended the edifying of his body Catholic, and the comming of all to the unity of the Faith. A Congregation cannot be all Saints. This power it clearly given that body, which the Lord is to make a perfect man, according to the measure of the fulness of Christ, Lib. 2. 290.

The sum of this is repeated, as *the fourth Argument*, 2. p. 293.

"To that Church hath Christ given, as to the first Church the Ordinances and Ministry which he principally intended to perfect, to gather, and to bring to the unity of the Faith.

"But he principally intended to perfect, to gather, and to bring to the unity of the Faith in a perfect body, by these ordinances and

225

"Ministry, the whole Catholic visible Church: and secondly this or that Congregation.

Ans. 1. Mr Rutherford shall answer Mr Rutherford Lib. 2. Pag. 248. Where he professedly disputes out of this place of Eph.

4. for a Church invisible to be the *first subject* of all ordinances, Christian privileges, and Officers, on this manner.

Hence let me reason thus, (saith he)

“The Church whose gathering together, whose unity of Faith &c. and growth of that measure of the fulness of Christ, that the Lord intendeth, by giving to them for that end, some Pastors and Teachers; Eph. 4:11, 12. must be that Church to whom all the promises of the Covenant and privileges do belong.

“But the Lord intendeth the gathering together to the unity of the Faith, to the knowledge of the sons of God, and growth of the measure of the fulness of Christ, only of the invisible elected, and redeemed Church, not of the visible, professing Church, nor doth the Lord send Pastors or Doctors, upon a purpose of gathering the Visible Church.

Thus Master *Rutherford* is of several apprehensions, and one undermines another: and upon the former grant this cannot stand, much less conclude.

Come we a little nearer to the mark, and try the particulars.

First examine the *Proposition*.

Those whom Christ doth purpose to bring to the unity of the Faith, and the fulness of the stature of Christ, &c. Eph. 4:11, 12. those are certainly such who shall be saved. And therefore must of necessity be *true believers*. For they alone attain the *perfection* formerly mentioned.

And it is as undeniably evident, that *ordinances and Ministers are not given firstly to such*, I mean to *true believers*, as Mr *Rutherford* is express in several passages of his book. The intendment of salvation from God, and the giving of Ordinances and Ministry keep not equal pace each with other; nay Master *Rutherford* will tell us, that *such an opinion sides apparantly with the Arminians*, L. 2. P. 248. The *proposition then is utterly untrue*.

Let the *Assumption* come to its trial.

“But God doth principally intend to bring the whole Catholic visible Church to the unity of the Faith, the acknowledgement of the Son of God, and the fulness of the measure of the stature of Christ.

226

Answ. The *whole visible Church consists of good and bad, wheat and tares, elect and reprobate, as it is confessed by Mr Rutherford and by all judicious men.*

And doth God intend to bring *reprobates to the unity of the Faith and the fulness of the stature in Christ?* I know that Mr Rutherford will not say so, so that both the premises failing, the conclusion must needs fall with them.

Ans. Secondly, what is all this to the controversy in hand? The question between Mr Rutherford and us, is this; *That to the Ministry and guides of the Catholic visible Church, the Lord hath committed the Keys, as to the first subject:* But let the former conclusion, and the whole frame of the reason be granted, to wit, that *Ordinances and Ministry are given to the Catholic visible Church of believers* (for these must here be understood, as being distinct from Ministers and guides) yet this proves not the *Keys given to the guides only.* For the former we can grant in a safe sense according to our former explications, and yet we shall deny this latter, as not finding any sufficient proof see it.

Answ. 3. *Lastly, apply we the Argument to that cause and question in hand, as controverted betwixt us, and it will appear that it lights strongly against it.*

To that Church which Christ principally intends to bring to the unity of the Faith and the acknowledgement of the Son of God, is to them gives the power of the Keys, as to the first subject.

But the gathering of the Ministry of the Catholic Church, the perfecting of them, and bringing of them to the unity of the Faith, and the acknowledgement of the Son of God, Christ doth not principally intend.

Therefore unto them are not the Keys given as to the first subject.

Thus we have done with the *second and fourth Arguments.*

Arg. 3. *“If all power Ministerial be given to a Congregation (by our brethrens confession) under the name of a flock, of redeemed ones, as the body of Christ, Act. 20:28. Col. 1:18. Then it belongs to the Catholic Church. For of them these titles are ve-*

rified, and agree first to the Catholic visible Church, as is clear Col. 1:18. Eph. 5:25, 26. 1 Tim. 3:15. Eph. 2:19, 20, 21. And so they come to our hand.

227

Answ. I am glad we are come so near, if indeed it be so: why do we not then shake hands? for that is it which we seriously and earnestly desire, If it was that will and good pleasure of God. Let us then enquire whether Mr *Rutherford* his mind and our meaning agree, and then we shall most willingly fall in with him.

This Catholic Church, as before admits of a threefold apprehension: either as it implies a *covenanting congregation* of believers: or 2. *Totum representativum?* 3. or *Totum integrale*. If he means the first, as it is the meaning of the Scripture, we have what we would, and Mr *Rutherford* his conclusion falls flat to the ground.

If the Catholick Church hath the power of the Keys given firstly to it, then the Ministers and Guides thereof, are not the first subject of them.

But the Catholic Church *i.e.* according to us, A congregation of Saints covenanting (as before we have explicated the question) hath the power of the Keys, therefore the Ministers or Guides are not the first subject:

The *Proposition* admits no gain-saying, because the Catholic Church and the Guides are different and distinct in common apprehension.

The *second part* Mr *Rutherford* grants to wit, *That the ministerial power of the Keys, is given to a congregation, under the name of the flock, &c.*

And hence his cause must needs suffer shipwreck, failing by these shoals, for I suppose as Mr *Rutherford*, must as he doth, difference betwixt the *Church-catholic* as the spouse and body of Christ, and the *Ministry* thereof.

But here he grants, that this power is given to the spouse and body. Therefore not firstly to the ministry. Beside, the places which he allegeth, and seems to allow, evince thus much.

Paul sends for the elders of *Ephesus*, and bids them take heed to the *flock, over whom Christ hath made them overseers*, therefore this *flock* is distinct from their *overseers*; and if unto

such a *flock* the power ministerial be given, it cannot be given to the *overseers* firstly.

Hence the *flock* is not the Catholic Church, take it as an *integrum* of all congregations, for its only at *Ephesus*; and over it, not overall the world, where they made them *overseers*.

228

Nor can it be meant of an Oecumenical Church, upon the same grounds; yea by his own confession else-where, it is not so to be taken. Taking Catholic in this sense, according to former explication, *i.e. the general nature of a Church, as existing and acting in the particulars*, we have what we desire, and our cause is confirmed by this means, nor confuted.

That which is added, p. 291. 292. adds no force to this Argument, nor hurt to our cause; namely its said, *The whole Catholic Church visible, is made one visible ministerial body, and said to have organical parts, as it is described, Cant. 6:4. by eyes, teeth, temple, and so to have particular Churches under her.*

Ans. All this is true, in a true sense, and urgeth not the conclusion at all. For *the general nature of officers*, is answerable to the *general nature of the Church*, I mean it is of the like latitude. And conceive all particular congregations so constituted, they may be called *unum genere*, *i.e.* they all, are *Church* so gathered and *constituted*. This particular Church is a Church, and so all the particulars they have the nature of a Church attributed to them, and affirmed of them, as the *genus* of the *species*.

And thus the nature of the Church, and so the power of the *Keys* in the Church, take them completed in their full being, they include the particular in the general, and determine the general in the particular and so the nature of the Church and power of the keys, exist firstly in the particular, are therein acted and in that determined, which is all we call for, and our cause requires in the explication of it. So that we are to seek neither for the nature of the Church, nor the power of the *Keys* acting or existing but *in particular congregation*: As the *genus* only exists, acts, and is seen in *his species*.

The *fifth* and *seventh* arguments belong to another place, where we shall attend them. The sixth is little or no whit differing from the third, yet we shall propound it, and make a return unto it.

Arg. 6. "*Because Christ hath not given the power of the Ministry, ordinances, and jurisdiction to the single congregation, as to the first subject, upon the ground that our brethren speak, to wit, because the single congregation is that spouse, to which Christ referred as an husband, and that body to which he carrieth the relation of a head.*"

229

"*Nor is it that adequate number of ransomed persons, of sheep, of lost ones, to the which Christ doth carry that adequate and complete relation of a Saviour, King, Governor; therefore that visible Church, for whose salvation Christ hath given the ministerial power, must be the larger visible Church.*"

Answ: If the Reader be pleased to look back to the first conclusion, in the explication of the cause, or the preparation we made to the Answer of the second Argument, it will appear that as we do not, so we cannot understand our question of the *first* subject of the *Keys* to be *an individual or single congregation*: as though that individual had it firstly and all from it: when the clamour of *independency* doth proclaim the contrary. How can we maintain every *individual* congregation to be *independent*, if one did depend upon another? whereas it's well known, that we *maintain each congregation hath equal power with another*; therefore we say that the power of the *Keys* belongs to a *congregation*, as *existing in its particulars*, and therefore *equally* belongs to all particulars, in all which the *general* with the *particulars* are *preserved and perfected*.

The *complete being* of a Church attended, as in Scripture phrase we find it, and as it suits with the rules of reason, it comprehends the *particular in the general*, and the *general* comes to be determined in the *particular*; and therefore the *Tenet* Mr *Rutherford* proponnds, is not that which we maintain, but that which he is pleased to make to himself.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Catholic Church as it is totum representativum in the assembling of Pastors, &c. in a general counsel.

WE have thus dispatched the first member of the Controversy, touching the first subject of Church-power, or the power of the Keys, namely, it doth *not* appertain to *the Guides* of the visible Church, Take it as *Totum genericum*, or *universale*. Let us now consider it, as *Totum representativum*, i. e. as the Catholic visible Church is, represented in the *Convention*

230

and *assembling* of the *Pastors* of all *several* congregations, in a *general* or *oecumenical* Council.

And according to this acception of a *Catholic visible Church*, the whole course and current of Master *Rutherford's* dispute in the several answers and explications that are returned to Arguments propounded, is to be understood. The words are fair and full *lib. 2, p. 305. The power of the keys, by order of nature is unity in the Catholic representative Church, as in the first subject.*

Before we proceed to the pinch of the debate, we will look about us a little, that we may see where the way lies. For the path to these general councils hath been so long disused, that its almost grown out of sight, and as he sometimes speaks in a like case, *The high ways are unoccupied.*

1. Remember then we must, There be *two* things, wherein the *qualification* and so the *commission* and warrant of a member of a council consists especially. The *material* ground of Commissioners at Assemblies, is their *gifts* and *fitness*. The *formal* ground is, the *Church-calling*, and sending them. *Parker de Poli. 1. 3. c. 18. Material ex donis internis pendet, formale ex deligatione ecclesiæ*, and this Assertion is approved by Mr. *Rutherford*, and confessed by all ours, that I met withal, *l. 1. p. 213.*

2. The *Churches* may send, and if they will follow the pattern in the word, they *must* send *learned* and *holy men* unto Synods, *besides Pastors, Teachers, Elders*; so *Luke* hath it *Act. 15:25, 26.* and therefore its an Argument *which* learned *Whittaker* allegeth, from the nature of a Synod: That since

a general counsel doth represent, *universal ecclesiam*, there should be some of all sorts and orders of men sent thereunto: As Pastors, Doctors, Elders, Brethren, who should as it were personate, and supply the place of the whole.

3. All these so sent and assembled in the Council, have a decisive and definitive sentence in the acts that shall be made, decrees and determinations that shall part. This is made the hinge and the very casting difference of the controversy betwixt us and the Papists, whereby our men vindicate the liberty and power of the brethren met in council, against the usurpation of the Pope and his Proctors, whereby they would arrogate and monopolize all authority of deciding and determining controverts

231

unto the Prelates, And therefore Bellarmine would carve out all the authority to that crew and company, and says, *Apostolos iudicass, Presbyteros consultass, plebem audivisse tantum*. But Whitaker states the question, as the common received Judgement of all the orthodox, and so maintains that which is openly contradictory to the Popish conceit. *Nostra vera hæc sententia est, non solos prælatos habere jus definiendi its conciliis, sed homines quosvis idoneos eligi posse, qui ad concilium mittantur, eosque liberè pronuntiare debere*.

Vbi supra contr. 2. q. 3. c. 1.

Hence this Representative body is but apart, as it stands in reference to the Catholic visible Church, and therefore it is said, *not to be a Totum* in that relation, *but representare totum*, by way of delegation or commission given *eo nomine*, or in that respect. The acts of this company carry a kind of proportion and resemblance to the body which it represents: that what they in virtue of their delegation do, it's all one or the like reason, as if the body represented did it. Look at them, as they are now assembled, they are an entire body resulting out of the concurrence of all the several members so concurring.

We see now what the nature of this representative body is: we shall now draw nearer to the mark, and make application of this to the particular in hand. Master Rutherford expresseth the question in these terms. *Lib. 2. 289. "To the Church universal vi-*

sible hath the Lord given a Ministry, and all his Ordinances of Word and Sacraments principally and primarily. And to the Ministry and guides of this Catholic visible Church hath the Lord committed the Keys, as to the first subject.

But we shall look off from this place, and take those words which are most plain, as the bottom of our debate, *Lib. 2. Pag. 305. The power of the Keys, by order of nature is only in the Catholic representative Church, as in their first subject,* From Pag. 300 to 309. And the scope of all his answer in the most candid and fair construction that can be made of them, looks this way.

Again, by *power of the Keys*, we understand all the power of Ordination, excommunication, &c. Which in the current and common apprehension is comprehended therein.

And the reasons which yet carry and cast the balance to the *negative part*, and our apprehensions sort the present that way, *are these.*

232

1. We shall attend Master *Rutherford* his *own explication*, as that which he must take for granted and good, as admitting no just exception, namely,

Quic quid convenit καθ' αὐτο convenit ἀντιστραμμενως καὶ καθολικῶς,

It must agree to all and only to that kind. Whence the Argument grows on, thus,

That which firstly and only belongs to the Catholic representative Church, that neither was, nor can be before it. The very nature of the terms gives in testimony undeniable unto this. For it cannot belong to *it only*, if it belong to *others beside it*: nor to *it firstly*, if to *others before it*.

But the power of the Keys was before the representative Church, yea before it had any being. For the Churches had the Keys and the exercise of them by the space of 300 years, after our Saviour, when as yet there was not the name of an *Oecumenical council* heard of in the world.

Beside, from *the former grounds* agreed on, touching the *constitution* of a general council, its plain: That the *Churches delegate* all, both *persons* and *power* from themselves to the making up of such a general Assembly. *And therefore they had all Officers, and they the exercise of their Office-power before that day long.*

Nor will that distinction relieve the cause in this distress, to wit, that *in order of nature* they are only firstly in the representative, but *in order of time* they are before in other subjects; nay the medicine makes the cause worse, though it was sick before. *For that a proper quality should be in time before his proper subject, which gives it its being; and that it should be, in time before its own nature, wherein his being lies, is beyond the relief of all the rules of reason.* Beside, that several things being compared together, one might be before another in nature, when it was *simul* and together with another in time, hath been usually said, (and yet by some usually questioned, *in that time ever attends nature*) but that the *same* things should be *in time, before its nature* had any being (as this distinction would bear us in hand) I suppose is unheard of.

2. *If the power of the keys should be given to an Oecumenical council as to the first subject: Then those should have and formally exercise the power of the keys, who eere no, Pastors nor officers in those acts.*

But that it denied by master Rutherford, ergo.

233

The proposition is proved, because the decrees and determinations of the council and their actings, in their decisions and definings are *no proper works of a Pastor, &c.* nor do they proceed from these offices or officers as such. Thus Judicious *Ames. Bell, enerv. Tom, 2. c. 2. de concil. p 10.* *Definire in conciliis generalibus non potest esse pars muneris Pastorum, quia tum Pastor nullus ecclesiæ Primitivæ, et pauci tantùm sequentium sæculorum munus pastorale potuissent implere.*

And the ground is sure and safe. *Acts which are common to Brethren, as well as to such as be officers, Those are not proper, nor do proceed from an office or officer as such, but from some root or respect which doth indifferently belong unto both, as its evident in the case in hand, because they all act as messengers: for that as we heard even now, gave the formality to the member of a Synod, and by power and warrant of this proceeding issued from thence.*

Beside we heard before, that the counsel consists of *brethren*, as well as Elders, and the power of determining and bind-

ing issues jointly from all, and to maintain the contrary is judged an open point of Popery by Doctor *Whitaker*. *Uti supra*.

3. *Arg.*

3. *If the power of the keys belong firstly to the Oecumenical council. Then it belongs to all other, by virtue of that, for this the rule, καθ' αὐτο doth require. If none have this power, but only this subject, then this power can go no further then this. For this ἀντιστραμενως and καθολικως require: where ever Risibility is, there the nature of man must be, because it agrees to it firstly to Richard, John, Jeremy, not as this or that individual, but as they have the nature of man in them.*

And hence there can *no power of the keys (as ordination ex-communication, &c.)* be put forth but by *the virtue* of an Oecumenical *council* giving in their influence first to that work: which is contrary to the evidence of Scripture, and the experience of all ages.

And before I leave this argument I shall take leave to make some *inferences* from it, such as necessarily follow from the nature the thing according to the practice of all Arts, proceeding from the unfallible evidence of like precepts.

If all the power of the keys be firstly and only in the Catholic representative body.

234

Hence in all other by virtue of this.

Hence this is as necessary to the well-being of the Church as the power of the keys, because the Churches have not this power but from hence. Hence, this representative Church it necessary to the bene esse of a Church, not only ad melius et optimum esse. For it is as necessary as the power of the keys; but that is necessary ad bene esse, by Master Rutherford his confession. Hence this power of the keys is here most perfectly; because here firstly. Hence most constantly and ordinarily? If firstly, only, and always here, and in others by virtue of this, then it is here most constantly and most ordinarily.

All these follow undeniably from the rule Καθ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἀντιστραμμενως, nor can there be given any reason to the contrary. Take any example in any act, and upon this ground these inferences will flow naturally and beyond exception. Risibility belongs

to the nature of a man. Therefore is there firstly, only, always. Therefore, constantly, perfectly. Therefore it's derived from hence to all others, that shall be made partakers of it. Therefore take away the nature of man, and destroy it, you destroy this faculty.

From hence its clear, that *the contrary expressions* to these, dropped here and there by Master *Rutherford* without which he could not decline the dint of the Arguments alledged against him, are so many *Assertions contrary to the truth and the nature of the rule*, Καθ' αὐτὸ ἀντιστραμμενως.

4. *Arg.*

If the *power of the Keys be here firstly and only*; then it can *exercise* them without all doubt *lawfully*: and in the right *exercise thereof can attain its end*.

But the *first part is denied* by Master *Rutherford* Lib. 2. Pag, 418. "I much doubt if a *Catholic council can formally excommunicate a National Church*. And indeed he may well doubt it.

For suppose that many persons in the particular Churches of the Nation shall complain of the evils of the Churches, and groan under them: The *excommunicating of these Churches*, would inflict the punishment as well upon the *innocent*, as the *no-cent*, so the *communion* would reach the one as well as the other, and so the *censure* should proceed upon them as well who deserved it not, as those who did deserve it.

But secondly its certain, if the Churches *refuse* the sentence,

235

the *power of the council can never prevail to attain its end*.

5. *Arg.*

Let me add a *last Argument* taken from Master *Rutherford* his own expressions, which are these. Lib. 2. Pag. 289. "To this *universal Church visible hath the Lord given a Ministry, and all his ordinances of word Sacrament, principally, and primarily: and to the Ministry and guides of this Catholic Church visible hath the Lord committed the Keys as unto the first subject*.

Whence I should thus reason.

To the *Ministry and guides of that Catholic visible Church hath Christ committed the Keys, as to the first subject, unto which he hath*

given his word, ordinances, Sacraments, Ministry primarily. This proposition is interminis expressed and affirmed by Master *Rutherford*, nay determined as a conclusion beyond all gain-saying.

But (I assume) to an *Oecumenical counsel*, as the Totum representativum of all Churches, God hath not primarily, given to his Ministry, Word, Sacraments, ordinances.

Therefore an *Oecumenical representative Church* hath not the keys given to it, as to the first subject.

The *Assumption* (which only needs propose) sense and experience, the nature of the thing, Master *Rutherford* his confession in cases parallel and of like nature doth abundantly confirm. For it's well known to every man, that after the *Ascension* of our Saviour, by the space of 300 years, there was no general council in the world, were there neither Ministers sent, word not Sacraments dispensed, *Pastors* and *Teachers* executing their office, performing the duties of their places and charges, all that while to those, to whom, and for whose good, they were principally and primarily appointed?

2. Each man knows, that the council consists principally of those, who are *Elders* and *Pastors* in other Churches, and will a mans sense suffer him to say, that there must be *Ministers* sent to, teach and feed, and watch over these *Ministers*.

3. Nay doth not the examples and records of all ages evidence, that the preaching of the *Word*, admimstration of the *Sacraments*, &c. nor primarily nor secondarily is here attended? but the scanning of controversies, deciding and determining of doubtful questions.

236

And lastly when Master *Rutherford* denieth *Ministers* to have a *Pastoral* charge and watch over a *Presbyterial Church*: because that watch only is appropriate to the particular Congregations, the care of whose souls they stand charged withal: By parity of reason, he will in no case impose this upon any Pastor, to be a constant watchman over a general council: not only, because it's more then he can discharge, beside his care of his particular flock, but also, because it would seem irrational, that there should be a *Pastor*, and so a Ruler over those, whom he makes to have supreme rule ever all Churches.

Hither appertains the *seventh* Argument of Master Rutherford touching the *keys* given to the *Catholic visible church*: and therefore I *formerly reserved it for this place*, and shall now take it into scanning and consideration, and it is this, *Lib. 2. c. 295*.

“When any scandalous person is delivered to Satan, he is cast out of the whole Catholic Church, therefore he was before his election, a member of the whole Catholic Church. For he cannot be cast out, who was never within, and when he is excommunicated, his sins bound, as in heaven, so on earth, i. e. not only in that tract of ground, where a handful of a little congregation independent (as they say) of 10, or 20, or 100 doth ordinarily feed, but in all the visible world, where God hath a Church, and all, both within the little congregation and without, are to repute him as an heathen and a publican.

Answ. When we enquired touching that which gave formality to a member of a Church or congregation, we then at large debated the question, namely, That *visible profession did not make a man a member of a congregation, much less a member of all the particular congregations on earth*, whether we refer the Reader. Only, we infer from that which was then proved, that he who was not a member of *all Churches*, he cannot be said to be cut off *from all* because he *never was* ingrafted into them: no more than a member of one *individual man*, being cut off from his body or person can be said to be cut off *from another*, because these two men have the nature of man common to them both: or more plainly; because a member of one Corporation is dis-franchised and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, as Traitor, therefore all other Corporations should dis-franchise him also, because these two are *species of a Corporation in general*.

237

True it is, when one Church of Christ hath righteously cast out a man, *All other congregations should account of him at such an out cast, approve of the sentence of the Church*, unless any thing appear to the contrary, and they should so express themselves, towards him, *as such a one*, whom the *Lord Christ hath sentenced and judged as a heathen*: and therefore becomes all, who are the *subjects of Christ to judge so of him*. As all the *subjects of the Kingdom* do account him a *Traitor*, and carry themselves to-

wards him, as such a one, who is convinced and *proceeded* against, as such, *in one City or Corporation*.

This is the aim of that *answer* which Master *Rutherford* alledgeth, from *some*, who say, That the party is excommunicated only out of *that* Congregation, whereof he is a member *antecedenter*; because Christ hath given the power of *excommunication* only to the Church: But he is excommunicated to all other Churches only *consequenter*, by *consequent*.

To this Master *Rutherford* says; “*I answer the plain contrary. He is antecedenter and formally delivered to Satan by the power of the Catholic visible Church, which is put forth in exercises and acts, before that Church, whereof he it the nearest member. Even as the left hand doth cut off the finger of the right hand, which otherwise should infect the whole body. Now it is not the left hand only that cutteth off the contagious and infectious finger, but the whole man. Deliberate reason and the will consenteth it should be done, for the preservation of the whole. The left hand is a mere instrument, and the loss of the finger, it a loss to the whole body: and the finger is cut off the right hand not antecedenter only, by the power of the left hand, but by the intrinsical power that was in the whole body. It’s true the contagion should creep through and infect the right hand first: and therefore incision is made upon the right hand first. When the Eldership of the Congregation delivers to Satan, it is not done by that power, that is intrinsical in the congregation only, but by the power intrinsical, that is in the whole universal Church.* lib. 2. pag. 296.

We shall here pause a little, and as travellers use to do, view the coast how it lies, because the path seems dark, and the passage somewhat hazardous.

I Answer then, If the Catholic Church put forth a power intrinsical in the excommunicating of the offender and delivering him to Satan, (as it is here said:) It must be either an Oecume-

238

nical council or a representative body of all, that must do this, or else *all the Churches* must have a hand in it.

I. An *Oecumenical council* cannot *excommunicate*. For that which is *not* hath no being, cannot put forth any *operation*. *Non entis non est operatio*.

But a *general counsel* was not after our Saviour by the space of 300 years There hath been none of late, by the space of many hundreds, and when there will be any, no man knows.

And *therefore, it can put forth no intrinsical power* in this censure of excommunication, neither *antecedents*, nor *consequenter*.

2. Nor can *all the Churches*, he said, by any evidence of reason to have a hand, or put forth a power to this work. For Master *Rutherford* his own principles are, *one congregation hath no power over another*, one *Classis* over another, one *Provincial* or *National* council, hath *no power* over another. Whence the *inference* is plain.

They who have no power, much less suprem power over another, they can put forth no power over another.

But (ex concessis) many *Churches*, *Classis*, *Synods* have *no power over a congregation* therefore they can put forth no power much less *antecedenter* to this work.

3. *Again*, they who put forth a power *intrinsical* to excommunication, they must do it according to *Christ his rule*, and suitable to order prescribed by him.

But *in cases of excommunication*, especially those of obstinacy the *rule* of Christ, and the direction of the Gospel require, *they should examine, convince, admonish, before excommunication.*

And therefore they must be thoroughly *informed* and fully acquainted with the offence, if they proceed *regularly*.

But *all the Churches cannot be thus informed with the offences of such*, who are excommunicated, nor yet are *bound to be, antecedenter*, to the dispensation of the *censure*. They are not bound to receive all the complaints of every particular Church, to hear and examine all witnesses, not bound to convene the offending party, *nor hath any Church but that, wherof he is a member, power to do it.*

And therefore according to the rule of Christ, *they cannot put forth a power antecedenter* to the excommunicating of him.

4. Beside if *all the Churches* put forth a power *antecedenter* to

the excommunicating of the offender, before, the particular Church: *then the sentence is known* and past before the sentence of the particular congregation proceed: *then there is no place left*

of *Appeal to other Churches*, because their judgement is passed, therefore they need not require their judgement, but this Mr *Rutherford* will in no wise allow; nor is it consistent with his principles nor indeed with reason.

5. *If after the excommunication passed in a congregation or Classes, when other Classes, Synods, congregations shall come to be acquainted therewith, and the proceeding therein, as irregular and unjust, they shall reject the sentence, as not suitable to the mind of Christ, and protest against the proceeding. They who in their judgements ever disallowed the sentence, and by their endeavour labour to repeal and oppose it; They cannot be said in reason to put forth an intrinsical power, and that antecedenter in the execution of it.*

And I suppose the Churches, who are of such a judgement would wonder to heare a congregation thus speak to them: Here is an offending Brother cast out of our society, for such obstinacy in evil: we have cast him out *consequenter*, but you have put forth an intrinsical power *antecedenter* to our act, else it could never have been done.

I suppose, if a Provincial, national, Oecumenical council (that would condemn them for their sentence,) should hear them so speak, *they would presently protest their innocency*; and that they had no hand in it, they were never acquainted with their proceedings, for if they had, they should have professedly opposed them therein.

Lastly, if the whole Catholic Church put forth a power antecedenter in casting out every particular offender out of the Church: they also must needs put forth their power antecedenter in receiving him in: which reason and the experience of all; ages gainsays. That a congregation should confute with all the Churches on earth, before they absolve a penitent offender: there was no such law delivered to the Church of Corinth in that case, but as he blames them, because they did not cast him out, before he wrote; so he wisheth them to receive him in again into communion, neither staying nor expecting, until a general council was called for that end.

The *similitude* which Mr. *Rutherford* useth, hath a handsome

240

colour to couden the inconsiderate Reader, but being seriously weighed reacheth not the cause in hand.

It is true, *the left hand* doth *not only* cut off the contagious and infectious finger, *but the whole man*. Deliberate reason and will consenteth thereunto; and the finger is cut off, not by the *power, of the left hand only*, but by the *intrinsic* power in the *whole body*. I say *all this is true*, and there is very good *reason* it should be so: because the *mind and will*, and so the whole hath *full and sufficient power* in it self, and that *peculiarly and properly* appointed by God and nature to preserve it self, and prevent infection in any member, and rather to cut of the infectious part, then that the contagion should spread to the ruin of the whole.

And it is so exactly *in particular congregation; the chief officers*, as the *mind and will* and the rest or the *Brethren*, as the *whole*, have intrinsic power given them by Christ, and should put it forth in his name, and according to his order to remove an infectious member. But how unsuitable is it to require the same of other Churches, because they excommunicate in the *general nature of a Church* with them, when in truth they have no power over a particular Church, and therefore as they cannot, so they should not attempt any such thing? For to lay aside now the consideration of an independent congregation, we will propound only, *Mr. Rutherford his own principles for proof in this case.*

It's confessed by *Mr. Rutherford* that a *Church* in an *Island* hath power of excommunication in her self: and therefore she may put it forth alone. And yet I suppose *Mr. Rutherford* will confess, that a party so excommunicate is to be accounted a Heathen to all Churches as well, and as much, as any excommunicated out of a Church that hath neighbouring Churches near it: notwithstanding no other Churches have, and therefore can put forth no power, in the executing of that act of excommunication done by a Church in an *Island*.

The same also may be said of *Classes* and *provincial synods*, in regard of *other Synods and Classes*, over whom they have no power, by his own grant, and yet a person excommunicated in one regularly, is so accounted of by all.

And common sense will constrain a man's judgement here-
unto.

241

The *Major* and *Aldermen* of one *Corporation*, must first be privy to the offence of any member in the Society, and then they have power to proceed against him, without either the power or privy of another corporation, though they be both members of *the same Kingdom*, and both *species* of a corporation, the common nature whereof is attributed to them both: because there is peculiar power left to them in their own place and precincts. The like may be said of a particular congregation.

These grounds thus made good by reason, will give in evidence against *several expressions* of Mr. *Rutherford* as distant from the truth.

“That sister Churches receive members of other Churches to communion by an intrinsical authoritative Church power.

If he mean *such an authoritative Church-power*, as a *congregation* puts forth in *excommunication* such a power these should put forth in *admittance* to communion: Its an *Assertion* neither safe nor sound, and a man's experience will teach him the contrary: For by authoritative Church-power we can enjoin our own members *to come* to the seal, or else *censure them*, but we cannot so deal with others, if it shall seem good to them to refuse to come.

He adds, *“Christ hath given an intrinsical power to many consociated Churches to cast out a contagious lump, otherwise the consociated Churches are to exercise the punishment, of the avoiding the excommunicated person, as an Heathen, which followeth from a power which is no ways in them; what conscience is here?*

I Answ. A good conscience rightly guided by rule; For if by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, as the Lord and his Law speaks: then much more shall a fact be established, that hath not the testimony of two or three, but of a whole Church, it may be so many hundreds to bear witness thereunto. And no man, nay no court in the world, can but yield to this evidence, before something appear to the contrary, unless against conscience they shall lay aside the express Law of God.

We shall propound a narrower case then this, and yet its so plain that it will carry the judgement of any considerate man with it. Suppose a party going to some remote place, whether his occasion leads him, intends to joine with the Church of Christ there set up: another person privy to his intention, and

242

knowing the man undeserving, he gives intimation to a friend under his *own* hand and *two others*, that the party is scandalous for oppression and cousenage: when he shall desire entrance and acceptance, the letter is shewed, and witnesses discovered, and he justly denied admittance, with is a just punishment justly inflicted upon him, and that which a good conscience.

In the case in hand, the argument forceth a *fortiori*. If we may account a man scandalous, and carry our selves towards him as such a one, under the witnesses of two or three, before the contrary be manifested: much more may we account a person justly excommunicated and demean our selves towards him in a manner suitable to such a condition under the testimony of a Church of Christ, until something shall appear to the contrary.

“But suppose the Church err, and cast out the person Clave errante? shall a man in a brutish manner practise according to their proceeding, and not discern whether the censure be justly or unjustly inflicted?”

Answ. This is not to practise after a brutish manner, but to proceed according to *such rules*, better then which *nor reason nor righteousness* requires any: For under such a testimony the person stands justly excommunicated in mine account, and I must judge so if I will judge righteously. Instance. A person is accused in *open Court of Treason* upon *three witnesses*, which are pregnant and peremptory: *The judge* cannot but condemn the man, as such a malefactor; and in case he should make an escape, *all that* hear of the proceeding, they are to *account him* such a one, and to proceed against him as such, and yet cannot be said to practise *brutishly*, but *piously* and *righteously*, according to rules of reasonable nature, which God hath revealed in his holy word, until the testimony given in be controlled and disannulled; so it is here.

Lastly I shall present unto the *Reader* and to Master *Rutherford* what himself hath writ in another place, and so leave this argument, *lib. 2. p. 320.* we find these words, the question being there propounded, since a scandalous person living betwixt two-neighbouring presbyteries, and so likely to infect both equally and indifferently by his offence, why therefore should he not be cast out of both?

Master *Rutherford* his answer is this.

243

“Though he dwell in the borders of two Classical presbyteries, yet since God, the God of order hath made him a combined member now by institution of one presbyterial Church, not of another, he is to be excommunicated by the one, not by the other.

A man would think at the first blush, *If one classical Church do not excommunicate antecedenter: by the same proportion of reason many must not, nay none but his own classis do excommunicate him, and therefore how can the Catholic Church be said to do this antecedenter?* but Master *Rutherford* best knows his own meaning, and this will *occasion* him to explicate it.

CHAP, XIV.

Of the Church Universal, at it is Totum Integrale.

AND to deal candidly in this as in the former course of our dispute, we profess our aim in this inquiry is, only to give in what evidence we can, to the clearer discovery of the Truth. For I cannot find any expressions in Master *Rutherford* that fully fasten this sense upon any passage of his dispute, and it is not in my thoughts to father any thing upon him, beside what he fully expresseth. For our more clear and direct proceeding, I shall take leave to inquire. 1. *what is meant by a Catholic visible Church taken in this sense, at Totum integrale.*

2. *Whether such a Church is to be found in the New Testament.*

3. *Whether the Lord Christ hath set Officers here, as in their first subject; and to them so set, the power of the keys doth firstly appertain.*

To the first.

That the *Catholic Church* hath some time such a respect, as *Totum integrale*, I now and then find amongst *Authors*, *Ames Medull. lib. 1. c. 32. par. 5.*

Ecclesia particularis respectu Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, quæ habet rationem integri, est membrum.

His meaning is, if we look at particular *members* and particu-

244

lar *Churches* as *aggregated* together, that which results and ariseth from the confluence and concurrence of them all, we put the respect of *Totum integrale* upon it, and so it is called *ecclesia Catholica*.

And for the right discerning of this, and differencing of some considerations about it, The Reader must take notice *that three things* are to be attended for the distinct understanding of this *Totum*, that he may sever it from former respects, unto which we have spoken and discern *the nature of it* from the *general nature of a Church*, between which there is an exceeding *vast difference*.

1. Then, the *particular persons and Congregations*, the members of this Church Catholic taken in this notion and consideration, contain in them the *essential causes* of it, out of which it ariseth, and is constituted: Whereas *Totum universale* contrariwise contains and *communicates* causes to particular Churches.

2. Hence, these particular persons and Churches are, and must be in *nature* before this *Totum integrale* i. e. This Catholic Church thus aggregated: and this follows from the former, in so much as the *causes* are in nature before the effect.

3. Hence this *totum* in proper and precise consideration, though it be ever with its members, yet is *distinct* from them, as that which ariseth out of them. As a *man* is neither *body* nor *soul*, but an *integrum*, a *third* rising out of them *both*.

The Reader must carry these along with him, because haply we shall have recourse to them, as occasion shall require.

The second things to be inquired, is, *whether this Church is to be found in the New Testament*. When this *Quære* was presented unto Master *Rutherford* by

way of Objection, thus, *You cannot demonstrate out of the Scripture, that there is such a thing in the New Testament as a Catholic visible Church.*

He answers in these words, *Lib. 2. 418.*

“I conceive the subject of 1 Cor. 12. is a Catholic visible Church; we do not understand a political visible body, with ordinary visible government from one man, who maketh himself the Vicar of Christ, the Pope, whose members, are Cardinals, Bishops, and such

245

“like, but the Catholic body mystical of Christ, and that as visible.

We see here Master *Rutherford*. his expressions presented before us; but what his meaning is, I confess, I cannot clearly perceive, as,

1. What is the meaning of that *phrase, mystical as visible.*
2. What is the *thing* intended by it.

1. I do not readily conceive his mind in such an expression; we understand the body *mystical* of Christ as *invisible*. For the *mystical* body of Christ, in common and current sense is constantly taken for the *invisible* body of our Saviour. Now to consider an *invisible* body as *visible* doth *implicate* plainly; and is, as if a man should say, I will consider *whiteness* as it is *black*, and therefore this seems not to be his mind: but it may be he takes *mystical* in another *figurative* meaning; or haply the expression is mis-printed. It sufficeth to point at it, to occasion further explication.

2. *What* is the *thing* here intended, is as hard to find out fully.

When I observed that he puts *visible* in a kind of *equal breadth* and latitude with *mystical*: *That* being *Totum integrale* of all the parts aggregated, I could not but imagine, his intendment was to take *visible* in the same sense. Beside *Lib. 2. pag. 222.* I find him distinguishing the *Pastors of particular* Congregations from the *Pastors of the Catholic* Church, whereas had he taken Catholic-like for *universal*, then the *Pastors of one* must be the *Pastors of the other*. For *genus* is only existing in its *species*, and there only can be seen, and so consequently attended.

These are probabilities which sway my judgement *that way*. But I find also that sometimes he puts in the word *universal* to

express his meaning of the place. And *this casts the ballance the other way*. So that I cannot say, he meaneth by Catholic Church visible, a *totum integrale*. And therefore I shall not oppose it as his sense, but only dispute against it, as not the sense of the place; and that these Reasons following persuade me for the present.

1. Arg.

That Church is meant in 1 Cor. 12. in which God sets Teachers, Helps governments as ordinary Officers firstly, vers. 28.

“*But he sets not these firstly in the Catholic Church visible, as totum aggregatum, (before explicated.)*

The *Assumption*, where only the doubt lies, is thus proved.

246

Because the setting of the officers in the Church (I speak now of those which are ordinary) is by the *Election of the people*, and therefore this setting and officers set must be *there, where* the election is; this election or call being the foundation, whence the relation between Pastors and people results, and so become in relation one to another, gives mutual being each to other, arc together one with another.

But clear it is that *election* is in the *particular Churches, Act. 14:23. Act. 6:5. Tit. 1:5.* and therefore there these ordinary officers are *firstly* set by God.

Argum. II.

In what Church Pastors are firstly set, over them they have firstly and primarily Pastor like power in preaching, ruling, and dispensing the acts of their office. The nature of the office, God's charge and command, the end at which they must aim, and for which sent, evinceth this. *Act. 20:21. 1 Pet. 5:2.*

But ordinary Teachers have not this pastoral and official power over the Catholic Church, as will thus appear.

Those whose power by the Law and order of Christ may be refused in all congregations, but in their own particular; They by no law of Christ have right of pastoral power in any, but in their own particular charges and Churches; otherwise the Lord Christ should set a man in his office, and by rule and law others may for ever refuse the exercise and power of his office over whom he is set.

But the power of ordinary Pastors may by law and order of Christ, be justly refused in all congregations beside their own. As suppose all congregations have Pastors of their own, they may justly refuse any to preach, or exercise any Jurisdiction amongst them.

Whereas he that hath power to preach as a Pastor, he hath authority to enjoin those, who are his flock, to attend him, though they should refuse it: yea to exercise his office, though they do not desire it. For it is not read in any Gospel, that the Lord Christ hangs the performance of a Teachers office upon others desires, but upon his own duty, with which he stands charged with by virtue of his place.

For I might *lastly* here *add* (though many other reasons are at hand, yet I will not multiply, because I know not Mr. *Rutherford* his mind in this behalf, and I would not trouble the *Reader*

247

without cause) I say, I may here add; *If a man be a Pastor to all Churches beside his own particular: Then he is either the same Pastor to both, or another and diverse.* This last none will own; therefore he must be the same to both; and he that hath the same pastoral office, he hath the same power and jurisdiction in both, stands in the same manner bound to both, because right of Jurisdiction issues from his office-call.

These mists then being removed, the *meaning* of the Apostle is this; *God hath set in his Church, i. e. in a Congregation existing in its particulars,* and so in all particular congregations, the extraordinary and ordinary officers, according to the extraordinary and ordinary occasions thereof; and this sense suits with that, which we explicated in the first part of this dispute, touching a *Catholic visible Church* as *Totum universale*; and hence that *quære* which carries the only difficulty with it receives a full satisfaction, *l. 2. p. 401.*

“This indefinite speech (says Mr Rutherford) must by good logic have the virtue either of one universal, or a particular proposition: If they say the first, we have what we crave: if they say the second, they fall into the former absurdity, for God hath placed Apostles in the whole Christian world.

Answ. If Mr. *Rutherford* crave no more but this, that every particular congregation should be the *species* of a *Congregation*, we willingly grant him his desire; but to affirm, that the *reason*

is the *same* of *Totum aggregatum*, is as far wide, as *east* is from the *west*. And that his cause gains nothing by this grant, is plain: for thus the nature of a Church exists only, acts only, is to be seen only in the particulars, doth equally and firstly communicate his nature to the particulars, so that no Church hath more power than another, nor yet power over another, having upon this ground and grant an *independent* power of its own: As *each species* hath *firstly and independently* the nature of the *genus*, which so existing in it, comes to be confined to it, and wholly to be ordered by it. As we shall give in evidence, by instance of many particulars, that we may relieve the Reader thereby.

Thus the *common nature* of a *Corporation* exists in all particular congregations, and so its common to all to have *Major* and *Common-counsel*, (I speak *ex supposito*) which government and Governors existing in and determined by the particulars,

248

have only *power* in their *own* place: The *Major* and *council* can exercise *no* authority in *another* corporation. To reason therefore thus, if the nature of a corporation be common to all, and the King hath set *Major* and *common-counsel* in all and every one of them, therefore the *Major* of one, may rule in another corporations I say such an inference, will in no wise follow.

The like may be said of like example. All *states* set *Generals*, *Colonels*, *Captains* in their *Armies*: The king sets *constables* in all *Towns*; *Sheriffs* in all *Counties*. If any shall reason thus, If this be common to all *Towns* to have *Constables*, *Sheriffs* in all *Counties*; therefore a *Constable* may exercise his office in another *Town*, or a *Sheriff* in another *County*: each man's experience will give in evidence to the contrary. And the ground of the Argument taken from the community of the nature of such things, will not enforce it, but infer the contrary, if seriously considered.

The sense of the Text thus opened, the *Arguments* gathered out of the several verses will easily receive their answer: This then is the sense, as hath been proved *A congregation* or Church

existing in his particulars is *the Church here meant*, and therefore all particular congregations are here intended.

And its true, that in all particular congregations (those extraordinary gifts and miracles being now ceased) there be the *ordinary* officers of *Teachers, Helps, Governments, &c.*

2. It's true of all particular congregations, that they are one body in themselves, and are one in the common nature of the Church, and these take in all visibly baptized into one Spirit.

3. It's true that in all these particular congregations all *Jews* and *Gentiles* are conaprehended, that come within the pale of the visible Church. For the whole nature of the general exists in the particulars.

4. It's true, that the members of each particular congregation have need each of other, and one particular Church of tke help of another, as occasion shall require.

5. It's true of all particular congregations, that their members should not make a schism one from another.

6. It's true of all particular congregations, that the members

249

do and should especially care one for another, and suffer one with another.

7. Its true of all particular congregations, that by immediate commission God set Apostles, whose power of rule reacheth to them all, but ordinary officers he hath fixed to their particular places and stations, each one in the individual congregation by the which he was called, and over whom he is appointed.

We have now done with our *inquiry* touching *the Catholic visible Church*: we shall *remind* the Reader of *two* things, which may be of special use, and so we shall put an end to this dispute.

I.

1. From the foregoing discourse he may discern, wherein especially the opinion of Mr. *Rutherford* appears, touching this Catholic visible Church, with any certainty. As namely, *Its certain that Mr. Rutherford holds the power of the keys belongs firstly to the Catholic Representative Church*; for to this pur-

pose his words are most express. *l. 2. p. 305. The power of the keys by order of nature, is only in the Catholic representative Church, as in the first subject.*

2. It's *not* to me *certain*, what he holds touching the Catholic visible Church, considered either as *Totum universale*, or *Integrale*: what probabilities his expressions carry either way, we have formerly intimated out of several places: and therefore I think it most fair, to fasten nothing upon him, unless his words were fully and conclusively clear.

Lastly its *certain*, *that if* the power of the keys be *in* the Catholic *representative* Church; as the first subject, *they cannot be long firstly to the Catholic Church*, either as *Totum universale* or *integrale*: The distance and difference betwixt these *three* according to former explication is so great and vast.

II.

Again let me remind the Reader, what light the truth hath gained, if we look at it, as laid forth in the right frame of it. As thus.

1. The common nature of a Church, and so the nature of officers in that proportion, are only existing, acting, and become visible in the particulars, as their *species*.

2. *Hence* all officers and office-power, as the nature of the

250

Church, so their nature, is equally, firstly, independently, communicated to all particular congregations: so that they do not receive office nor office power, one particular from another, or more particulars, because all particulars share in all equally and firstly, as *species* partake of the nature of a *Genus*.

3. *Hence* it is not lawful for the Churches to *give away* this their power unto; othees, nor lawful for others *to take it away* from them. And therefore they should not, by *combining* themselves with others lose this, nor should other Churches, by *combination* take this power from them, *in whole* or *in part*.

CHAP. XV.

An Answer to Mr. Hudson, concerning the Church Catholick visible, as Totum integrale.

While I was inquiring and writing touching this *ecclesia catholica visibilis*, an especial providence brought a book to my view which did purposely intreat of this particular subject. The Author Master *Hudson* a learned man, and a faithful minister of the Gospel. When I had considered his writing *δix και τειx* I found his judgement, sharp and scholastical, his spirit Christian and moderate, his expression succinct and pregantly plain to express his own apprehensions.

So that my heart was much contented with the *Acumen* and judicious diligence of the Author; though I could not consent to what he writ, yet I could not but imfeignedly prise the learning, perspicuity and painfulness expressed in his writing.

Therefore I thought good to cast in some few *considerations* touching the things of greatest consequence therein, *that so* I might occasion him and others also, into whose hands that book may come, if not to judge otherwise, yet to consider again of some particulars whether they will abide the balance of the sanctuary or not.

There is one principal point: I say, principals, because the whole frame of the dispute stays upon that, as upon the main pillar and foundation, which if it fail, the whole falls to the ground as

251

Master *H.* conresseth. p. 11.

“I find (saith he) the subject of my question exceedingly opposed, and that by our divines; and therefore I must crave leave to confirm that sufficient lyor els, what ever I shall say of the predicate, will be as a house built upon the sand, or a castle in the air.

The greatest weight lies here, and therefore my greatest inquiry shall be about the truth of this.

And before I enter upon the examination of this principal point propounded, I shall *collect several expressions, out of several places in the writing*, which I shall set down as so many *conclusions confessed by the Author* that my self and reader may have recourse thereunto, as occasion shall require in the follow-

ing discourse, when their specials shall come to a Judicious trial.

And since Mr *Hudson* acknowledged, that this question is exceedingly opposed, and that by *our Divines*; I may say, by *all the pious and Judicious Orthodox*, that I meet withal, who write against the Papists, it will not seem strange to any, nor yet, I suppose, grievous to Mr *Hudson*, if I join with them in this defence of the truth, as I yet conceive it to be.

And in my retired meditations, I could not but observe a *secret Kind of divine dispensation* that the *Presbyterian way* must need the help of a *point of Popery*, not only as a *pillar*, by which it must be under propped, but as a *foundation or head corner stone*, upon which *the whole building must rest and be erected*.

These grants and postulata which I shall mention, are thus freely and fully laid down in several passages and places.

I. CONCLUSION.

When a Church is called universal: *universal* in this question is meant principally in regard of

Persons. pag. 4.

Places, and not in regard of

Time.

2.

The universal Church visible, is the whole company of visible believers throughout the whole world, p. 4.

3.

All the visible religious *Assemblies* of a *nation* are *parts* of the *Church Catholic* (he means *members*) p. 6.

252

4.

Particular Churches are *made up* of the *members* of the *Church Catholic.* p. 11.

5.

The *proper notion* of the *Church Catholic*, and *particular*, is, of *Inugrum et membra* (p. 20.) and *is* (primum in suo genere,) *before them.* p. 10.

6.

For my part (says he) I conceive the Church Catholic to be *Totum Integrale*, and the particular Churches to be *Partes similes*, and so members thereof and parcels thereof, *as the Jewish Synagogues were of the Jewish Church.* p. 21.

7.

Every *particular* Church *partaketh* of part of the *matter*, and part of the *form* of the whole, p. 21.

8.

Particular Churches are limited and *distinguished* from each other by *civil* and *prudential limits*, for convenience of meeting, and maintenance and transacting of business.

9.

This membership is either devolved on a man by God's disposing *Providence*, by reason of his *birth*, or *cohabitation* there: or voluntarily assumed by his voluntary *removal*, into that place, allotted out by *civil prudence* for such a particular society, to in joy the ordinances of God conveniently together.

10.

The *Catholic Church* may by perfection. &c. be brought into a little room and haply to *one* congregation, p. 24.

11.

While the *Church* is but *one* congregation, *That* hath the *Notion* of the *Church Catholic* more *properly* than of a *particular* Church, yea though it be but in *one* family, as it was in the *Ark* in the days of *Noah.* p. 24.

12.

Speaking of the *existence* of the Church Catholic, in the existence of particular Churches, he grants that the Catholic Church existeth *not but in particular* Churches, *as a heap of stones existeth only in the existence of particular stones* p. 24.

I thus take leave to sever and sunder the specials one from another, because if I deceive not my self much, they will make

may readily have resort thereunto, as the occasion of the dispute shall require.

From these particulars thus premised, the STATE OF THE QUESTION is fully this,

Whether there be a Catholic visible Church, as Totum integrale, confessing of all the particular Churches, as its members?

And to this we must answer yet negatively.

Because this question, thus propounded, looks so fully like a *Popish Tenent*, at the first appearance, Mr. H. desires to put a *Protest and dress* upon it, that persons might not suspect it came from the *Romish Synagogue*, by reason of the *Pontificalian Shibboleth* it presents before the judicious Reader. And therefore he would difference *this* question from *theirs* in three things.

1. The Pontificians take *visible* for *conspicuous* and *glorious*.
2. They hold the *name* of the *Church Catholic* to belong to *one* Church.
3. They hold that this *visible Catholic Church* should be under *one visible universal head*.

The *Reply* is,

This salve only skin over the sore, but neither heals the wound: nor removes the scar. For it is certain, there be many collateral errors, which go in the crowd and company with this *Popish* opinion; but with his favour, those which he hath mentioned with many others, *they border about this cause*, but enter not at all into the *state* and constitution of it, but are *distinct errors*, so mentioned, so maintained by the *Pontificians*, so opposed by ours. For Mr. H. very well knows, that *Bellarmino*, with the rest of the *Popish* champions, marshal *these causes* as distinct companies, when they come into the field.

1. *Ecclesia non potest desicere* (i.e.) *numerus eorum qui veram sidem profitentur, non est semper frequens & gloriosus*. And that is these are of that question controverted betwixt us and them. *Whitaker de eccles. quest. tert.*

2. *Ecclesiæ regimen est monarchicum: nempe opus est visibili monarcha & summo iudice*. Whitak. de Rom. Pontif. q. 1. c. 1. [?????]

3. It's also a distinct question, That the Bishop of *Rome* succeeds

254

Peter in that Monarchical government of his *Whitak. de Rom. Pontif. q. 4. c. 1.*

Hence its plain that *all* the differences Mr. *H.* propounds, are so many *distinct questions* among the Pontificians, and *that this* [*Ecclesia Catholica est visibilis*] is a *fourth distinct from all the three former*. Therefore they *enter not* at all into the *state* nor constitution of *this*, as either controverted with the Papists, or now agitated and disputed with us.

And if Mr. *Huds.* please to cast his eye upon the expressions and apprehensions of judicious *Whitaker*, when he debates the question, he will plainly and presently perceive, that *visible* here is opposed to *invisible*, by the confession of all our writers against the Papists: and when they prove that the Catholic Church is not visible, they do not mean, that it is *not conspicuous* and *glorious* to the world, but that it *never was, nor can be visible to any*; but it is to be believed, not to be apprehended by sense.

Ecclesia Catholica anon potest à quoquam impio, imò, ne a quoquam pio videri. *Whitak de Eccles. q. 2. c. 2. p. 57.*

And therefore the forenamed Author makes these two distinct questions

Ecclesia Catholica non est visibilis.

Ecclesia visibilis potest desicere; i.e. ecclesia visibilis non est semper frequent et gloriosa. vid. ub. supra.

The issue then is,

If these three mentioned differences be three distinct questions from this, now controverted; then they enter not into the constitution of this: Take it in his peculiar and precise consideration and as controverted betwixt the Papists and us.

And if he will have recourse to learned *Sadeel.* he will there find, that *Turrian* so expresseth, so understands his meaning, that *Ecclesia Catholica visibilis est aggregata ex omnibus particularibus ecclesiis, per totum terrarum orbem fuis:* which is the very *hinge* of this *question now* controverted *with us.*

So that I must yet crave leave to concur with all our Divines against the Papists in this opinion, and to profess with

them, that, *Ecclesia Catholica est invisibilis: i.e. nec ab impio imò ne a quoquam pio, videri potest.*

And when we say that *Ecclesia Catholica non est visibilis*, neither they nor I mean, that it is *not conspicuous* to the eye of the

255

world: *but* that there is *no such Ecclesia aggregata ex omnibus ecclesiis visibilibus*, that hath *any being in rerum natura*, or was instituted by our Saviour Christ.

For the clearing of this *conclusion*, we shall first dispute from the *nature* of *Totum integrale*. For herein Mr *H.* deserves just commendation, that he deals openly, and like a judicious Divine, expressly intimates, what kind of *Totum* he meaneth, that so we may not be to seek, when we should speak to the point controverted and intended by him. *Dolus latet in universalibus.*

To begin then our inquiry touching the nature of *Totum integrale*, which being attended, according to the proper and right description of it, that will be as a *torch in the entry*, to give light, and lead the Reader into the particular truths, as so many particular rooms in the house, that so the whole frame may fully be conceived.

Integrum says (the *Logician*,) *est totum, cui partes sunt, essentialis: it is such a whole, unto which the parts are essentials; i. e. give the essential causes, whence the integrity and entireness of the whole is made and constituted.* And therefore to speak in their language, they are *orta argumenta*; the *members arise* out of the *matter* and *form*, and contain in them *materialia & formalia principia*, which they give, in their concurrence to make up the *integrum*. Thus the several Troopes and Companies make up the Army. The Free-men of so many Companies, the Common-Council of Aldermen, and Major make up a Corporation. So many Cities, Shires, Counties, make up a Kingdom.

In all these the *members are causal*, each gives in a *substantial share*, to make up the *integrity* or *intireness* of the *whole*.

Hence, the members are in *nature before the whole* (I say in nature, because I would not run into needless niceties touching any other priority, but thus they are certainly before the whole) because they contain the causes that make it up.

That which Mr *H.* suggests else where by way of *objection*, that they be *relata*, and therefore *simul naturâ*, is an old fallacy fre-

quent in the Schools, and proceeds merely out of a mistake of Logical principles. True it is, *that integrum* and *membra* may be clothed *with such a respect*, which may be put upon them, for our expression and apprehension (as it were easy to open, only it suits not this popular debate), but to speak *properly*,

256

took at *integrum* and *membra* in their peculiar *affection of arguing*, and they can be no more *Relata*, then one opposite can be another.

Hence, *The integrum* is another thing resulting and arising from the members imitating exactly the nature of the *effect*, existing from his causes, and therefore its called *symbolum effecti*. As a body is distinct and a third in reason and reality from all his members; The Army constituted of the several Companies; The Kingdom from the several Counties, Hundreds, Cities.

Hence lastly, This is made peculiar to this *Totum* (from *that* we call *Totum genericum*, or *universale*,) *That what belongs to this, doth not belong to all the members*. As that man is said to eat, drink walk, talk, look upward, when no part of the body, nor yet the soul, in reason, or according to truth, can be said to do any of these actions.

Hence then it follows undeniably and necessarily,

If *Ecclesia Catholica* be *Totum integrale*, it's a *third*, and *distinct from all the members*, and so from all particular Congregations. And therefore *there must be some Officer, Act, and Ordinance appertaining to that, which doth not appertain to any of the members*.

And this *rule*, reason, all experiences, all instances in all *integrums*, do evidence. There is a *supreme* governour in a *kingdom*. A *General* in a *Camp*, besides all other Officers in all the *Regiments*.

But there could yet be never given any discovery of a Catholic Church, as a *third* and *distinct* from its members, not yet *Act* or *Officer*, besides those which are observed and exercised in particular Churches.

And I would earnestly and seriously desire Mr. *H.* or any man living, but to lay forth the *nature* of *particular* Congregations, and attend *all* the Offices, actions, and ordinances there dispensed, and in *precise* consideration, offer to my understanding, the *nature* of this *whole distinct* in apprehension (I would not, I desire

not a separation of this whole from the parts, or the pulling of them a sunder, for that were *infanire cum ratiane*) but a presenting of some *distinct, Officer, Act, or operation, seclusaratione*, or not *habitâ ratione* of particular Congregations, which do not appertain to them. And this must be done, or else this *totum integrale* will prove a mere *fiction*, and a conceit minted out of a man's imagination.

257

It's true, *Totum genericum*, or take the *nature* of a *Church in general*, there is nothing required, but that it should exist in its particulars, as in its species: and that the general nature of a Church, and all the privileges firstly appertaining thereunto should equally and indifferently be communicated to all the particulars as inferior species: as the like is easy to be seen and observed in all examples of this sort, as we have instanced in the foregoing part of the discourse.

But the *nature* of an *Integrum* is wholly *different*, as it is a *third* arising from his members, so it ever hath *something peculiar* and not communicated unto them.

And hence it was, that the Papists, who maintained this Catholic visible Church, have created and fancied a visible Head to this visible Body, but that fond device labours now with the loathsomness of it less.

When Master *H.* is to make answer to this Argument he thus writes, *p.* 23.

“This is the main argument of the Pontificians, for the supremacy of the Pope, and that which made our Divines deny them a Church Catholic visible: But to the argument I answer that the Church had a Head of the same nature, consisting of body and soul who sometimes lived in this kingdom of grace in the days of his flesh, and did visibly partake in external ordinances, though now indeed he be ascended into his kingdom of glory, yet ceaseth not to be a man, as we are, though glorified, and ceaseth not to rule and govern his Church, here below; for it is an everlasting Kingdom Isa. 9:7. As When King James was translated from Scotland to England and lived here, he did not cease to be King in Scotland.

My Reply is.

1. The *confession of Master. H.* is very remarkable, which I desire the Reader to observe, and for ever to carry along with him in his consideration, that according to the concurring and joint judgement of *all our divines*, they saw it *necessary to deny the Papist a Catholic visible Church*, unless they should be constrained to grant them an officer, as a supreme visible Head: for so his words are express.

“*This made our Divines deny the Pontificians a Church Catholic visible*, namely, That so *they might deny a visible Head suitable thereunto*. As though he had said, unless they had denied, the one, they could not have denied the other.

258

This was the *conclusive determination of all those worthy champions of the Lord*, who opposed the supremacy of that man of sin in former ages; and I cannot but conceive their *grounds impregnable*: If the *one* be granted, the *other* cannot be avoided according to all the principles of well ordered policies, and the rules of reason propounded in the foregoing arguments.

2. The salve, which Master *H.* here applies, is so far from healing the fore, that it makes it worse, the physic being almost as bad if not more dangerous, then the disease: for,

When in his Answ. he would bear the Reader in hand that *Christ as man* consisting of body and soul, and living in the Church must in that regard, be the *visible head* of his Church, though now ascended into heaven: I would affectionately desire him in God’s holy fear to consider what he writes. For,

1. It is not only *untrue*, but very dangerous to hold, that *Christ as mere man* consisting of body and soul is a *visible Head* of his Church; and yet this he doth and must say, if he say any thing to the argument in hand: But upon this grant it will *follow* that Christ is such a head, that *is not present* with his Body, nor doth, nor can lend influence to his whole body, and the members thereof in all places: and therefore must not be sufficient to supply fully the necessities thereof; which how derogatory and prejudicial to our blessed Saviour, and the fatherly love of God the father to his Church, I am persuaded his love to Christ, will make him more sensible of such indignity, then I am able to express.

2. Its certain our Saviour is *Head* of the Church, as mediator, God and man, who hath *fulness* of *all grace* and of all power committed to him, and so becomes fully fit to execute the place and office of such a head, to send all officers, to furnish them to the work, and bless them in the work of the ministry, for *the gathering and perfecting of all his saints, until they come unto the unity of the faith*. So Beza in his confession: *chap. 5. Artic. 5. Whitak. de Pontif. Rom. q. 1. cap. 3. arg. 6.* where disputing, that to be Head of the Church, was a burden too heavy for any man to bear, a work too hard for any man to discharge, he issues the reason thus, *quare relinquendum est, &c. therefore we must leave the work to Christ, who, as he is everywhere, so he can do all things; alias enim caput non esset, otherwise he should not be a Head.*

259

3. Hence that which master *H.* takes for granted, that *Christ* was a *visible* Head, and Monarch in the Church, is not safe, nor true, as hath appeared by the foregoing arguments, and is confessed by all ours that I meet withal, *Whitaker de Pontif. Rom. q. 1. c. 2. p. 14. ad. 5. Bellarm. arg Christus igitur non degebat in terris ut visibilis monarcha, nec ideo venit in mundum ut monarchiæ visibilis fundamenta jaceret, Christ did not reside in the world as a visible monarch, nor came he into the world to set it up.* The like expressions Master *H.* may find often in *Whitak. p. 533. 554. ut. supra. Christ missus non est ut Regnum visibile occuparet, aut se tanquam Dominum et Monarcham in Ecclesia gereret.*

4. When we dispute touching the distinction of an *integrum* from its members, we look that this *distinction* should be attended in the *same kind*; namely, the *integrum* must not only have a distinct nature, but *such* a nature, as *ariseth* and *results* from the *members*; and so the *Officer* or officers, which are appropriate unto that, must have some suitable resemblance in regard of the *kind* of them with the other.

As the National Church of chejewes being a *distinU* kind of Church, had *peculiar anidistinQ*; Officers and ordinances, which were *nationall*, beside those of the Synagogue: So the Catholic must have, if it be a Church made up of the particular Churches, “*as the National Chunhivas made up of the Synagogues*”[^] Mr, *H.* words are.[^]n.,

Hence again, from the former ground laid and proved, it follows, the Catholic Church receives being from the particulars, and therefore its *after* and *out* from them.

Hence they receive no being from it, because the *integrum est totum cui partes sunt essentielles, non totum essentielle partibus*, for that is as far wide from this, as heaven from earth; for let our sense and experience speak in this case. This *totum Catholicum* is aggregate of the particulars, as a *heap* is aggregated and made up of *many stones*. (Master *H.* pag. 24.) an Army of many Regiments: but our senses will say, if asked: the stones must be *before* the Heap; the Regiments in reason *before* the Army, that arieth out of them.

That only which puts fair colours upon this false conceit, is, the misapprehending of some particular examples, namely, when they say, that *any* portion of *water* divided, *every* part of it *is* water, and hath the name and nature of it, The Answer is,

260

That predication or *affirmation* is not by virtue of that division of a portion of water that is made, *as integri in membra*; for in very deed, it is professedly *opposite* thereunto: But it is because the *nature* is preserved in the least portion of it, and thence this predication this part of water, is water, is made good, because a *genus* and *species* are there preserved and attended, going along with the division of *integri in membra*. For when we say, *hæc aqua est aqua*, the Arguments are *genus* and *species*: and the like may be said, and must be understood of the like examples. And that this is so, will easily appear by instances, if we narrowly sever the considerations and respects one from another.

Take a *quart* of water and divide it into *two pints*, here is a *division* of *integrum* into its *members*; though each *pint* may be called *water*, yet a *pint* cannot be said to be a *quart*, because the division of *that totum* will not permit it.

From these particulars, as so many proved premises, inferred from the nature of an *integrum* to the 2, 3, 5. conclusions of Mr. *H.* fall to the ground.

Nor can I see how the 5 and the 7, can stand together.

If the proper notion of the Church Catholic and particular Churches be of *integrum in membra*, pag. 20. Then particular Churches are essentials, and give matter and form to the Catholic.

Therefore they cannot receive matter and form from the Catholic, contrary to *conclus.* 7 pag. 21.

If the Church Catholic existeth out of the particular Churches, as a heap out of so many stones, pag. 24 then they are before the Catholic, contrary to *conclus.* pag. 10.

My second ground is that which Master *H.* grants, and the nature of the Church seems to force. “The Catholic Church may by persecution, &c. be brought into a little room, and haply into one Congregation, pag. 24. yet all the essence and privileges of the Church Catholic visible are contracted and preferred therein, and from them conveyed and derived to those whom they shall convert, *ibidem.*”

From this grant, I offer these collections to consideration.

1. Hence this Catholic Church being an individual, it must needs be *species specialissima*, and therefore can have no inferior to it, or subordinately under it, to which it can give *nomen & naturam*: for no man is so far forsaken of reason, as to affirm, *This*

261

individual Church is *that* individual Church.

2. Again, wherein fails this kind of reasoning?

1. *Catholica Ecclesia* extends it self to all persons and places, *conclus.* 1.

But so cannot a particular Congregation.

2. *Ecclesia particularis* may fail; so cannot *Ecclesia Catholica*.

3. *Ecclesia Catholica* gives part matter, and part form to all particular Churches, *conclus.* 7.

But a particular Congregation cannot do so.

4. That which is *aggregatum* of all particular Congregations, and its nature consists in *this*, that it is such a *Totum*, the nature of such an *integrum* cannot be preserved in *one*.

For *integrum* cannot be made of *one member*: As though a man should say, there may be the nature of a heap reserved in *one stone*: The nature of a flock in *one sheep*. A Corporation in *one man*.

Its true I confess, I should easily yield, that which all writers, all rules confirm, *Totum natura generii conservatur in una specie*: as the *nature* of *man* was preserved in *one* man *Adam*, But that an *integrum* made of many members should be intire and have his whole nature preserved in one, It is to me unconceivable, unless Master *H.* will help us with another Logic, that never yet saw light. Should one affirm the body to be an intire body and not lame, which lacks all the members, but only the head or hand, it would be counted a strange affirmation.

Let us yet once againe look a little more seriously into that particular branch of the 11th *conclusion*, if haply something may be fuggest cd to our secret thoughts, for our further consideration. Its laid, “*that Ecclesia Catholica was reserved in the family of Noah.*”

Beside the inconveniences mentioned before, we may thus further inquire: It’s granted that the *Church* was appointed by God to be *in families*. Suppose *Noah his sons*, issuing out into their own families, as they did: *Noah*, he had his family intire: when *Noah* was dead, and his family dissolved, I ask where *Ecclesia Catholica* was? It must needs be either in some of those families severally considered, or in a *fourth family as an aggregatum* of them all.

It could not be in the families *severally* considered, as that a-

263[262]

ny one of them should be, or could be truly called, *Ecclesia Catholica*. For *which* of them could claim that more then another?

2. *Ecclesia Catholica* gives matter and form to the particulars, as in the 7 *conclus.* but one family did not so to another.

3. *Ecclesia Catholica* consists of all the particulars as its members.

But no one did consist of the other two.

Nor can the *second part* be granted, *to wit*, that there should be a *fourth family* aggregated of all these: A man’s sense gives sufficient confutation of this: for there was never any such recorded in the word, nor conceived by any in that age: nor can there be such a one as Mr *H.* hath deciphered to us, that should give part matter, part form, to all the particulars, as in the seventh *conclusion*.

For it privily implies a *contradiction*: to be an *aggregatum* of particulars, and to give being unto them.

Lastly, take we Mr *H.* his definition of the Catholic Church “as it respects *all persons and places*, as in the 1. *conclus.* And therefore, *is the whole company of all believers in the whole world.*

How will, or in truth can, *this* agree to the visible Church, when it was confined within the pale and limits of the land of *Judea*? It’s confessed by all that I know, that God had no Church *visible*, to whom all Church privileges and ordinances belonged, *but only that*: And therefore all were bound to turn *Jewsi*, and become *Proselytes*, before they could be said to be within the *Covenant* of the Church, or had any right to the seals, or to share in any privileges thereof. *Exod.* 12:42. *Ephes.* 2:12.

And therefore all believers, that were not *joined* to the people of the God of *Abraham*, that were not incorporated into the Church, by subjecting themselves to the way and worship of God amongst them, and receiving *circumcision* in the foreskin of their flesh, they were debarred *all Priviledges*. Conceive we now *Rahab* converted to the faith, and as she was, it’s certain many families in like sort might be.

By Mr *H.* his principles, these were all of the Catholic Church, and had title to all Priviledges of the Church, which the words of the text professedly gainsays. Nay compare we Mr *H.* *his way* of the conveyance of the right of Church Priviledges, *with God’s way*, punctually expressed in his word, and then we

263[262]

shall see what accord there is. Mr *H.* thus writes, *p.* 11.

“*Particular Churches are made up of the members of the Church Catholic, and partake of the benefit and privileges of the Church primarily, not because they are believers of the particular Churches, but of the Church Catholic.*

So that we have Mr *H.* his mind and method thus laid open before us.

1. When a man is converted to the profession of the Gospel, and so becomes a visible believer, he is then a member of the visible Church Catholic.

2. He hath by this his profession and membership with the Church Catholic, right unto all Church privileges.

3. He then becomes a member of a particular Church: but hath not right to Church privileges, *because of that*, but because of his former membership with the Catholic Church.

This is his method.

God's method in his word is this.

1. A person is *converted* and becomes a *visible* believer.

2. He comes to be *adjoined to the Jewish Church*, and turns *Proselyte*.

3. *Because* he is now converted and turned Jew, he may eat the Passover, and enjoy all the other Priviledges, *Exod. 12:42. Isa. 56.*

It is hereby apparant that God's method, and that which Mr *H.* expresseth, is directly contradictory. The Lord says: It's not *because a believer*, but because believing he *joins* to the Church; therefore be partakes of Church Priviledges. Mr *H.* affirms: It's *not because he joins* to the Church, but because he is *a believer*, that he hath right to the Priviledges of the Church: which are open contradictions *in ipsis terminis*.

From the *ground* formerly made good and granted, it follows in the second place, The Church *visible* was *not of all people*, nor in all places.

If the Church was confined within the pale of *Judea*, then was it not in all places.

If confined to such only as were Jews, or became such, then was it not of all people.

And by all that I can observe in the text or out of Interpreters, its plain, that the *sons of Keturah* which were sent into the *east*, though they were circumcised, and in all appearance of proba-

ty, not only professed the faith (which were enongh according to M. *H.* his principles, to make them members of the Catholic Church) but were some of them true and sincere-hearted believers: yet its most certain *God did not account of them* as a *visible Church*, nor did he betruft them with Church-Priviledges. The Psalmist therefore confines and impropriates *them* to the Jew. *He hath not dealt so with any nation, neither have the Heathens knowledge of his ways, Rom. 3:2. what is the Priviledge of the*

Jew? &c. to them was committed the oracles of God, not to any other.

And therefore it is, that Divines, and those most judicious, conclude, and that with consent, that the Church was then *in populo Israelitico*, but now *in populo Catholico*: That it was then *in a Nation*, according to that, *I will make of thee a great Nation*: But now in *all Nations*, according to that, *Go preach and teach all Nations; and in Christ there is no difference either of Jew or Grecian, Scythian, or Barbarian*: and in *this* notion and consideration it is, that I conceive the *visible Church may now be called Catholic*, and not in the time of *the Jew*, because the Gospel is preached to all people universally and indifferently, and gathered out of all without any restraint, but was then confined *populo Israelitico*.

SECT. II.

Wherein Mr *H.* his *Demonstration*, by which he would prove a *Catholic Church visible*, is examined and answered.

These grounds being laid and proved, there is a ready way made to the right understanding of that which Mr *H.* propounds in way of proof of his Assertion, the nature whereof we have now opened.

His *demonstration* as he termes it, is this.

“If particular Churches be visible, then there is a visible Catholic Church.

But particular Churches are visible. Therefore,

Our Answer will be double.

1. We shall enquire what our Writers and *Protestant Divines* do return to the *Proposition*.

2. Then we shall apply our selves to the second part, or *Assumption*, and by both, it will appear, that this Argument doth

265

net probably conclude the cause, much less necessarily demonstrate it.

To begin with the *Proposition*.

When *Duræus* urged Doctor *Whitaker* with *this Argument* to maintain a *Catholic Church visible*, which he and all ours do constantly deny, Master *H.* may be pleased to consider, what return the Doctor makes *Whitak. contra Duræum Lib. 3. de Eccles.*

pag. 110. when *Duræus* had thus laid down his Argument, *Dic quæso, si singulæ Ecclesiæ ex quibus veluti partibus, &c. If all particular Churches, whereof the Church Catholic consists, at members, be visible, and fall under our sight, will it not follow, that the Catholic Church will be visible also?*

After Doctor *Whitaker* had told him, that the Catholic Church is not to be confined to *one age* and time, but comprehends *all* the faithful of *all ages*, which went *before us*, and are now in heaven, and then he demands of *Duræus* whether *all these be visible or no*.

Secondly, he comes yet nearer home, and drives him to a greater straight and narrow: *Deindeut Catholicam tuam ecclesiam in hoc seculum compingimus, tamen quousque particulares Ecclesiæ aspectabiles sunt, Catholica aspectabilis non erit.* In a word he parenthetically and readily *denies the consequence*, affirming *That the members may be aspectabiles, but the whole not so*. And gives the reason of his denial, which is this. *Si enim Catholica (ut tu dicis) consistit ex partibus, &c. Loco supra citato. If the Catholic be aggregated of many parts, then when these parts are gathered together, the whole may be seen, but the parts as severally cannot be seen.* And adds, answerably when the parts are seen severally, then the Totum, as aggregated, cannot be seen.

Nay if Master *H.* be pleased to review, how learned *Sadeel* deals with *Turrian*, propounding the very same Argument to him, in the very same terms, he will, and the *Reader* may perceive, what strength that judicious writer apprehended to be in this reason, and Doctor *Whitaker* allegeth and repeats this against *Bel-larmine* and gives his approbation of it. The concurrence of those judgements of these two Worthies you may find, *Whitak. de Eccles. controv. 2. q. c. 4. Arg. 11.*

Ecclesiam Catholicam adversarii dicunt esse omnes Ecclesias particulares, pertotum terrarum orbem fusas. quæ quia sunt visibiles, ecclesiam Catholicam exhis aggregatam visibilem esse affirmant.

266

Our Adversaries (saith *Sadeel*) *affirm the Catholic Church to be all particular Churches spread through the whole world; and because the particulars are visible, therefore they concludes the Catholic aggregated of all these to be visible also.* (So that it is plain,

the Papists plead the same Argument with Mr. *H.* for their cause, as he now doth for his.)

But *Sadeel* and *Whitaker* both, make a *round* return to him. *Sed hoc nihil absurdius dici potest.* They fear not to profess that the consequence is very absurd and destitute of any shew of reason, and therefore retort the argument, as marvellous strong against him. *If the particular Churches severed be visible, then the whole aggregated cannot be visible: And if the aggregatum be visible, they cannot be visible.* As they instance. If there be ten flocks of sheep several, they are and may be seen severed one from another: But then one Catholic flock gathered together of all these cannot be seen.

By this which hath been alleged, two things the Reader may attend:

1. How feeble these judicious writers judged the force of the consequence of the Argument.

2. Its evident by their whole debate, that they take it as a thing supposed, that to make up a *Totum aggregatum*, there must be in reason *the aggregation of the members.*

For it is not enough to make up a *Totum aggregatum*, that the several members are under *the same laws*, and governed *after the same manner.* For that which may and doth belong to those that are not aggregated in any such a whole, that cannot be sufficient to give a proper nature or *formality* to such an *aggregatum*: for things common do not give any proper and differencing nature. *But these* forenamed, to wit, to be governed by the same laws, and ruled after the same manner, may, and doth befall those bodies, that are not under such an aggregation.

Thus several Free cities and House-Towns, which are entire in themselves: Several Countries and Kingdoms, who have nothing to do with each other in their precincts and Jurisdictions, yet may have the same laws, and the same manner of Government. Only that, which makes them an entire and complete common-wealth in themselves, is the aggregation of them under the *same govemors as the chief*, whether *one* single person as in a *monarchical*, or *many*, as in an *Aristocratical* state.

And this might suffice for a satisfactory answer for the present, but I shall go a nearer way to work, and as they have denied the

confluence, I shall deny the second part or *assumption*, Namely, *that particular congregations are not members*, (out *species*) of a Church, which as a *genus* exists, and works, and is preserved in each particular, and as far as *visibility* may be given to a *general*, *existing*, and acting in the individuals, I shall *not gainsay* it: for it is that I have opened and defended in the foregoing part of the discourse. Such a *Totum universale* I grant, and do not know any either do or indeed can deny; but this serves not the Papists turn at all.

For the general nature of a Church being determined to its particulars, and existing therein, all particular Churches do equally and indifferently from thence receive all the Church-power and priviledges that are common, and there *needs no visible monarch* over all Churches, but faithful *Pastors* and *Teachers*, set *over every* particular congregation, for improvement of all ordinances, Sacraments, and censures for the good thereof.

Nor will it suit Master *H.* Because we need not (if we will follow the level of this truth, as it leads us,) go about by a Catholic visible Church aggregated of all, before we come to a congregation, but we must be necessitated to attend upon a particular congregation; for there both *the essence and privilege* of the *Church* is *first* to be found, because the genus first exists there.

Master *H.* conceiving *such an answer* might be made, he frames it as an *objection* against himself, and makes only *this* return, that he takes the *notion* of *Church* in regard of its particulars to be *Integri in membra* but the *proofs* which should settle it, are no whit sufficient.

1. He allegeth an expression out of Doctor *Ames* his *medulla lib. 1. c. 32. part 4 particulares istæ congregationes sunt partes similes ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, which words, it's certain, do properly and directly consider particular congregations *as species* of a Church, and were so intended by the Author, as it appears in the next word,

True in the following words, he speaks of *ecclesia Catholica*, *as integrum*, but rather as putting such a notion upon it, or analysing the reason of such an apprehension, then concluding that there is any such *reality existing*. For in the first words of that

268

chap, the thus writes, *ecclesia, quæ in terris agit, non est tota simul visibilis*. Therefore this *aggregation* is not visible (for in that the nature of this *Totum integrale* lies) so that this expression of Doctor *Ames* neither hurts ours, nor helps Master *H.* his cause,

Master *H.* addes also one argument.

“*Ubi omnes partes existunt simul compactæ, ibi totum existit.*

“*Sed omnes partes ecclesiæ Catholicæ visibilis existunt simul compactæ.*

Therefore *ecclesia Catholica visibilis existit.*

The minor he proves out of Eph. 4:16.

Answ. The *conclusion* may be granted in a right sense, without any prejudice to our defence at all. 1. Where the particular members of a congregation are compacted in covenant of the Church, and with Church officers, there is a particular Church, 2. Where there are many particular Churches, amongst them, there is *Totum genericum existens*.

In *this* sense, (which is the sense of the place) all may be granted: but in *his* sense, the *minor is denied*, namely, that all particular congregations do *exist aggregated together as members of the Catholic*; that should have been proved, but is not touched, much less evidenced.

And if Mr *B.* had attempted to shew how all particular Churches are *aggregated* or compacted *in toto integrali*, which *ariseth out of mem*, and hath somewhat *peculiar to it self*, and not common to them, he had helped the cause with some proof, and us with some light.

The *particular* taken from the Apostles and Evangelists, namely, it must therefore be a Catholic Church, because they were *given* to it, we shall meet with it, in 1 Cor. 12:28. where it shall receive a full answer.

Sect. III.

Where the Scriptures Mr. *H.* allegeth, are examined and cleared.

We have thus done with Mr *H.* *demonstration*, and we suppose it doth appear, that it doth not necessarily enforce the conclusion.

269

We shall now weigh, with like liberty, the *Scriptures* which he propounds to this end and purpose.

The first alleged by him, is, *Act.* 8:3. and to this also may that be referred; *Gal.* 1:13. because the aim of the Spirit is the same in both, and the second is but a relation of the first.

Now that by *Church*, in *Act.* 8:3. cannot be meant *catholica ecclesia visibilis*, is thus plain.

That Church is there meant, which *Paul* persecuted.

But he could not, nor did he persecute the whole company of professing believers in the whole world, for he could not see them, nor know them.

Beside, he did not persecute the Church of the Jews in Jerusalem, *i.e.* the *Jewish Church*, and yet its certain, there were there many that believed: but as the text saith, and he affirms of himself, he persecuted *that way*, and all that he knew of that way: which was indeed the *Christian Church* in Jerusalem, now erected by the Apostles, and there exceedingly increased by the blessing of the Lord, and therefore *Church* is put by a synecdoche, for that *particular Church*: and that also for the men and members of it, that *Paul* could take notice of it, *Act.* 9:2 to the words are, *if he found any of that way*, them he had commission to pursue, and so did.

The probabilities intimated to the contrary by Mr. *H.* do not evince; as first when he saith, "*It was not a particular Church, because the persecution was in Jerusalem, Damascus, and even to strange cities.*"

Answ. True, no wonder because he persecuted all that professed that way of the Christian Church, and those by reason of a great persecution were scattered abroad throughout all the regions of *Judea* and *Samaria*, they fled far and wide, and therefore he might persecute them where he found them, as he did, hunting after them with eagerness and madness of malice. Thus Dr *Whitaker* expounds the place, *controv. 2. de eccles. p. 456.*

When Mr. *H.* adds, an *indefinite* is equivalent to a *general*, he will find that it is not always so upon second thoughts, as innumerable instances might be brought to evince the contrary.

Nor yet lastly is there the same reason, that the word *Church* here should reach all other Churches. For the Apostle gives in

270

a peculiar ground why he was thus carried, namely he persecuted their way, not simply because they were believers. (For such many in *Jerusalem* were that were of the Jewish Church *Act. 13:14*. But because they made this manner of profession touching Christ and salvation by him alone, rejecting the ceremonies of the Law.

To this also you may refer these *two* other Scriptures:
Act. 2:47. God added to the Church such as should be saved.

1. That is *not* to the *whole* company of believers in the *whole World*: for such a company they never saw nor knew, and therefore could not be added to them: But to the Christian Church now erected: and therefore it is said, *they continued in the Doctrine of the Apostles in their fellowship, Act. 2:42.*

2. There were many believers of the Jewish Church, *Act. 5:14*. and therefore they who met of that Church, could not be added to them, but to the Apostolical and Christian Church. And therefore,

3. When it is said, *they were added to the Church, v. 47.* in the *41. v.* It's said, *they were baptized, and the same day were added unto them about 3,000 souls,* i.e. to the Apostles and their company.

Lastly. the *Church* is distinguished from *all the rest*, many whereof were certainly professing believers, *Act. 5:14, fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these things.*

To this head, namely of the Christian Church of the Gentiles, you may add that *1 Cor. 10:32. give no offence to the Jew, nor Gentile, nor to the Church of God.* Where the word *Church* (saith Mr. *H.* page. 13.) cannot be the Church of the elect, nor any particular Congregation, but indefinitely.

Answ. But must it therefore be meant of the *Catholic Church visible*, and that as *integrum?* the consequent deserves a denial and that it cannot be meant of the Catholic Church, the words of the text give apparent testimony.

That Church which is contra-distinct to the Jews, that cannot comprehend the *whole* company of believers, *through the whole world*, because some believers were of the Jews, 1 *Pet.* 1. *Jam.* 1:1.

But this Church is so contra-distinct.

Again, that Church is here meant, whom a man may offend

271

by his practice in the particulars mentioned.

But he cannot so offend the *whole* company of believers, *through the whole world*: because a scandal must be seen or known certainly: but so a persons practice cannot be to all believers in the whole world.

Therefore the *meaning* is plain, we must not offend those that are without, nor yet the *believing Jews*, nor any of the *believing Gentiles*, who are brought home unto Christ, and the fellowship of the Church.

To this head also belongs that of *Eph.* 3:10.

That to principalities might be made known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God if it be not meant of the *Church invisible*, It must needs be understood of the *Church of the Gentiles* then gathering, not of the whole company of all believers throughout the whole world, as the several circumstances carry it, beyond control. For in *v.* 9. the Apostle speaks of such *mysteries that were kept secret since the beginning of the world.* 2. It's such *multifarious wisdom*, which was *now made known by the Churches*; but before to the Church of the Jews: And *therefore the Churches of the Gentiles* are here to be considered and understood.

Unless, as I said, it be meant of the *invisible Church*, unto which Master *Beza* and *Piscator* seem to incline, because first the Apostle speaks of such things that appertain only to the faithful, as *v.* 9. he speaks of *all things created by Christ Jesus*, i.e. all the elect & called (say they, i.e. those former interpreters mentioned) 2. This discovery of wisdom is in *v.* 12. according to his eternal counsel in Christ Jesus intended towards his elect, and indeed in those dispensations this wisdom appears, which drives the very thoughts to amazement: But however it be taken, it helps nothing to Mr. *H*, his *Ecclesia Catholica*.

Master *H.* addes, 1 Cor. 12:28. “*God hath set some in the Church as first Apostles, teachers, 1 Tim. 3:15. That thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church.*

“*Ephes. 4:11,12. perfecting the body of Christ.*

“*These places must needs be meant of the Catholic Church says he.*

Answ. No: but they are to be understood of every particular, or (which is all one, and my meaning) of the *Church* as a *To-*

272

tum universale existing and determined in its actings by the particulars, or if you will, The Apostle points at *one particular*, but includes *all particulars* by a *parity and proportion of reason*, As God set in the *Church of Corinth*, and so in all *Churches*, Apostles and Teachers. The *Church of Ephesus* is *God's house*, and are all *Churches* truly constituted.

The *Church of Ephesus* is Christ's body, and so are all the *Churches* instituted by Christ. They are all one in the general nature of them, and those privileges which belong in common to them all equally and indifferently.

Let us now see what is said for the confirmation of the sense, for which Mr. *H.* allegeth them.

The greatest cost that he bestows upon that in 1 Cor. 12. as conceiving that to be most pregnant, and therefore prudently gathers in upon the dispute thus.

It cannot be meant of the triumphant or invisible Church, but the visible, and that not essentialis, but organica, both which we willingly grant, and confess his reason good, as formerly we have done to Mr Rutherford.

But how doth he prove that *Churches* collectively taken, or *Catholica ecclesia tanquam integrum* is here meant. That he endeavors by *this reason*.

“*If there be officers of the Church Catholic? visible, then there is such a Church Catholic visible.*

“*But the Apostle and prophets were officers of the Church Catholic visible, therefore.*

“The *minor* he thus proves, *because they had no limits*, and yet are said to be set, not in *Churches*, but in the *Church*. The frame stands thus.

“*They who are so set in a Church, that yet they have no limits in their works that Church must be a Catholic Church.*

“*But the Apostles, &c. are so set in a Church, as yet they have no limits in their office, therefore that Church must be a Catholic Church.*

Answ. The *major* proposition or *consequence* is denied, as not suitable to the truth, which may thus appear.

The *reason* of their *unlimitedness* arose from their *commission*, because it was *general*, being immediately called and appointed by

273

God to *preach to all nations*, and so had power to plant all Churches, & had virtually all Church power in them: but this did not issue *nextly* from the Church, in which they were *firstly* set.

As the *eleven Apostles* were first set and *over the Christian Church* erected in Act. 1. where there was a company of an 120, can any man reason from hence thus?

In what Church the Apostle were set, that is the Catholic Church, and the whole company of all believers in the whole world. But they were set in that Church mentioned Act. 1. and chap. 2:47. therefore that 120 were the whole company of all believers in the whole world.

2. *That Church where Deacons are set*, that Church is not an unlimited Church.

But ordinary *Deacons* were set in the same Church, wherein the Apostles were set, as in the place. 1 Cor. 12. its affirmed *jointly* and *indifferently* of them *both*.

Therefore that Church doth not argue an unlimited power.

The minor proposition is express in the text.

The major is sure, as being bottomed upon confessed principles; ordinary officers have not an illimited power, but are confined to their proper charges, because that is one main difference, betwixt them and extraordinary ones.

That which is impossible for a *Deacon* to perform, that our Lord Christ never imposed, never exacted at his hands, nor doth it belong to his office.

But for a Deacon, called *Helps*, in the 1 *Cor.* 12. to distribute to the whole company of all believers in the whole world, is, and was ever imposible.

3. If Teachers be unlimited in their work, then an ordinary officer hath power over all the Churches, and is bound to feed and watch over all, and so there is a road way for *Tot quots* and *pluralities*.

4. If setting an ordinary officer in the Church be by *election*, then in that Church he is set by which he is elected.

But a particular company combined in a particular congregation, they only elect, not the whole company of all believers in the whole world.

Therefore in that he is only set.

Touching that of 1 *Tim.* 3:15, he gives in a double Argument for proof.

274

“This Church muſt be viſible Church when he and others muſt exiſt and converſe together, and carry themſelves in mutual duties. Now theſe directions concerned not Ephesus alone, or in any ſpecial manner, but all the Churches where ever he ſhould come, it’s that Church, which is the pillar of truth, and holds it forth more forenſi, &c.

Anſw. All theſe particulars here affirmed, may be and are truly ſaid touching a *particular congregation*; for in *that* Timothy may converſe with others, in mutual duties: there may directions be given touching *that*, which by a parity of reaſon, will reach *all others*. As thoſe *Paul* did give to the *Elders of Ephesus*, that they ſhould *feed and watch over their flock*: This is common to *all Paſtors*, in all their Churches: and *Timothy* was left in *Ephesus* to that end.

A particular congregation, which is the true Church of Chriſt, it, as a *pillar*, doth hold out the profeſſion of Faith and Goſpel *more forenſi*.

And therefore there is *no evidence* nor ſtrength of *Argument*, from *all* theſe to conclude a *Catholic Church*.

2. But if theſe *only* belong to *particular congregations*, and not to the *Church Catholic*, at now controverted, then the

place serves for a *confutation*, not a *confirmation* of it; survey we the severals in short.

1. It's yielded by all that I know, who plead for a Catholic visible Church, that *this visibility* is only in the *parts* of it, not in the *integral state of it*. *Ames. medull. l. 1. c. 32. p. 1.*

2. That Church state which men *cannot see*, in that they *cannot converse* one with another, nor perform duties one to another, look at it in that precise consideration, of which now we speak.

That which is not seen by any, that as a pillar cannot hold out the truth more forensi.

The first is yielded as true.

Therefore the second cannot be denied.

3. *If there be such an Ecclesia Catholica, as a particular or individual integrum, (for so it must be attended) then it hath some special acts or operation peculiar to it self, not communicable to the members of it: As the nature and definition of an integrum doth require: and which we have formerly evidenced.*

275

But there be no such acts and operations that were ever yet found, or could be instanced in.

It's true, there be *common operations*, ordinances, privileges, that belong to a congregational Church, as *Totum genericum*, firstly, and therefore are attributed and given to all particular congregations *secondarily* and *as they are acted and existing*, so they may be, and there, are easily and evidently apprehended.

But set aside the particular congregations, the several operations thereof, and privileges therein. If Mr *Hudson* or any man shall demonstrate some *particular* either *acts*, privileges, *officer* or *officers*, that are *peculiar to this Totum aggregatum*, I will yield the cause.

Lastly, *That which is not, nay cannot be the pillar of truth, to publish or hold out the truth more forensi, that Church is not here meant.*

But Catholica ecclesia visibilis cannot do this, for we have proved, that there is no such *ecclesia aggregata*: and *non entis non est notio*.

In the place of the *Ephes. c. 4. 12.* that *Church* is called *one* in regard of the common nature of it, which as *Totum genericum* is communicated to all the particulars, with all the common privileges, that by a likeness and proportion of reason is given to them.

That resemblance of the *worldly empire*, hath been formerly confuted, and the disproportion demonstrated; for there must be some peculiar act and officer, belonging to the Church as such an *integrum*, as it is in all worldly empires, wherein the integrity consists, and comes to be apprehended which is not to be found in the Church.

The consideration of *Church*, as *Totum genericum* gives answer to all those places where the word *Kingdom* is used to signify the visible Church, and therefore I might spare here any repetition, and leave the Reader to make the application himself but the truth is, the word *Kingdom* in many of the places here quoted, carries another sense, and doth not reach the cause in hand, much less conclude it; as will thus appear by the trial of the particulars.

The *Kingdom of heaven* beside other significations, as the *Kingdom of glory*, &c. it doth by a *Metonymy* (so its frequently used in the Evangelists, simply the *word* of the Kingdom and

276

the *dispensation* and *administration* of the Gospel in the Churches, and the special things appertaining thereunto, The *Kingdome of heaven is like to a man sowing of seed*, Matth. 13:24. *like to Mustard seed. 31. to Leaven. 33. to treasure hid in the field 44.* The *Church* is not like to Leaven or seed, but the dispensation of the Gospel is.

And so it must be understood in that 1 *Cor. 15:24. Then shall Christ deliver up the kingdom unto God the father. That Kingdom* cannot be the Catholic Visible Church, because that consisting of sound hearted Christians and false hearted *hypocrites*, these are not delivered up into the hand of the father, that he may be all in all, to them.

Beside Mr *H.* his *own* words are witness enough against this sense, for so he writes in the place, p. 15. "*It's the Kingdom exercised in the visible Church, in Ordinances of worship.*"

It is to be exercised in that visible Church; it's therefore distinct from it in sense and signification.

To this head also belongs that in *Heb.* 12:28.

Wherefore receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, &c. This kingdom is not the Catholic visible Church.

1. For, *that* kingdom is here meant, which cannot *be shaken*. But this may be shaken by strong perfection, and the most of the members of it, the particular Churches destroyed and dissolved.

2. It's a kingdom which is *unlike* that which was in *the Old-Testament*, and the unlikeliness lies in this, that *this now* in the time of the Gospel *cannot be moved*, but *that* was: whereas the Church, for its existence, is subject to be as much shaken now, as that under the Law.

But the fairest *construction* of the words, and most *full* to the scope of the place, is to shew how far differing the dispensation of the ways of God's *worship*, which is *now* appointed by him, is from *that* which was ordained *under the Law*: Those Ordinances and administrations are now come to an end, and others intituted in their place and room: but these we have now under the Gospel are *last*, and so the *unalterable* institutions of our Saviour: and thus Mr *H.* expresseth himself; carried, as it should seem, with the constraining evidence of the words. "*This, kingdom cannot be meant (saith he) of the internal kingdom of grace, but it is meant of the external ordinances of worship and discipline: but I suppose these are not the Church, and therefore there*

277

is nothing here to be found for the establishment of that conceit.

Much less is there any colour of such a conceit in that of *Matth.* 3. *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand: i.e.* the Catholic Church is at hand; how harsh is such a sound to a man's ear, such a sense to a man's mind?

The rest of the places, where *kingdom* signifies the Churches *Luke* 7:38. So likewise those similitudes of *floor* and *field*, they point out *all* particular *Congregations* under that condition, which is *common* to them all, *to wit*, that they are made up of a mixed multitude of good and bad, or which is all one, they look at the general nature of a *Congregation* existing in its particulars: but put not on the relation of *members to an integrum* at all. Nor

doth the seeming reason of Mr *H.* alleged to the contrary, carry any constraining force to persuade a man seriously judicious. For when he thus writes pag. 15,

“Now if these things (those to wit, which were spoken concerning field, floor, Kingdom) were spoken of a particular Congregation only: which particular Congregation in the world shall impropriate these to itself? but if true of every one in particular, and all in general, and these all he continually called one kingdom, then there is a Church Catholic visible, to wit, *totum integrale*.”

The answer will be easy and ready at hand: That our expressions and apprehensions look not at any thing impropriate to one, but *that* which is *common* to all, and true of all, because all these particulars are *unum genere*. And the general nature is one in them all: and it is but reason, that in that regard they should be called one. But thence to gather, that therefore there is a Catholic visible Church, as *totum integrale*, is to wrong the meaning of the text, and to wring out blood instead of milk: Nay in truth to make the conclusion to oppose the premises, and his own expressions.

That which is common to all the particulars, that cannot be an *integrum*, but a *genus*: as the rules and definitions of *genus* of necessity require.

Those are his premises.

Take his expressions, *If true of every particular, and all in general*: whence the issue will come to this:

That which is true of all the particulars, as a general, that must

278

needs be a *genus*, and not an *integrum* to them.

The first Mr *H.* affirms; therefore the second cannot be gained.

The place of Matth. 16:18. attonitos tenet interpretes, like the body of *Asahel*, puts every man to a stand, that passeth by.

True it is, that dotting delusion of the Papists, making *Peter's* person the *rock*, is hissed out of all, that have attained any eye-salve of the Scripture, to clear their understanding in the truth thereof: yet there remain more difficulties and mysteries in some parts of the Text, which were never seen with any full convict-

ing evidence to this day, though many have set themselves, and that sadly to the search thereof.

We will only attend the particular here specified by Master *H.* *what Church a here understood?*

Though I must confess (for I love to be plain) that I do incline to Mr *H.* his judgement, that the *visible church* is here understood: yet I must profess also, that his proof is no way satisfactory either to evidence that it must be visible, much less a *Catholic visible Church*:

For when it was objected, that this was an *invisible Church*, here spoken of, because the *visible may fail*.

He only speaks to the second part, that the Catholic Church cannot fail: but that this was not an invisible Church here intended, he doth not at all prove, nor in truth set about it.

2. His reason whereby he would persuade that the visible Church *nunquam deficit*; hath not strength in it, nor truth in it, though the conclusion be true, which he would maintain; For he thus disputes.

“If all visible members should fail, then all the invisible must fail also: for none are invisible in this world, but must be visible also: except any be converted and fed only by inspiration, which we have no ground for in the Scripture.

The frame stands thus,

If none be invisible members in this world, but they must be visible members also: when visible fails, then the invisible fails also.

But she first is true; there be no visible, but they be invisible also. The assumption deserves a denial and that I suppose upon second thoughts, he will grant upon his *own principles*.

279

1. For its most certain, that an invisible gracious Saint, may justly be cast out of the Church.

2. It's as certain to Master *Hudson* that he that is cast out and excommunicate from one congregation, is cast out of all congregations, and out of the *Catholic visible Church*.

Hence I would reason.

He that is cast out of all visible Churches, and the Church Catholic, he is no visible member for excommunication cuts off visible membership.

But he that is and remains an invisible member, may be justly cast out of all visible Churches, and so the Church Catholic.

Therefore a man may remain an invisible, and yet not be a visible member.

That which is added for proof toucheth not the cause: for a man cast out, and so no member, may be fed by word, and prayer and fasting, promises, conferences, readings, without any inspiration, and this the scriptures abundantly declare, and each man's experience will make good.

Besides, it hath been made good, that a man may out of the weakness of his judgement conceiving the Churches not rightly gathered, refuse to be Baptised, and so be no member of the Church, and yet be a Saint truly gracious, according to their principles.

Again, suppose a person fall into some notorious evil, and for that cause, all the Churches may reject him, and deny him communion, he is then no member visible: and yet he is an invisible one.

It's not a little *dangerous* to lay the foundation of the *not failing* of our *grace*, upon the *not failing* of *Church membership*, which this doth. This were enough to make it appear, that this place lends no relief to the conclusion: because it doth not prove a visible Church here intended.

But let this be granted. I would yet add, that this cannot be a Catholic Church of Master *H.* his cut. For I would reason from his own words and explication, which I think have weight in them.

That Church which only includes the Church of the Gentiles, and *that to be built*, that cannot comprehend the whole company of the faithful in the whole world, and so cannot be a Catholic Church.

But this Church, Matth. 16:18. (by Master *H.* his own words) *includes only the Church evangelical of the Gentiles.*

The *Proposition* hath sense to settle it, for there were many of the Church of the Jews true believers and professors.

The *minor* is Master *H.* his own expression *p.* 17.

We are now near home. The last place, where any strength of dispute lies, is in 2 *John* 5:10. where excommunication is called *casting out of the Church.*

Answ.

By *Church*, *per synechdochen generis pro specie*, which is most frequent and familiar in the Scripture, *That particular Church* where Diotrephes usurped preeminence, is understood.

So its used *Act.* 20:28, *Feed the flocks, over whom ye are set*, and that was the Church, which Christ *hath redeemed*, in the following words. And our ordinary speech is generally in this strain, such a man is cast *out of the Church*, meaning that *particular congregation* in which he was *incorporate*.

Let us hear how Master *H.* can force any Catholic visible Church, with any concluding evidence, from hence. His words are as follows.

“If the Church here be a visible Church, I would know, whether a man truly excommunicated in one congregation, is not thereby excommunicated from brotherly fellowship in all congregations.

I answer, yes, and what is gained from thence? therefore there is a Church Catholic visible. The inference is weak of reason. For when a person is justly excommunicate from the congregation in which he was, it follows of necessity, *all that fellowship he might enjoy, by virtue of communion of Churches must of necessity be denied unto him, and he justly deprived thereof:* because in the virtue of his fellowship with one, he gained fellowship with others: and therefore when he is justly deprived of the one, by the censure of the Church, he must in all reason be deprived of the other; but by what strength of inference a Catholic visible Church should be concluded from hence, I confess I see not.

If Mr. *H.* conceive that the party was an actual member of every congregation, and that when one congregation cuts the

281

party off from his particular membership he had with it, by the same act, it cuts him off from all the other. If this be his meaning, there be as many mistakes almost as words in such expressions; and therefore the inference must be wholly destitute of strength and truth.

That which is added afterwards, is yet much further from “the mark, as when he adds. *I would know whether the delivering up to Satan, is only within the bounds of one congregation, so that if he remove out of such a circuit or circle of ground to another, he is out of Satan bounds again, and may communicate there safely.*

The frame stands thus.

If a person excommunicate is not cut off from his membership with every particular congregation, and so from the integral visible Church, then when he removes from such a circuit of ground, he may communicate.

But this last is untrue, namely when he is out of the circuit of ground, he may again communicate, therefore.

This *consequence* is conjured into such a circle of a conceit that its beyond the compass of common reason, unless Mr *H.* should imagine, that excommunication only calls a man out of a circuit of ground or that the power of Satan were only confined to some circle, I wonder how such a consequence came into his thoughts.

The truth is, The power of excommunication lies in the particular congregation, where a person enjoys his membership with the Saints of God, under the kingdom of Jesus Christ. And when a party is cast out of that, and delivered up unto Satan, and into the Kingdom of darkness, let him be where he will, and go where he will, he is under the Kingdom of Satan, and all the Churches should look at him as a Traitor against Christ, and so deal with him, as one incapable of Church-communion.

Those two places, *Ephes.* 3. and last, *Joh.* 10:15. are either understood of the Church invisible, as the circumstances seem to intimate; or else they shew that unity, and so community of the dispensation of Christ in all the Churches of the Gentiles, with which the general nature of a Church formerly opened

and disputed fully suits, and therefore gives no appearance of a proof for *Catholica ecclesia visibilis* as *Totum integrale* and *aggregatum*.

282

We have now done with the first Question.

The reasons and Scriptures brought for the proof thereof, have been answered and satisfied: so that by the concession and confession of Mr. *H.* we shall not need to add any thing of the second.

For this was like the main pillar, upon which the whole frame was built, which failing utterly, the whole must necessarily fall to the ground. This Question being plucked up by the roots, upon which the other and all the consecutaries and collections grew, they will wither presently of their own accord. This bottom breaking, there needs no battery further to be erected against the rest of the discourse: it moulders away without any more ado, and therefore I shall ease my self and the Reader of any further pains to be improved that way.

Only for a close, I shall be bold to offer some few considerations to Mr *H.* his more serious trial, touching *some propositions*, two whereof are expressed in the tenth and eleventh conclusion; the *third* and *last*, may be found in the eleventh page. All these I shall shortly set down and suddenly express my reasons, why as yet I am not yield assent thereunto, and so leave the whole debate.

1. Proposition is laid down in these words

“These parts (that is a particular congregation) are limited and distinguished from others by the civil and prudential limits, for conveniency of meeting and maintenance, and transacting of business.

That which seems here *difficult*, I shall thus suggest.

1. That several congregations are separated one from another in place; as it is a thing that a man’s sense can determine, which admits no gainsaying, so I suppose it’s not the aim of Mr *H.* nor the scope he intends, nor which he would have the Reader to attend in those words: but *his purpose* is to point out *that whereto the distinguishing and differencing formality of one*

congregation from another consists, as the following words and special instance used to that end, gives in abundant evidence.

283

But this apprehension, I cannot yet see how it suits with the nature of a particular Church, or the nature of a *form* whence this act of distinguishing properly issues.

1. That which *formally* and truly distinguisheth, is *internal* to the thing; but *this* is *external* and merely adventitious.

2. That which is *common*, nor doth, nor can distinguish; but this is so.

3. *That* which distinguisheth truly, it is the *form* of the thing properly and firstly, *or else* it proceeds as a *peculiar property* from it: its either *essentiale constituens* or *consequens*: but this is neither, for neither the form nor property are separable: *but thus the place or limits are.*

4. *It this* distinguisheth one congregation from another, how comes it that to his and each man's experience, not only in the *same Town*, but in the *same meeting-house* there be several and distinct Churches? As the *Dutch* and *English* Churches in *Colchester*. *If the distinction* of congregations issued from the *limits of the place*, then they who were in the same place, they should not be distinguished. Then the Dutch Church in *Colchester* should be English: for they are both within the same precincts, and either do or may at several times meet and assemble within the same stone walls of the Church so called.

5. *If the diverse limits of the place*, did put a difference distinctive upon a congregation, then the place of the Merchants, moving from *Delph* to *Rotherdam*, because they are in *distinct places*, therefore they are *distinct Churches*; and so by moving and settling in several places, one congregation should differ from it self; and as before many congregations were one, now one and the same should become many.

It's true if the demand be, of what particular Church we speak, or to what Church we would write, its usual and sufficient to describe the Church *by the place*, as the common subject where it hath its abode: but this is no proof that therefore a common subject should give a distinguishing difference of that from another.

When the *Christian Church of the 120.* was erected in *Jerusalem*, beside the Church of the Jews formerly instituted, and yet not abrogated, was it ground sufficient thus to conclude, because they are in the same city, therefore they are the same Church? I suppose the inference will be judged unfound by all;

284

and yet if the differencing distincton issued from the place, it would undeniably follow they were not at all: distinguished each from other.

The second Proposition is in the same place, and
its thus expressed.

“The membership of a particular Church is devolved on him, by Gods disposing providence, by reason of his birth, or cohabitation there, or voluntarily assumed, by his voluntary removal into the place allotted out by civil prudence, for such a particular society to enjoy such ordinances, of God conveniently together.

To this assertion I cannot give my assent, and shall presently give in my reasons when I have briefly laid open the meaning of the expressions.

When Master *H.* seems to lay several grounds, by which membership comes to be attained, I suppose in the last resolution they issue all in one, namely, *the constancy of abode and residence, within the limits of such a place.*

For imagine that a man hath an inheritance fallen to him by *birth* in such a town, if yet he will let it, or set it out to another and reside in another place, *his birth* doth not devolve his membership upon him in that place. For if he were *borne heir* to lands in 20 *places* or parishes, should he have membership in all, when he doth abide but in one? I believe Master *H.* would deny such an inference.

The like I may say *of removal*: If he did but as Traveller and messenger, take up his habitation, I suppose Master *H.* would not affirm he was a member in the place because he lodged two or three nights or so many weeks or months in a place.

That I may then put the fairest construction upon his words that in love and prudence, and ingenuity I can, I conceive the

meaning to be this, *where a person takes up his habitation*, whether he have right to it by birth, or it come by gift, purchase, or hiring, &c. *his membership issues from hence immediately*, that he *takes up his constant abode* within the limits of such a place or parish.

But that this cannot give the formality of membership, I have

285

formerly proved, and I confess I do a little strange that Master *Hudson* a man learned should fall in with such an opinion, which I cannot perceive gains so much from any Judicious at this time, that they are willing to speak a good word for it.

1. *For no civil rule can give an ecclesiastical right.*

Because those are two kinds of government opposite one against the other, and each of them entire and complete within it self.

2. *This destroys the censure of excommunication* and wholly frustrates the power thereof, that it can never attain its end. For the scope of the censure, is to cut a person off from his membership and communion with the Church, as the name of excommunication and the nature of the ordinance requires.

But if the Priviledges of membership be devolved upon me by a civil right and cohabitation, *This*, excommunication nor doth, nor indeed can take away. And therefore upon this ground it cannot take away my membership and communion with the Church.

And therefore is by this means wholly made void and of none effect.

3. *If right of cohabitation gives membership*. Then *Turks and Jews* may be members, and they and their children have right to all Church ordinances as well as any: *Then* men may *make* themselves members of a congregation though they be never so scandalous and unworthy to be received; nay though the congregation be never so desirous, in a just way according to the rules of Christ, to hinder their proceeding, and reject them from their communion: which Master *Rutherford* and all rules and reasonable men gaine say: In a word, by this grant, all the

power of Churches and censures and ordinances would be frustrated or profaned.

The *pretended inconvenience* which persuades him to embrace this opinion, is, because, to be in a city, and not to be a member of the Church in the city, it seems to imply an unchurching of those places, &c.

But I answer, it doth *but seem* so, it doth in no wise do any such thing; *only it shows that God's people are a free people, and that combination issues from free consent*, when no rule in nature,

286

nor providence according to God puts any restraint in that kind.

The third Proposition is p. 11.

"Particular Churches are made up of the members of the Church Catholic, and partake of the benefits and privileges of the Church primarily, not because they are members of the particular Churches, but of the Catholic.

In these words, there *somewhat implied, something expressed*: To neither of which I can *give assent* unless some proof be alleged, which may prevail with my judgement, and persuade thereunto which as yet I see none.

That which is implied is this, That the Catholic Church may have its being, when as yet there be no particular congregations existing; for this the words of the proposition do necessarily presuppose.

If particular Churches be made up of the members of the Catholic: then the Catholic Church and the members thereof must have a being, before *either* can give a being to the particular.

But I see no rule of reason, nor testimony of holy writ as yet to settle such an assertion.

For lay aside in our consideration the confederation, and combination of Christians, which make up particular Churches: let it be supposed there be hundreds of Christians, who are visible believers, featured up and down in several coasts of the world, these now according to the method of Master *H.* his frame of *Church policy* will first makeup a Catholic visible

Church, and out or that, particular Assemblies will afterwards arise.

This is the frame of Master *Hudson's* Church-policy: but this seems contrary to the principles of *all bodies politic*: that ever were, are, or shall be. *For there neither is, nor can be an external tody politic* (of that kind we now speak) *made up and constituted of people that never were in external communion one with another* (haply) *never had the sight and knowledge one of another*, as it is here supposed.

True it is, if there were many thousands professing and believing in the name of Christ: so many as were sincere have union and communion with Christ invisibly, and so make up an invisible

287

Church Catholic. But that there should be an external visible particular *body politic*, either *civil*, or *Ecclesiastic* (which this *Catholica Ecclesia*, as *Totum integrale*, must be) and that constituted of men, which haply never had the sight or knowledge one of another, who never entred into agreement of government one with another, is beyond my compass to conceive, and I suspect any mant ability to explicate and evince.

Again, that persons thus scattered and severed, are wholly destitute according to reason and all rules of the Gospel, of all Church privileges.

I would thus reason.

They who are in such an estate as that they, nor have, nor can have Church Officers, They are destitute of Church worship, seals, censures, and so Church government, and Church Ordinances.

This is undeniable. Because according to Presbyterian principles, none of all these can be acted or administered without Officers.

But persons thus scattered and severed one from another, can have no Officers. For those receive their call and right administration by the joint voice and election of the people now in communion one with another. *Act. 6. Act. 1.*

Again, I conceive it will be granted (which cannot be denied) that these particular persons, thus severed, are *membra integrantia* of this Catholic visible Church. And therefore they wholly give being to this Church, but receive no being from it.

Hence I cannot see, how this part of the Proposition will stand, with that *conclusion*. That the Catholic Church gives part matter, part form, to the particular Churches.

If particular Churches receive their being from the members of the Catholic Church, (as this proposition affirms;) Then they cannot receive part matter, and part form from the Totum.

For if *Ecclesia Catholica* give any matter or form to the particular Church, it gives it by its members.

But it cannot give matter or form by its members.

Because it received all its being, and so all matter and form from them, but gave none to them.

Therefore they can give none from it.

These intricate difficulties and twistings of controversy which appear in Master *Hudson's* frame, keeps me yet that I can give no assent thereunto.

288

There is a *third branch* in the Proposition, namely,

That particular Churches partake of the privileges of the Church primarily, not because they be members of particular Churches, but because they are members of the Catholic.

Against this we have formerly given in proof, whether we refer the reader: and so rest to make any further inquiry touching this subject of ECCLESIA CATHOLICA VISIBILIS.

CHAP. XVI.

We have now done with Church-power.

Of Church Communion as it is a peculiar *privilege* to the member of a Church.

THE Priviledges of the Church, present themselves next to our consideration; and the chief of all these which we shall especially attend in this place, is Church-Communion. Because we perceive the disquisition of that to be of greatest difficulty, and the right undemanding of it to be of greatest use. And here we shall make the entrance of our inquiry about that question propounded and largely debated by Master *Rutherford lib.*

2. pag. 269. *Whether ordinary hearing be a part of Church Communion.* 1. The *sense* is to be opened. 2. The *conclusion* we hold to be proved. 3. The *Arguments to be answered.*

To the first,

CONCLUSION I.

Communion, according to the nature of the word, *implies ever something common to many, wherein they share by way of proportion, each person according to his condition and place.*

When this is applied to *several subjects*, though it requires a *communication* of something to all the subjects, yet it ever implies an *appropriation* of that so conveyed only to that kind: whence it is, that as there is a *community* of the thing to all such wherein

289

this communion lies, yet there is also a *specification* or determination of the *subject*, unto which that is conveyed, whereupon it comes, though *all such* have it, yet *none but such* are made partakers of it.

Thus in *cities* there be *several companies*, that maintain *several communions* among themselves: Thus *civil communion* belongs only to *such a civil state*: The like we may say of *Church communion*, whereof we now intreat. It doth *not imply all or any of those things which a Church hath in common with other, while it is a Church, but as it is a Church*; As instance:

A *Church* while it is a *Church* in that relation, they have *communion with the Town* or people of the *Plantation* amongst whom they dwell, communion with other *Towns* who live with them, under the same *Jurisdiction* and *Government*, but *this is not Church communion*, because it is not *as a Church*, they enjoy or share in this communion, but *as Planters* in the same *Town*, or people under the same *Government*.

But *that is Church communion, which belongs to a Church, as a Church*, under that notion, (as we use to speak) respect; or relation.

Conclusion II.

The *communion of the Church* lies,

Either in the things, which they do enjoy as *Sacraments*, *Censures*.

Or else the special manner appropriated to them in their *dispensations*.

And though the *things*, sometimes be *common* to other beside the Church, *yet* the *manner* of dispensing, and so of enjoying these is always *peculiar* to the Church.

Suppose the Churches be intreated, by a company of Indians, whose hearts are stirred with some consideration of the truth, to desire some conferences with several of several Churches, and several of the Common-wealth, that their judgements may further be informed, and their consciences convinced, and the course of Godliness cleared up unto them: upon the meeting granted, they have liberty, and they take it, *to wit*, they propound their demands, they hear answers, they make Objections, seriously and sadly debate the difficulties. There be conferences, disputes,

290

debates, by these novices, now coming on to Religion, with *Elders*, *Magistrates*, in the audience of the *several members* of the Churches, and yet no man will say, these are *Church actions*, because they do not this *as a Church*, but *as Christians*, to draw on beginners to the faith.

Suppose again, the Church of her self appoints a meeting, and appoints the Elders to handle the same questions, to propound and explicate the same Scriptures, in way of answering and clearing up difficulties, *This is now a Church action*: because though the *duties* be the *same*, yet the *manner* of the dispensation issues *from another root*; namely, *Officers*, by *virtue of their authority*, require and call for the presence and subjection of the people: others enjoy the *benefit* of the actions, (which as such, are not Church actions,) as hath appeared before, but the *manner of dispensation is properly Church work*, and in *that they have no Communion* with the Church.

And this frequently and familiarly is to be observed *in all Corporation*, when they meet in public, many strangers, of several Counties, Countries, come in to see and hear the *benefit* of the administrations: But *only the members* of the Corporation enjoy *Corporation communion*; i.e. they are only under the power and authority of the Corporation, and by virtue of that relation are to be there, and to submit themselves to the authority, delivering orders to that end, and may be constrained thereunto; which strangers cannot be, and so it is here.

CONCLUSION III.

Its plain from Master *Rutherford* his own grant, that the ordinance it self, nor the public dispensation therof, nor the hearing, of the dispensation doth make Church communion: For he confesseth that Turks and Infidels may come in occasionally, several times, as it were *obiter*, and yet this doth not make them partakers of Church-Communion, and yet in these their attendances, these three things are evidently, and undeniably to be observed.

The

Ordinance,
Dispensation on the Minister's part.
Hearing on the turks.

291

CONCLUSION IV.

Therefore in the fourth place, we are to inquire what he meaneth by *set* and *ordinary*, lib. 2. pag. 269. and *professed* and *resolved hearing*, pag. 270.

If by professed, he means *such a profession* as makes a man a member *ut supra*; this doth yield the cause, which he would maintain in appearance, namely, *he that is a member of a Church doth communicate in Church Communion.*

Never any denied this.

But if it be the *resolution* of the spirit of a man inwardly (for there *resolution* lies) and *profession*, outwardly to attend this action of hearing, we then know where to fasten, and we have *two questions* to discuss.

1. *Whether preaching publicly, and public hearing be a Church action in it self considered.*

And that this is no Church action, Mr *Rutherford* yields, which indeed is the main scope and hinge of the question, as it is practised, and by dispute agitated betwixt us and them.

For *if* Infidels coming in occasionally, once, twice, twenty several times, to hear, do not yet in so doing communicate in a Church-action: *Then* preaching and hearing do not make a Church-action, in themselves considered. *At primum verum ex concessis.*

Quest. 2. *A bare profession to attend the outward hearing of the word ordinarily, is not a Church action, nor doth infer Church Communion.*

Our Arguments are,

Arg. 1.

That profession, which may stand with the professed opposition and renouncing of the doctrine of the Gospel, and the truth of the Church: That doth not make any Church communion. For Opposition professed against the truth of the Doctrine, and truth of the Church-state, is cross to communion with it.

But such a profession ordinary may stand with both these.

For a Jesuit may be hired, as an intelligencer, to hear and report the Doctrine to others, who set him on work to that end: or else as a Caviller to undermine it in the hearts of others whom

292

he would either draw to Popery, or confirm in Popery, He maybe a constant hearer, and yet profess that he hates the Protestant Religion, and renounceth the Handing of the Churches.

Arg. 2.

Where there is no Church union, there is no Church communion, because this issues from that.

But many hear ordinarily, who have no Church union, or real membership with visible Churches.

Arg. 3.

Church communion is ordered by the fewer of the Church, and they can exercise their power therein: for what excommunication takes away, that communion of the Church can give.

But the Church doth not, nor in reason can hinder ordinary hearing.

Therefore it did not give it, by any power of Church work.

We shall now take Master *Rutherford* his *Arguments* into consideration.

Only we shall crave the Reader to recall two things, (formerly evidenced) to mind, and to carry them along in his consideration; and those will help to expedite the *Answer*, to the *reasous* alleged to the contrary.

1. *That Infidels and Turks may come in occasionally, and yet that hearing is not Church communion*, Lib. 2. p. 270.
2. That an *action in it self* simply considered, may not be a *Church action*, i.e. proper to the Church, yet the *manner* of enjoining this, or enjoying of it, in virtue of Church-power, is a *Church-work* and way) issuing from *Church confederacy* and combination.

From these *two premises* now recalled, formerly proved, *It follows*.

That the Preacher may in preaching edify the Church met for that end and convince an *Infidel* coming in occasionally, 1 *Cor.* 14:24, 25. And yet the Infidel doth not join in Church communion, though in hearing the word preached by the Officer of the Church; which is an *Answer to his first Argument*.

Hence the Infidel may be converted, and so enjoy the benefit of the ordinance, and be built upon Christ, at that his occasional coming, and so join in worship with them, and yet not in

293

Church worship, for his own occasional coming was no Church communion, by Master *Rutherford* his own grant, which is an *Answer to his second Argument*.

Hence the Infidel may be called by others, and being so called, he may come and hear, and partake in the worship, and yet not as *Church hearing or worship*, which is an *Answer to the third Argument*.

Hence Church-hearing will be then *Church communion*, when by *virtue of Church covenant* they put forth Church power in dispensing and *persons* in virtue of that relation stand bound to submit, in attending to such administrations, and thus all the members hear. But the *Infidel* hears upon *another ground* and so shares in the *act*, but is not under the *Church-power* and *manner of the dispensation* of that act: and therefore *his hearing* is not *Church-hearing*. As it is in the meetings of civil Corporations: The members of the Corporation, they come in virtue of the combination, which they hold by Charter, and so have *Corporation community*: others come in by the by, as *strangers*, and they communicate in the *hearing of the Acts* that pass, but not in the *Corporation community*, which they have no share: nor hath the Cor-

poration any power over them, which *Answers the fourth Argument*.

Hence this hearing doth not separate a visible member *in genere notiorum visibilium*; because it belongs to an Infidel also: which *answers the fifth Argument*. Nor doth this hearing bring the hearer under any tie, which answers *the sixth Argument*.

From this ground thus laid and made good;
we may collect several things.

1. The *hearing of* Infidels occasionally argues not *communion of Pastor and people*, betwixt *him* and the *Officer*, that preacheth to him; *Communion betwixt Pastor and flock is Church-communion*, as the terms, and the nature of the relation evidence.

But in this hearing of an Infidel, there is no Church communion, *ex concessis*, from Master *Rutherford*, *lib. 2. 270*.

2. If *this hearing* would make a person of such a flock, and so the Minister his Pastor, *then this* kind of hearing of a wicked and unworthy Minister, would make a man partake with him in that

294

sinful station of his: which hath ever been accounted irrational, in those who have been rigid in their reparation, so that it is easy to distinguish betwixt the *word* that is dispensed, in which a hearer communicates, and betwixt the *office and station* of him that doth dispense it, with which they only communicate, who stand in relation to such a one dispensing as their officer.

5. Hence *Church-power and Church-privileges* are differenced in the same act. *Privileges*, (in my aim here,) imply that good and *benefit* which attends any Church dispensation. As take any *Church act* dispensed, there is. 1. The good and *benefit* which may rise and be received therefrom. 2. *Church like power* in the dispensation thereof. And these *two*, though they go together, yet are *so differenced* in reality of their natures, that the one may be in joyed, I mean the good and privilege of the act, by such who communicate not in the power. As instance.

A man preacheth authoritatively in his congregation. Indians and Turks, come to hear occasionally, they partake in the

good of the word and dispensation of it. But not in the *authority* of his ministry. For he is *not a Pastor* to them nor communicates with them as a Pastor; as it hath been formerly from Master *Rutherford* proved.

Hither belong those expressions. 1 Cor 5. & last, *what have we to do to judge those that are without?* Matth. 18. *let him be to thee as a heathen.*

Therefore Hethens come not within the privilege-respect of a brother in Church-communion, though they come to Church hearing.

And hence it is, as people are more or less capable of the good of these dispensations (for so they may be) so they do, and may, partake more or less in these privileges, and yet not in Church power whereby they are dispensed. As it is in some Corporations, some persons of some families, by reason that their predecessors have been Benefactors to the Charter, they have privileges to come into the counsel of the company, to adventure with them, if they will, and yet have no stroke, by any special relation, to act in, or carry on the occasion or design taken up. Thus members of other Churches are capable of more privileges then those, who are not in that condition: and

295

therefore partake of the benefit of some acts and ordinances, and yet communicate not in the authoritative dispensation of those acts; and this appears thus.

If a Pastor of another congregation hath no authority or power, by his office to require them of another Church, to receive a Sacrament, but they, may refuse, if it seem good to them. Then are they not under his pastoral power to dispense it to them. For by his office power he can require *those* of his own Church to receive it.

And *if he hath no power authoritative* to enjoin them to receive it, they cannot challenge it by any special interest they have in that power. For the parity of reason is the same on both sides.

That look, as it was before, when the *Pastors* did preach *authoritatively* in his congregation, he did not only dispense the word unto his people, as one out of office may do, but he could by virtue of his office and relation, enjoin them to hear

it. They in virtue of their relation to him as a Pastor could expect and require it from him. Yet Indians coming in *Obiter*, they partake of the good of the dispensation, but are not under the authoritative power of the dispenser: so that he by his authority, could not require them to hear, nor they, by any relative interest to his power, could challenge: him to speake to them.

And here *then* remember *two things*.

1. That the *benefit* of the ordinance dispensed and the *power* in the dispensing the Sacrament, are so different, that though the *Pastors* did *dispense it to a member of another* congregation, yet he had *no power* to *constrain* him to receive it.

2. Remember, that though a member of another congregation is capable of the good of those ordinances (for it is not because a member of *this* or *that*, but *because a member of a congregation* that he becomes capable nextly of these seals) yet he hath no *relative interest* in the power of the dispenser to require it at his hand. And this example will hold proportion with the former, namely. *That persons may partake in Church-privileges, who do not partake in Church-power.*

Take this other example.

A man provides for his wife, as an husband, such and such diet, and he can require her, out of his authority, to take his

296

provision, A neighbour coming in may haply share in the like provision, but not upon the like ground. The neighbour as privilege of special neighbourhood. But the wife by the power of her relation, as a wife.

So that I cannot see but the proportion is fair. A person may partake of the word authoritatively preached, and yet not communicate with the power and authority of the officer as his. A person may partake of a Sacrament authoritatively dispensed, and yet not communicate with the authority and power of the dispenser, i.e. as in either, to have relation to him, or them, as their officers.

The like may be seen in such acts, which issue from that relative interest which respect the specialty of the covenant of this or that Church. As namely, when members elect, admit, censure by vote; The formality of these acts is only proper to

them, yet the good and benefit of all these, they who are present, partake of.

Instance thus.

Suppose a Penitent is to be received into the Church, the members they express their readiness of love, pity, mercy, brotherliness to forgive: others also present join thus far in that act, as consenting to, and approving of what they do according to God: yea are much quickened, comforted, encouraged yea taught and instructed by that they hear and see, and so *receive the good*, and are much edified by the ordinance. And yet its that which all men will yield, they share not, communicate not, at all, *in any interest of the power* by which such acts were dispensed.

I

PART II.

Of the Church considered as *corpus Organicum.*

Chap. I.

Of the number of Officers therein, and the nature thereof.

WE have in the foregoing part of our Discourse enquired, touching the constitution of a Church, in regard of the material and formal causes of it, and the special qualifications that attend thereupon, in regard of the power and privileges that appertain unto it; and thus far we have looked at it, as *Totum Essentiale*; and yet there is much more required to make up the integrity and perfection thereof, that it may be completed in all the special Members and Officers, which the Lord Christ hath appointed and set in this visible body of his, for the improvement of the special operation of every part, and the edification of it self in love, *Ephes.* 4:13, 16. And thus the Church becomes *Corpus Organicum*, A body organized of such prime and choice members, which may con-

duce to the beauty and building of the body in that entirety that it may grow up to an holy temple in the Lord.

2

As we look at *Sampson*, when he was deprived of his eyes, as a man still, to whom the full definition of man did fully agree, est *animal rationale*, as a living creature endued with a reasonable soul. But consider him in the integrity or intirenes of his constitution, as consisting of body and soul, and that body made up or such members, as eyes, head, hands, such as are integral to the whole: We say then, though he be a true man, yet he is not an entire man, but lame and maimed, destitute and deprived or some of those parts, that conduce to the perfection of his integrity.

It is so here, A Church without Officers is a true Church in regard of the essence of it: There is a company or society of visible Saints confederate together in the profession of the faith of the Gospel. But it is not complete, but lame and maimed in regard of the integrity of it.

The Lord Christ therefore hath provided for the perfection of his Church in this behalf also; it is a coronation gift which he bestoweth upon his Spouse, *Eph. 4.* when he had conquered the enemies of our salvation by his death and obedience triumphing over them in his resurrection, and now returned into his own country, ascending into the highest heavens, and sits crowned with majesty and glory at the right hand of the Father, he gave gifts, gave *some to be Apostles, some Evangelists, some Prophets*; those extraordinary, because there was extraordinary use of them; for the first planting and watering of the churches: He gave also some to be Pastors, some Teachers, for the gathering of the Saints the work of ministry, building the body of Christ.

And though the chief aim and scope of our Saviour (under the glory of his name,) was to provide for the special good of his elect; yet because those his elect were mingled here with the wicked in the world, nay many an elect child proceeds of a reprobate parent, and because it is impomble for the eye of man to search into heart secrets, and inward sincerity which

is covered there, but must judge of men, and dispense ordinances to men according to the laws and limits of rational charity; therefore it is that our Saviour hath bestowed these oft« as a royal gift upon the visible Church over whom (as

3

we have heard) he is a head Political, by outward guidance and government, as well as a head mytical by his special and spiritual conveyance of his grace. The consideration of the Nature, Institution, and operations of Officers, hath a containing power to conclude this truth beyond all control. For,

1. The invisible Church, and all that is comprehended within that notion, is to be believed, is not liable to our eye, nor comes to be discerned visibly.

But for the Officers of the Church, which are now standing and ordinary, there is required a visible company of people, that must concur and consent to call them: The persons must be tried and approved, (and *ergo* visible) that must be called. God sets ordinary Officers in his Chuich, but it is by man, and therefore he must know them, 1 *Cor.* 12:28. *Gal.* 1:1, 2.

2. Look at their Ordination, when they are called.

3. Look at their Dispensation and exercise of their places and power, in preaching the word, in administration of Sacraments and censures.

4. Look at the parties which are offenders who must be censured, or penitent, who must be received again.

All these operations proclaim a visibility on all parts and in all the particular circumstances.

Which is the rather to be observed; because when we read or meet with such expressions in Scriptures which intimate either the call or institution of Ministers, or any of their ministrations, we may know, they do belong unto the visible Church, and are to be attended in that relation and respect .

For common sense will constrain a man to confess, that there must be visible persons, who must exercise keys in go-

verning: and there must be visible persons that must be governed.

What the word of the Gospel hath revealed concerning these Officers may be referred to those particular heads, and thus laid out unto our view.

4

Officers of the Gospel may be considered with reference to their

Number

Ruling

Ruling only, as Elders

Ruling and Teaching both, as

Pastor

Doctor

Supporting the

State of the body, as Deacons.

Health, as Widows.

Institution, in

Election.

Ordination.

We see the frame, we shall attend the particulars, as they are propounded in their order.

Touching the Number of these Officers, generally two things are to be attended.

I.

Whether beside these five appointed by Christ, any more can lawfully be added, or mould be tolerated?

Ans. No, in no wise; the rule is here sure, from which we must not depart, no not a hairs breadth: thou shalt add: nothing thereunto, take nothing there-from.

That which our Saviour inquired, and the Scribes confessed, touching *John's* ministry, it is true of all these orders and Ordinances, They are from heaven. The Lord Christ is the giver and alone Institutor of them, and none beside, and this is evidenced; 1. From the right of giving, whence these proceed. When our Saviour ascended, He led captivity captive, &c.

He that conquers the country, to him it appertains to set rulers over it, and over his subjects in it.

2. They are especial means of God's worship, and all of them in rise and end have an eye to spiritual things, and spiritual operations, though they be employed in ordinary outward things, as the Offices of the Deacons and widows are appointed by Christ to provide for the state and health of the members: that the love of Christ, as the Head of his Church, might thereby be observed, and the spirits of those who are refreshed thereby, may be more full and enlarged to serve him with a glad heart, in a Church way, and in the improvement of all Ordinances to that end: and all other civil provisions, though good in their kind, will never attain this end, without the Ordinances of Christ, *Acts* 1:2, 3.

5

3. It's affirm'd by the Apostle, touching two sorts of them, the Pastor and the Teacher, whose employment is principally about labouring in the Word, that they are for the perfecting of the body, until we all meet in the unity of the faith, and the fulness of the stature in Christ: so that they are able to attain this end, and that in all ages until the full accomplishment and gathering in of all the Saints; and therefore there needs no more to be added, to the end of the world.

It is therefore the usurpation of that man of sin, when he ascended upon high, to the Pope's chair, and to be Head of the Church, that he gave some to be Surrogates, Chancellours, Deans, Arch deacons for the building up of the kingdom of darkness; because he easily perceived, that Christ's Officers would never do his work kindly, nor further his kingdom, but he must have his own creatures, which must be at his beck, and stand, *durante beniplacito*; and therefore must be forced to do his drudgery, and durst do no other, unless they should be flung away, if the man of sin did but once frown upon them.

That as God complains of *Jeroboam's* practice, when he would maintain his faction, and preserve the people from returning to their King, He set up false worship; because he concluded, the truth of the word and worship attended unto

would make them look unto their true King; and to keep them in false worship, he provides false teachers; made the lowest of the people priests, who because they had no call and appointment from God, never had care to preserve his word or worship, but to maintain that course of religion, whereby they were maintained in their places.

And therefore as God said of them, he will say of these human Orders. They never came into his mind or heart.

Not come from Heaven, but from the bottomless pit, and therefore ought not to be admitted, nor yet tolerated; but being plants which the Lord hath not planted, they should be plucked up.

Whom God never calls, God never blesseth.

And it is to be observed, that these Orders have been the props and pillars of that Kingdom of darkness, and have been the brokers and maintainers of all that hideous wickedness, which hath been vented in the doctrines and opinions

6

that have afted in the lives and conversations of that hellish crew that have had their dependant upon the man of sin.

And it is marvellous dangerous to bring in, or continue the least alteration from the mind of Christ in any thing.

The Church of *Scotland* complains bitterly, that a constant Moderator made way for a Bishop, and so for, the bane of their Churches. Christ who is the King and Head of his Church and House, he in reason should appoint his under-Officers, and such as he best knows, suits the occasions of the Family, and will best provide for the good thereof, and his own content.

II.

The other thing in general to be observed, is,

That they must be kept distinct; and that according to the mind and intendment of our Saviour one person must not adventure to engross all, nor several of these together.

As to be Ruling Elder and Pastor, or one and the same man to be Elder and Deacon.

For it is apparent by the Apostle hit discourse, *Rom.* 12:7. that they are put in way of opposition, as *Membra dividentia*, ἔτε οὐ διάκωνων, ἔτε οὐ παρακαλῶν. Therefore cannot be in subordination or subjection one to the other.

2. The Apostles' comparison carries this with it, as the main thing intended therein. *Rom.* 12:4. As there be many members in the body, but all the members have not one and the same office, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πράξιν.

It is therefore wide to say, as Mr. *R.* that this comparison holdeth not in all: because it must hold in the very thing that is intended, yea specified; for this is the hinge upon which the comparison turnes, *v.* 4, 5. and the ground of the Apostle his inference, ἔξοντες δὲ χαρίσματα διάφορα. *v.* 6. *vers.* 6.

3. Each of them is sufficient to take up the whole man: so that he is not able to attend both, but he shall neglect the special service of the one.

4. If the Apostles professed, they could not attend tables, and attend Word and Prayer, and therefore laid aside the one, that they might discharge the other; who shall think he is sufficient for many of these?

The reasons that Mr. *R.* allegeth, do not satisfy.

7

“1. The Apostles did exercise both, as they could, according as the Auditory was.

Reply 1. The Apostles were extraordinary persons, and were fitted and assisted answerably, which none, whose calling is ordinary, must look for.

Secondly, they had all offices virtually in themselves, and did put forth acts of all, as it appears before the choice of the Deacons: But if any now shall think himself able to undergo two of them, the profession of the Apostles and their practise also will be a real confutation of them; since they so assisted, saw reason to lay down one, that they might improve the other, none will dare to take up both, unless he will presume he hath greater both sufficiency and ability, then the Apostles.

“2. Mr. R. saith, That the formal Objects, to wit, the information of the Judgement, and exhorting, are not so different, as that they should be incompatible.

Reply. These, in themselves and full breadth, are not so incompatible; But look at the specialty of the gift, that fits for the one, and that which furnisheth for the other. 2. To attend mainly and chiefly upon each, according to the gift, they will prove inconsistent.

To have a special gift for the one, and to bestow himself upon that, and to have a special gift for the other, and to bestow himself upon that also, will ever be found, if not impossible to attain, yet ever disadvantageous to the dispensation of the Gospel. And a man’s own experience will evidence as much to him, if he will attend it.

Nor is it sufficient that one is eminent in the gift, which fits the Ruling-Elder, or Deacon; yet that gives no allowance, he may be Doctor, Ruler, and Deacon.

But look where a man’s spirit is best fitted, if once called to that work, he must let all the stream and strength of his abilities run in that channel, lest being divided into many, he becomes fit for none, and fails in all.

This may suffice for the number.

Of the Ruling-Elder.

We shall now take a survey of the several, in the order in which they were set before us.

And we begin with the *Ruling Elders* place, for that carries a kind of simplicity with it: there be more ingredients required to make up the Office of Pastor and Doctor, and therefore we shall take leave to trade in the first.

Quo simplicius, to prius.

1. That there is such an Office appointed by Christ.
2. What it is, or wherein lies the limits and bounds thereof.

I.

That then is such an Office and Officer appointed by Christ, as the Scriptures are plain to him, whose spirit and apprehension is not prepossessed and forestalled with prejudice: So this cause hath been maintained by many of Christ's Worthies of former, and now of latter times; and now at last, by those two famous and eminent Champions, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Gilesby.

So that we have no coritroversy here but with Hierarchical Persons, the force and power of whose Arguments, lies especially in a Pursuant and a Prison, armed with Authority of an High-Commission.

And therefore we shall content ourselves to settle the Scriptures shortly upon their *basis* and bottom, according to the sense of the Spirit of God, in the several places, and dispute briefly there-from, and so finish this Head of Discipline.

The first Argument we have from *Rom. 12.7.* which gives in witness to this truth; where all these Officers are numbered and named expressly; if the meaning of the words be once manifested, which will be made clear in the particulars following:

1. The gifts here mentioned and considered, are not such as have reference to a civil, but to an Ecclesiastic condition; so the words of vers. 5. *We are one body in Christ.*

2. The operations also which issue from the several functions

9

evidence as much; Prophecyng and attendance thereunto, exhorting and the beitolwing the heart and *end*-; your there-upon.

2. Gifts here are not such as be common, and belong to all Christians, as Faith, Hope, Love, Holiness, &c.

First, those gifts are here meant, by which the members of the Body of Christ are distinct one from another, and have several acts appropriated to them, as *vers. 4.* τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πράξιν: οὕτως, οἱ πολλοὶ ἔν σῶμά, &c. But the common Graces are not so distinct, for in them they do agree.

Secondly, Εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἔτε παρακαλῶν: The weight of the phrase, having the Article in that manner added, notes not every member, but some by way of eminency to whom these appertain.

Thirdly, the reason and Logic of the place carries a distinction with it, and the severals are set out, by way of opposition, contradistinct one to another, and therefore cannot be subordinate and meet in one subject, where they would be both formally acted, and hence they must be public functions; for had they been private gifts, one would have contained the other, as distributing might be included in shewing of mercy.

3. These public Functions and Gifts are ranged and referred to two heads, in the general, under which the several are comprehended, and unto which referred: as,

Gifts are either

Προφητεία

ὁ διδάσκων.

ὁ παρακαλῶν:

Διακονία

ὁ μεταδιδοῦς.

ὁ προϊστάμενος.

ὁ ἐλεῶν.

So that Prophecy and Ministry are here put as common heads, unto which the rest may be referred, and under which they are ranged, and that's the reason why the Apostle in this enumeration changeth his phrase: The 1. Distinction he expresseth in the plural: The 2. in the singular. *Beza in locum.*

So that it is a mere conceit, that carries not the weight of a feather with it, of such, who say that *Paul* intended to see

10

down the several functions in the Church: then there should be seven, not five, making Prophecy and Ministry two, when these are not distinct *species*, but two general heads, unto which the particulars were referred.

Hence we reason.

That function and office in the Church, which differs so from all the rest, as one member of the body distinct from a-

nother, in actions appropriate to it self, that is properly a distinct *species* or kind from them.

But the function of a Ruler doth so differ from all other Offices in the Church, as the members of the body do in the actions appropriate to them.

The Proposition needs no proof.

The Assumption is the express words of the Text, *v.* 4, 5.

II.

The second Argument is taken from *1 Cor.* 12:28. God hath set some in his Church; as first, Apostles; then Prophets; thirdly, Teachers; after that Powers, then gifts of healing, helps, Governments,

The scope of the place, and Apostle his intendment is, to lay open the several Offices and Officers that the Lord hath set in his Church, and so many chief members out of which the Church is constituted as an entire body.

And for the right discovery of the Apostles proceeding and purpose, we may observe:

1. That the functions he here names, were partly extraordinary, and so temporary, serving the necessity of the Church, in that estate, and in that time, when it was first planted, and was to be watered with more then ordinary help, as having more then ordinary need, as Apostles, workers of Miracles, &c. some were ordinary, and to continue, as Teachers, Help is which were Deacons, Governments which were Elders.

2. The gifts themselves are expressed in the abstract, *Ἀντιλήψεις: Κυβερνήσεις:* yet the persons and officers which stood possessed of those, are to be understood, as appears, if we look to the words before or after; far when the Apostle says, *οὗς μὲν*, though there be an apparent *ἀναντατίδατον*, yet *οὗς δὲ:* is to be understood, and chat hath an eye and necessary reference to the persons: secondly, look to the words after *vers.*

29, 30. he interprets the gifts by the persons in the second repetition, *Μὴ πάντες Απόσταλοι, μὴ πάντες χαρίσματα ἔχουσιν ἰαμάτων.*

3. Though some extraordinary persons had some of these gifts virtually, and put forth the operations thereof, as the Apostles, they wrought miracles, spake with tongues; yet that hinders not, but these gifts might formally be in some subjects, as appointed of purpose by Christ, for that kind of employment: As some only spake with tongues, some only had the gift of Healing.

And it is most apparent in some of the particulars, though, the Apostles did prophesy and teach, yet Prophets and Doctors were special functions appropriate to some men, so also were Deacons; and therefore also it hinders not, but Governments might be a special kind of Rulers, distinct from Teachers.

From which, premises, the dispute issues thus:

As Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are distinct, so are Helps and Governments distinct; for the Spirit puts there in the same rank, as having a parity of reason, which appertains to them all.

But they were distinct Officers, and found in persons as distinct Officers, as *vers.* 30. Are all Apostles? Are all Teachers? Therefore the same is true of Governors.

III.

A third Argument is taken from that famous place, 1 *Tim.* 5:17. which is full to our purpose in hand, and intended by the holy Spirit of the Lord, to make evident the station and office of Ruling Elders unto the end of the world; and it is admirable to observe, how the factors and followers of the Pope and the Prelates, who labour to prop up their place and pre-eminency, have used all the wilyness of their wits, and unwearable wrestlings of their carnal reason, to darken the evidence of the truth, and to defeat the power of the proof in the place, as fearing, it should seem, lest by this means, their way to promote and maintain the pride of the Prelacy, would be utterly prejudiced and overthrown; whereas, do but suffer the Deacon to lay aside the care of the poor, make him but half a Priest, give him the allowance that he may baptize, and not give ths Sacrament of the Supper; raise the

12

Ruling-Elder one stair higher, that he may be a Teaching-Presbyter: By this time, the Bishop is beyond the bound of an ordinary Elder, and with a little help, he will be handed up into a Diocesan Palace, and one lift more will make him a Primate; and if the Kings of the earth favour him, he will make himself a Pope presently; for they differ but in degrees, not in kind.

So that you must not wonder to see the contention grow so hot touching a Ruling Elder, because if he be confined within his compass, the wings of Pope and Prelate will be exceedingly clipped, and their power impeached.

It's not suitable to our purpose to contend with all cavils, nor shall we need, for they have been confuted long before this day, and that by such who have beene furnished with choice abilities to this purpose; I shall therefore satisfy myself to give the native and natural sense of the words, as suits only to the rules of right and reason, and may be easy to such (as the ways of wisdom are) who are willing to understand.

The form of the context stands thus:

When the Apostle, in the foregoing verses, had directed to the right choice of the Widow, whose labour should be improved in the Church, he intimates also his mind, how (he should be respected by the Church, in whose service she is employed: *Honour widows, &c. v. 3. i.e.* so care for them, that they may be diffidently supplied, according to their care and condition.

And from thence he takes occasion to leave an Apostolical Canon upon Record, how the Elders of the Churches should be provided for: To wit, the lowest degree of Rulers are worthy, not single and sufficient supply of Widows, but *double honour*, the certain put for the uncertain, the finite for the infinite (by a *synechdoche*) *i.e.* all honourable respect, *Officium & beneficium*, not only sufficient to relieve their necessities, but that which may honourably answer their places, employments, and prayers.

But the Elders that are of the highest rank, and whole place requires laboriousness in Word and Doctrine, they may

most especially challenge, and the Church ought especially to bestow this *double honour* upon them.

¹³

The words carry a distribution with them *οἱ μὲν, οἱ δὲ*, or *μάλιστα δὲ*; and this *tractatur collatione imparium, a majoribus, μάλιστα*.

The sum of the verse is expressed in a discrete axiom; The Arguments are *comparata imparia*; The things compared are

the Persons

A Ruling-Elder.

A Teaching-Elder.

And it is especially to be observed, their works are not the things compared, but the persons notified by the kind of their works: For the words are not, The Elders, because they rule well, and because they labour,

But those

Elders that are ruling.

Elders that are labouring in Word.

So that these are not the consequent part of the Proposition, but the antecedent, or subject only; and therefore the persons and Officers being the things compared, it is certain they must be distinct persons, for that the nature of things compared doth require.

And hence those conceits vanish: namely,

Elders here are not attended for their private conversation in holiness, as though to rule well, was to order themselves well in a Christian course.

Secondly, nor will the conceit hold, which saith, There be not divers Elders, but divers workes of one Elder attended; when *οἱ μὲν, οἱ δὲ*, are persons compared and described, not acts.

2. The consequent part of the discreet axiom, is,

The first Elder is worthy of double honour.

The second Elder is worthy of double honour;

But with this difference, its chiefly his due:

First,

In the order to be attended

in measure, more of it is due and debt to him.

Now its well known, it's required that both parts of the discrete axiom, be not only discrete, but true in themselves.

Whence again, that conceit utterly vanisheth, which makes the companion to lie betwixt the two acts of one man, namely, The well ruling of a Pastor is worthy of double honour, be it alone in it self considered, which is an assertion grossly cross to the rule of divinity, as the former was to the rule of logic. That interpretation which makes the performance of the lead part of a Pastoral calling, though it be with the neglect of the

14

greatest work, worthy double honour; that is grossly contrary to the mind of God, and the verdict of the Scriptures. For *cursed is the man that doth the work of the Lord negligently, and woe to me, if I preach not the Gospel*. Rather a double woe is to be denounced against them, then double honour bestowed upon them.

But this interpretation doth this. Or thus I may reason

If the Apostle, in this text, doth not speak only of Elders preachers, then he speaks of Elders no preachers.

But the first is true, he speaks in the place of some Elders no preachers, which is thus proved.

If he speaks only of preachers, then were there some preachers who preached not at all. But there no be Preachers who preached not at all.

The second part is past denial. The consequence is proved. If those Elders who are most worthy of double honour are said but to labour in the word then they who are accounted but worthy of it, did not labour in the word.

But those Elders or Preachers, that by the Apostle are counted most worthy, are said but to labour in the Word, *i.e.* to preach. *ergo* they who are but worthy, did not preach at all.

Lastly the Bishops' factors, who take up this defence, provide ill for the honour and pomp of their great Lords, the potent Prelates of the world.

For by the Apostles peremptory determination, the meanest Minister that is conscientious and laborious in preaching, should have more honourable respect, then the Diocesan, who sits in his Cathedral, and under the name of ruling, tyranni-

seth over the poor people, but labours not to feed them with the word of life.

To the evidence of the text, we may add the testimony of *Ambrose*, which carries an amazing kind of manifestation and discovery with it.

Apud omnes ubique gentes honorabilis est seectus, unde & Synagoga, & postea Ecclesia Seniores habuit, quorum sine consilio nihil agehatur in Ecclesiâ, quod quâ negligentîâ obsoleverit, nescio, nisi forte Doctorum deficiâ, aut magis superbiâ, dum soli volunt aliquid videri.

The brightness and patness of the witness is such, as though it had been writ with the beam of the sun, and da-

15

zels almost the eyes of envy it self, and therefore its strange to see how the spirits of men turn every stone, wrench and wrest every way, if not not to pervert the meaning wholly, yet to darken it as much as may be, but all in vain.

I shall leave a mark or two of remembrance upon the words that the wise hearted reader may be made cautelous, and so fenced against such forgeries of devices, which the carnal reasons of men of corrupt minds have coined and vented to take off the evidence of the testimony.

1. Let him know then, that the Elders mentioned by *Ambrose* were such, that their places, and Offices were almost worn out, and laid aside in most of the Churches in his time.

But that the Office of preaching Elders was not. *Ergo* those Elders were not such.

2. That the defacing of the power and rule of these Elders, it came as he conjectures, partly by the idleness, but especially by the pride of Teachers, because they alone might be lifted up. *Ergo* these Elders could not be Teachers: for those Teachers laboured to destroy the place and power of these Elders; but it is against all shew of reason, nay against common sense to say or think, That these Elders should destroy their own places.

Again, The Teachers that would darken & abolish the place of these Elders, it is said, their aim was to make themselves alone eminent.

They who would make themselves alone eminent by the disannulling of the honour of other's places, they could not be

such who were of that rank, or did possess any of their places.

And this is sufficient to wipe away all such exceptions, that the subtilty of the wit of man hath raised and pretended to weaken the authority and intendment of this now alleged testimony, which hath and doth torment all the prelatical party.

*That Christ hath appointed the Office and place of Ruling
Elders hath been made evident.*

2. We are now to inquire, *What be the duties of their places,* and that with as much brevity as we may.

The several duties which lie upon him by virtue of his of-

16

office are of two sorts

Some he hath in common with the Pastor and Teacher.

Some be proper and peculiar to himself.

Some are common with the other Officers, and therefore it is we find them all ranked under that common name of Elders in the place, 1 *Tim.* 5. formerly handled. But because in our common language, we appropriate this by a *Synechdoche*, to signify this Office; thence it is, we so usually call him the Elder of the Church; but when the Scripture would design him to his proper place, and so distinguish him from other, it doth appropriate Ruling to him only, and styles him *προεστῶς, προϊστάμενος*, Ruler or Guide, who is above other, and as a leader goes before them.

The duties which are common to him with the rest of the

Teaching Elders, are attended party

Before the assembly meets, Or

When the Assembly is met.

Before the Assembly, when there is any emergent occasion of weight or difficulty which concerns the congregation; the Ruling Elder is as one of the common counsel, the concurrence of whose judgement, his voice and verdict, is to be taken in with the others, in the confutation and consideration of the business, for they are all leaders, all Governors, all watchmen, in this common work, and *ergo* must have a com-

mon influence of counsel, as the concernment of the Church shall require, *Heb.* 13:17. *1 Cor.* 12:28 *Act.* 20:28.

When offences are public, or private cannot be cured, before they be brought to the congregation, It belongs to then all by way of preconsideration, and preparation, to ripen the occasions, that all the doubtful or perplexed circumstances that might trouble the body, or other cause any mistake in such as be weak, or mislead any through misunderstanding, all such mists by thorough search must be removed, the particulars cleared, the cause punctually and plainly stated, that the understanding of the meanest in the congregation may be able to discern, when the business is propounded, where the pinch lies, and so to pass sentence answerably.

The Church must be told, but by an orderly way; and they

17

are the leaders of the Church, and *ergo* in reason must so know and prepare the cause, that they may lead them aright.

3. When the Church is met, in the ordering of the proceeding of any public censure or act of discipline, the Elder with the rest of the Governors, hath liberty and authority to interpose his judgement, to express his opinion, according as opportunity is presented, without any leave asked, because the Ruling and leading of the work is common to them: order and decency only observed.

The duties which peculiarly or in an especial manner are appropriate to his place, are such which concern the carriage and demeanour of the members in their more private way,

when not assembled, or else
when they are congregated.

1. The members of the Church, when under the exercise of God's hand they become to be exercised with any spiritual wants, as in time of sickness, because of the pressure of the disease, and the grief and weight thereof, or their own weakness, they are not able to pray for themselves, *Jam.* 5:14. they are then enjoined *to send for the Elders*: not that it was unlawful for them to come, before they be sent for, if the sick be in a low and wearish condition and not able to pray for themselves, but because either the Elders happily

do not know of their necessities, or yet not know the time and opportunity when it may be most seasonable to repair to them: *ergo* its most meet they should, *i.e.* they have liberty for to send: and the Elders by virtue of their places and calling are bound to go, and pray with them, and for them, when they cannot pray for themselves, thest rest of the studies of the preaching Elders then requiring their employment, and the improvement of their time in searching the Scnptures, and preparing for public dispensations.

And by the same parity and proportion of reason, if any want comfort, sinking under discouragement and sadness of spirit, or through ignorance are not able to understand the things delivered, they may call for the help of the Elder in private, that they may be informed and comforted by him.

2. And hence it follows that he hath power to inquire of the condition, and take account of the special state of such of the members: for else how should he be able to administer

18

seasonable and suitable support? The Physician must administer some questions and interrogatories to the Patient to know his particular disease, before he can administer physic to him.

3. In case he hear of any uncomely, and uncomfortable differences arising betwixt members, he is to see himself by enquiry to know them, and to remove and still them.

4. If any same be bruted abroad, touching the offensive carriage of any of the congregation to those that are without, so that some blame may redound to the party, and so some blemish lie upon the congregation, it appertains to his place to make diligent examination to see the certainty and truth, that if false, it may be cleared, if just, the party may be censured, and the credit of the Gospel so provided for.

5. To him it is, that such as are willing to join with the congregation, mould repair and expresse their desire. He is by virtue of his place, to take special consideration of their persons and conditions, and if he find no just impediment to lie in the way, he is to bring their names and desires to the congregation, as in his wisdom he sees fit, according to God, and to lead the whole assembly in the work of their admission, by

presenting them to trial, calling for their allowance and approbation by vote. And it seems to us, to follow from hence, that in case the censure of Excommunication is to be administered, it appertains to him to lead the action, and pronounce the sentence: because there is parity of reason: he that ruled the action of admissions and receiving into the Church, to him it appertains to lead and dispense the act of excommunication or casting out; and the argument that forceth and fastens all those services upon him, as his peculiar charge, is this,

What ever doth not belong to labouring in word and doctrine, and is not a common act of rule, those actions belong to him that rules well. But all these acts now specified are such. And in truth, the nature of the things would easily persuade a man's reason to yield thereunto. For how unequal and unreasonable would it seem to a man acquainted with the weight and work of the ministry, that when the Pastor or Teacher should be attending upon reading, and searching the sense and mind of God in the word, and the mysteries of God therein, (who is sufficient for such things?) that they should

19

be then taken off their studies, & be forced to attend upon men's special weaknesses or wants in private, when they should prepare for the public dispensations, so that the one must be of necessity neglected, or they distracted in both? whereas this appointment of our Saviour provides for both, without any prejudice or disadvantage to either.

Of the Pastor's Office.

We have done with the Office of the Ruling Elder. That which presents it self next to our confederation is the Office of the Pastor, and then the Teacher.

The limits of the Pastors work, may be thus laid out, according to the laws of Christ's institution. The scope of his Office is to work upon the will and the affections, and by savoury, powerful, and affectionate application of the truth delivered, to chase it into the heart, to woo and win the soul to the love and liking, the approbation and practice of the doctrine which is according to godliness, and hence he that exhorts is enjoined to attend upon exhortation. *Rom.* 12:

7. Not that the Pastor may not interpret the text, and lay open the meaning so far as he may make way for the truth to work more kindly, and prevail more effectually with the affections: but that is not his Ἰδιον ἔργον, his main work whereupon the strength of his studies and abilities should be bellowed is this: He attends and insists upon exhortation how he may speak a good word for Christ, make up the marriage, and betroth the soul to our Saviour. This is called a word of wisdom, 1 *Cor.* 12:8. because it is a point of special prudence, and that in the greatest excellency of it, how to come within the bosom of a sinner, and grapple so powerfully with his spirit, that he may take no nay at his hand.

He that wins souls is wise *Prov.* 11:30. and therefore his labour is to lay open the loathsome nature of sin, and to let in the terror of the Lord upon the conscience, that the careless and rebellious sinner may come to a parley of peace, and be content to take up the profession of the truth. And because when he hath so done, either his hypocrisy may carry him aside from Christ, or discouragement may make him afraid to come to the Lord Jesus, *ergo* his wisdom and work

20

must be to discover the cunning fetches of the hypocrite, and to hunt him out of his muses, that he may not cofro himself and fit down with some reserved delusion, and go no further. 1 *Cor.* 1:23.

2 To answer all those fears, and to scatter all the clouds of discouraging objections, that the soul may see the path plain and safe to come to the promise, and to receive power and comfort to walk with God therein. *Acts* 14:22.

3. When the Soul is truly brought to Christ, because it may either out of sloth not stir up it self to do what it can, or out of weakness or unskilful unhandiness not be able to do what it would, *ergo* the Pastor must endeavour by heat of exhortation to quicken it, strengthen and encourage the soul in every holy word and work 1 *Thes.* 2:11, 12. &c.

Of the teachers Office.

That this is distinct from the Pastors place and employment, we have formerly proved, and in truth the scope of the Apostle, *Eph.* 4. in the short enumeration of the Offices of

those that labour in the word will not in a comely and reasonable conformity to such an intent, differ either a needless repetition, nor yet allow this name to be put in by way of interpretation of the former, when the latter doth rather darken then discover the meaning of that which went before.

Beside in *Rom*, 12:7. when the Apostle doth on purpose set himself to record the several Officers appointed by our Saviour, he puts this by way of division, and opposition unto the other: only I find some difference in the apprehensions of interpreters, touching the nature and work of the Teachers amongst themselves. Many and those of exact judgement, seem to confine him to the School, (with whom under favour), I cannot so fully agree: I should rather conceive, Doctor may be attended with some distinction.

There is a Doctor *in* {*Scholâ*, *Ecclesiâ*} both have their special use, and employment: but the second is here meant, for he is given to the Church, and that with this intent and aim, for *the gathering and perfecting of the body*, and that is of the *Church* or *Congregation*; and ergo they are to choose him, to employ and improve him for their special and Spiritual edification: which

21

the School will not reach so immediately unto, as his place, bur Saviours purpose, and the Churches necessity, and Spiritual edification will require.

In this second sense we understand the Officer we now inquire after, and that wherein he shares in common with the Pastor is, that they have both of them Authority and right delegated from Christ to consecrate and to administer the Sacraments.

He who hath office-power to publish the Covenant of Grace, he by the same office may administer the seals of the Covenant.

But they both may out of Office-power and Authority, preach the Covenant of Grace.

When I say preach out of Authority of Office, I so speak, because as we have formerly disputed, Brethren, who are qualified, may, as occasion shall require, and they invited thereunto, preach, or publicly open the Scripture, to the edification of the hearer, and yet not do it out of office.

Look what office-power authorizeth to the dispensation of the Covenant; the same, upon the same right, will authorize to the administration of the Seals. But the peculiar things appropriate to his place, are;

1. The aim and scope of the Doctor is, to inform the judgement, and to help forward the work of illumination, in the mind and understanding, and thereby to make way for the truth, that it may be settled and fastened upon the heart; and is therefore enjoined, *Rom. 12:7.* to *attend unto Teaching:* Not that it is not lawful for him to administer a word of exhortation, as it were by the way: But he dwells not upon that, that is not his main work, bestows neither his studies nor his strength upon it, as his chief business, and therefore *a word of knowledge* is said to be given to him. Hence all such dispensations, which do properly and immediately conduce, to this end, do belong in an especial manner to him.

As to dwell upon the interpretation of the Text, so far as the difficulty and intricacy thereof may require, and to clear it to the capacity of the meanest, because this is necessary to the information of the judgement.

2. To him it appertains to lay down a *Platform of wholesome words*, and to deliver the fundamental points of Chri-

22

stian Faith, the principles of Religion, as the main pillars of truth, which may under-prop our apprehensions, that they may not be carried aside with every wind of Doctrine, because this is necessary to the teaching.

3. To him it belongs to handle such controversies as are on foot, and do arise betwixt the Church and Adversaries of the truth, to state them clearly, strongly, and solidly, to confute them out of the Word, and to convince such as be the broachers and maintainers of them, because this is necessary for the information of the judgement.

Other things might be added, but these are the principal.

The controversy which hath exercised the world since that man of sin was advanced into the chair of Ambition, and falls in here, is;

Quest. *Whether Episcopus and Prestyter be the same jure Divino*, and according to the verdict of the Scriptures, and the appointment of our Saviour Christ?

Ans. Though the nakedness of the assertion, that would difference *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* by divine right, hath been of former, and much more of latter times laid open to the view of the world, so that there needs nothing to be added here; yet to leave it upon Record, that we concur with those worthies in the defence of the same Truth, we shall in short set down our witness together with them.

We shall speak something by way of explication, and state the question: Add secondly, some Arguments for the confutation of that which is erroneous, and for the confirmation of the Truth.

Episcopus is three-fold

Divines.

Humans.

Satanicus.

A Bishop by divine Institution is such an Officer, which Christ hath set in his Church, and whose Office is set forth and discovered in the Word, and such are Pastors and Doctors, *Tit. 1:7.* *1 Tim. 5:17.*

Humanus is a President or constant Moderator, chosen by consent of Ministers, meeting and consulting about the affairs of their Churches in their common consociations, to whom it appertained, to moderate, the actions of the Assembly, to propound things to be agitated, to gather voices, to pro-

23

nounce the sentence which passed by common approbation; and he had no more, but his equal suffrage with the rest, and when his action was ended, was but in equal honour with the rest; nay, may be, in less respect, in regard of years or gifts.

In consociations, reason and order forceth such a kind of proceeding: For should all interpose in the fore-named acts, it would breed a disturbance and confusion in all.

Only to impose and leave it constantly upon one man, experience which is past gain-saying, hath made it appear to be perilous, and to be indeed an in-let to worse inconveniences,

then at the first could have been suspected. Prevent then that irregularity of fixing such an employment constantly upon one, there is nothing of such a course, but may be tolerated in consociations, where persons by mutual agreement concur for to help with common concurrence of counsel, as emergent occasions shall require.

Satanicus is such an *Episcopus*, which the enemy Sitan, acting the pride, and suiting the Sovereignty of the spirits of men, hath by a mysterious way successively and secretly brought into the Church, that so he might Mid-wife Antichrist into the world, this being the next step to that man of sin: And he becomes *princeps Episcopus*, who by his insolency hath arrogated and affirmed, and at last confirmed even a Monarchical power unto himself.

And however the Pope, who is the universal Bishop, is the man of sin, yet the Bishop, especially when he is ascended to his Arch-Bishops Chair, is the same, but only considered in his minority, as the child of sin, or the man of sin in his child-hood.

For laying aside the rankness of those extravagancies of the Pope's temporal power, or that power in temporalities; It will appear his power in *spiritualibus* is of the same, kind: for he assumes a peerless power to himself; that look what the King is to his Council, he takes them to himself in way of consultation, but the small determination and resolution lies in his own bosom: So the Bishop is to his inferior Clergy: He will hear them speak, when he pleaseth to give allowance, but it is in his own breast, to cast the balance, which way seemes best to himself: So *Downam, Bilson,*

24

Saravia; whence he appropriates to himself to be *Rector* and *Judex*.

1. He is sole Rector, and therefore Ministers cannot put forth any Act of their own order, without his leave; and therefore if the Lord Bishop be in place, the poor Priest must not preach, nor pray, nor administer, if his great Master will officiate the work, which (as hap is) they do not much trouble the world withall, if it be matter of work.

He counts himself the sole Pastor, they are only his *Subsidiarii*, who come only in *partem sollicitudinis*, but share not in *plenitudine potestatis*.

2. Hence he is *sole Judex*, by whom all are to be censured with punishments of suspensions, depositions, degradations, ex-communications: But the Scripture owns no such Officer, but he is a mere human creature; nay, an invention hatched by Satan, warmed in the womb of pride, self-Sovereignty, covetousness, until the monstrous birth of Antichrist came abroad into the world.

Our reasons against this usurped Order are these of many: 1. The express testimony of the Scripture, then which nothing can be more pregnant, *Tit.* 1:5, 7. The Apostle having enjoined his Scholer to *appoint Elders in every City*, and how they must be qualified, he adds the reason of his advice, *For a Bishop must be blameless, &c.* Where the dispute of the Apostle shews, not only the community, of the names, but the Identity of the thing signified thereby: Otherwise his Argument had not only been a false reasoning, and failed in form, having four terms; but in truth had not reasoned at all, for it had been ready to reply, *Επίσκοπος* or *Bishop*, is another thing from *Presbyter*.

Acts 20. *Paul* sends for the *Elders of Ephesus*, and professeth in the 28. *verse*, that *the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, or Bishops*, where not only the name is common, but the thing signified by *ἐπίσκοπεῖν*, is enjoined them, as their duty.

What *ἐπίσκοπεῖν* implies or requires, that they were to do.

If *ἐπίσκοπεῖν* require, to lay on hands, to exercise jurisdiction *in foro externo*, that they must do; and should they have been reprov'd for so doing, they might have shewn this their Commission.

25

And that which yet adds further evidence is, *ἐπίσκοπος* is never read nor recorded in the New Testament (provided it be not applied to some extraordinary subject, as it is said, that another was to take *Judas* his place, and *ἐπίσκοπήν Act.* 1:20.) but the actions therein required belong to any *Presbyter*.

2. If they be distinct, the Bishop is superior: (for they *deny* either equality or inferiority:) But they cannot be superior. Every superior order hath both superior acts and honour belonging thereunto above the superiour; but Bishops have neither above those that are Presbyters; for if labouring in the Word and doctrine be an act above Ruling, and is most *worthy of double honour*, then the act and honour of a Presbyter is above the act and honour of a Bishop. For they only assume the acts of rule, but give the Presbyters leave to labour in the word and doctrine.

3. If they differ from Presbyters *Jure Divino*, then there be some ministers by Divine authority. necessary for the gathering of the Church, and perfecting of the body of Christ, beside that of the Presbyters. For if the Church can be perfected without these, there is no need of these. But there is no ministry necessary for the gathering and perfecting of the Church, beside that of the Presbyters. For the Apostle setting down the several ministries, which Christ had purchased, and by his ascension bestowed upon his Church, when *he gave gifts to men* for that end, they are only comprehended in these two, *Pastors and Teachers*, *Ephe.* 4:12, 13. and they who are given for this end, can and shall undoubtedly attain it. Whence the issue is, If Pastors and Doctors be sufficient Teaching ministries to perfect the Church until we come to the unity of the faith, then there needs no more but these, nor are there any by Christ appointed but these, all others are superfluous. The first part is the words of the text: *ergo*, the second cannot be denied.

4. Distinct Officers must have distinct operations, *operari sequitur esse*. But they have no distinct operations from Presbyters. If there be any distinct operations, those must be ordination and jurisdiction. But both these belong to Presbyters Jurisdiction, *Job.* 20:13. binding and loosing imply a power of censuring, as well as preaching, and both are given in the Apostles to their successors the Rulers, and Elders of the

26

Churches. who succeed them in their commission. For Ordination, it's given to the whole Presbytery, *1 Tim.* 4:14.

And if we look to ancient times, that prime place of *Hierom: ad Euagrium* shews the charter, whence all the authority was derived, *unum ex se electum in altiori gradu collocarunt, quem Episcopum nominaverunt*. Whence it follows,

1. That Bishops were first Presbyters.
2. That they had their first election and constitution from them: and *ergo*, Presbyters had their rise and ordination before Bishops.
3. *Ergo*, If they can give Ordination to Bishops, they can give it to Presbyters also.

5. *They who have the same commission, they have the same power from Christ*, because all power issues from their commission. But they all have the same commission, *John 20:21. prout me misit Pater, ego mitto vos*. It was said to all the Apostles equally, and to all their successors indifferently. We have now done with the nature and work of these Officers.

In these two last may we attend the

Manner of the doing,

Reward for it.

First, *For the Manner*, it may appear in three things.

I.

They must bestow their whole man, and their whole strength and study upon this so weighty and worthy work; and therefore the Apostle when he had considered that the Lord had put life and death into the hands of the dispensers of the word, *2 Cor. 2:16*. he cries out, *who is sufficient for these things?* and if no man be sufficient, it is then needful every man should bestow his whole strength upon it.

Hence it is unlawful for a Minister to be a Magistrate; not because these things are contrary; but the weight of the one is so great, that it is beyond any ordinary ability to undertake to discharge both, unless he would wrong both; and therefore the Apostles professed *they would lay aside the attendance to tables, that they might give themselves to the word and Prayer*, q.d. That channel was wide enough, wherein the full stream and strength of their endeavours might be laid out unto the utmost, *Act. 6:2, 4*.

II.

They must bestow their whole time, partly by way of prepara-

27

tion to furnish themselves for the work. A good steward lays in old & new, or else he could not bring it out, *Mat.* 13:52. 1 *Tim.* 4:13. 2 *Tim.* 4:13. partly in his dispensation, 2 *Tim.* 4: 1, 2. *Act.* 20:34.

III.

They must take up no other employment, nor bestow themselves upon any such business, but that which may fit them for this main work, and furnish them in the more fruitful discharge thereof, such as may be helps and no hinderances hereunto. 2 *Tim.* 2:4. *He that goes to war, doth not entangle himself in the things of this life:* but useth his family, calling, &c. as the traveller useth the boat; the Ferryman lives by his rowing, the traveller useth it for his passage.

2. *Touching the Reward.*

Quest: But *how can it be conceived, that a Minister should provide for his family, and yet not bestow his care and strength about it?*

Answ. Very well: as he puts forth his effectual working, and the full employment of his time and strength for the good of the Church; the Body also should jointly put forth their effectual working for his temporal good; so that they should make provision for him and his family in the things of this life, as he lays out himself for the provision of all spiritual good things for them and their families in the things belonging to a better life, and this also is a Church, or Ecclesiastical work, and spiritual service, as issuing from a spiritual ground, and aiming at a spiritual end.

Quest. *If the question be, what is the Rule according to which the Church ought to walk, in making this provision?*

An. We may conceive the compass of the Rule in the conclusions following.

1. *Conclusion.*

It's not a matter of liberty or curtesy which may be done or left undone: but it is a duty and a work of justice, unto which the Church is called, and to the performance whereof they are bound in conference. Provision in this kind is wages and not benevolence. So our Saviour concludes (*Matth.* 10:10.) touching his disciples, when he sent them to preach: he bids them not to be solicitous for relief,

For the workman is worthy of his wages. And the Apostle determines it by the verdict of all Laws. Look we at the Law of nature; *We must not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the*

28

corn, 1 Cor. 9:9. Look at the Law of Nations; *Doth any man go to war at his own charges,* Ver. 7. Look we at the Law of God; he hath ordained *that those who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.* They must not live of their patrimony, but of the Gospel. As instance, *They who administered at the Altar, lived of the Altar.* He that shall bestow his time and thoughts to provide bread on the week days for his family, how shall he be able to provide bread for the Church upon the Lord's day?

II.

This provision should be so honourable and comfortable as that it may attain the end for the which it was appointed by God, & so collected by the people, and given to the Ministers. The end (as is above intimated) that the Officers might employ their time and strength, and study, for the work of the Lord, and that freely, and fully. Hence therefore this provision should be such as might take off all care and distraction in a rational proceeding, that they should have no need to bestow either thoughts or care, travel or expence of time, which was either fit or needful to be employed to make preparation for the public, or to bestow themselves upon the private necessities of the members of the Church, as their occasions or the Officers duties should require. Thus the Levites were in the Old Testament. Thus the Apostle chargeth also 1 Cor. 16:18; And if they must not entangle themselves in the businesses of this life: *ergo,* the Church must not be an occasion they should: and this is one thing aimed at, in that, 1 Tim. 5:17; *The Elders are worthy of double honour,* yea they must be given to hospitality: and therefore they must have such supply, as that they may not provide for their own comforts only for present, and lay in for this in a faithful way of Providence, but that they may be able to give comfortable entertainment to strangers, as opportunity shall be offered.

III.

Touching the order how this may be raised, that place of the Apostle, is of all other most pregnant, and carries most conclusive evidence to direct and determine in this case, *Gal. 6. Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth, in aligned things.*

Two things are of special remark in the words. First, What the things be, whence this maintenance must be raised. Secondly, From whom.

29

1. *That from whence it must be raised*, is said; πάντα ἅταθα; *i.e.* All good things that are communicable, for some things are such as admit no communication; such as a man lawfully cannot, so he should not make them common.

As a man hath one room to lodge in, one servant to attend him, one coat to cover his nakedness; only so much provision as will supply his own necessities; these cannot be made common. But what ever good things he may make common, if he have for himself and to spare, he should communicate, according to his place, portion and proportion.

Some good things are common to all or most of the body.

Other good things appertain to some few.

In all there must be a communication; as if they have Land, Lots, Meadows, Cattle, &c. so must the body provide for them; So provisions for clothing, diet, or any choice comfort that God calls in occasionally, which may be communicated, they should even of those specials communicate.

2. *The persons that must do this.*

The Text gives an express answer; *every one* that is taught, whether Servant or Master, bond or free, rich or poor; yea, though in other cases he receive contribution, yet when, or wherein God betrusts him with any good thing, wherein he may communicate, and if he find the Word powerful, he will be provoked to do it; and against this I know no judicious and pious Divine, unless it be such who are taken up too much with a tang of a Popish and Jewish way of Tithing. However they may, and do happily add somewhat more, yet the Text hath that native and natural evidence, that it

will like a mighty current, carry any conscientious man away with it. Upon this ground laid, I shall take leave to add several things.

1. This way of maintenance is most safe, and certainly in the times of the Gospel most suitable to the mind of God, having the express testimony of the truth for warrant, thereof, and that recorded with such evidence as cannot be waved or questioned. This maintenance is sufficient, and abundantly satisfactory to answer the work that is done, and the end to which it is given. That which makes the portion and provisions of the Ministers, to carry some kind of proportion to the plenty and variety of all the good things of all those with

30

whom they live; That way of raising maintenance makes it honourable and comfortable. But this doth so, because not only many, but all, bring in something of all they have either in their constant possession, or what they can occasionally procure, or God in his providence casts in. And here there is a latitude given to divers apprehensions. Some conceive (the Lord's Treasury, being committed to the Deacons, for supply of all Tables of Officers, and the Tables of the poor, both its own and others.) That this Treasury should be furnished every Lord's day by the free-will offerings of the Assembly, every one calling into it, as God hath blessed him, *1 Cor.* 16:1, 2, 3. They also conceive this rule of *Gal.* 6:6. may be attended in this way, every one bringing in of all their good things in a *proportionable value*, as may suit the occasions of the Church. Others again conceive, that the maintenance mentioned in the fore-going place cannot be fully raised by a treasury common to the poor and Ministers, nor can it be gathered upon the Sabbath day.

The conclusion hath two parts: First, That this way of maintenance cannot be raised fully by a treasury common to the poor and Ministers, out of which supply unto them both should be fetched.

1. To such a Treasury all should not pay: But to this all do, for all are instructed.

2. Thus to provide is appropriate to the Minister, and to him alone. For of him alone it is said, *let him that teacheth*

be made partaker of all our good things; let no man else; not the poor. That which is put into a common treasury, that is common to all, who must be so relieved. But the poor are not to be relieved by all our good things; nor doth either rule or reason lead us, or allow us so to do.

3. If all our good things cannot be put into the Treasury, which yet by the word we cannot but bestow upon our Teachers, then this providing for Officers must not wholly and only be confined to the treasury. For experience tells, there be many of our good things thus to be given to our Teachers which cannot be put into a Treasury.

4. This coupling of the poor and Ministers in one common Treasury confounds the works of Justice and Mercy. For the poor who are to be relieved out of mercy, they share in the

31

contributions which are put in, out of a just recompence of wages to the Ministers.

2. And upon the same ground they conceive that this way of maintenance cannot be fully raised upon the Sabbath, because there be several good things cast in by way of Providence, which we should bestow upon our Officers. And happily they cannot be kept until the Sabbath, nor will it be comely to give them in, in that place, and at that time. These be the different apprehensions of differing brethren; but all agree in this, that an honourable and comfortable maintenance is a due debt. *It should be no breach of love, that each Church follow her own light herein.*

3. In case any member shall fail in this free contribution, he sin in a breach of the known rule of the Gospel: it appertains to the Church, to see the Reformation of that evil, as of any other scandal; and therefore if there be any doubt or difficulty arising, how it may be regulated in any such particular, the Church is according to God to determine it, and the Deacons according to such a determination, are to seek the execution of it; and because it is better to prevent a scandal, that it may not come, and easier also, then to remove it when it is given, its most suitable to rule, that each man should know his proportion, according to rule, what he should do, before he do it, that so his judgement and heart

may be satisfied in what he doth, and just offence prevented in what is done. Hence again I collect.

That this way of raising maintenance, appointed in the Gospel, is far differing from that way of tithing in the Law, nay to be tied precisely to follow the one, cannot stand with the other, for this is raised out of all good things, the person that is taught hath: but those Tithes in the Old Testament *were out of the seed of the land, the fruit of the trees, or of the herd of the flock*, Levi. 27:30, 31, 32. Deut. 14:22, 23.

2. *This maintenance* is to be paid by all that are *taught*: But the Levites were to receive the first tenth, and pay the tenth of the tenth unto the Priest, *Neh.* 10:38. So that if the patrons of tithing look at the command given to the Jew, as a moral law, they must confine themselves precisely to the prescript form thereof, *ergo* the Ministers must have the tenth of a tenth, and from them happily who were never taught by them. As

32

the Levites who taught in the particular Synagogues paid to the Priest who administered in *Jerusalem*. And hence it follows, That the way of tithing in the Old Testament was not a natural nor moral law; For no law appointed in the Gospel, is inconsistent with any natural or moral Law of God, which this is, as hath immediately been proved.

Of Deacons.

We have done with those Offices, and officers, which look at the whole Church, and whole dispensations merely and immediately reach the special good of the soul: But the Lord Christ, as a King of infinite mercy as well as wisdom, he provides for the outward good and comfort of all his household and subjects, in regard of their estates, that they may be maintained, and their health also, and so their lives preserved in a prosperous condition, and to this end he hath appointed Officers, that should in a peculiar manner look to the Church, and so provide for the good of both.

The Office that is to look to, and relieve the Estates of such as are commended to their care, is the Office of Deacons, of which we shall inquire: First, their Name: secondly, their

Office, as it is distinct from the rest: thirdly, the bounds wherein their duties ought to be confined.

The name *Deacon* in our English comes from the original Greek word, which in the general and largest acceptation of the word, signifies as much as to administer, and implies any kind of administration, whether

Civil or
Ecclesiastical.

Mat. 22:13. Then said the King unto his servants; the word is τοῖς διακονοῖς, and it is used also to express the administration of the civil Magistrate, *Rom. 13:4. when their administrations are considered as under God, being his servants, he is the Minister of God to thee for good, διάκονος ἐστίν*. And in this large circuit of signification, it compriseth all special Officers in the Church, as Apostles, Evangelists, &c. *1. Cor. 3:5. Who is Paul? Who is Apollos? ἀλλ ἢ διάκονοί, &c. but Ministers, &c. Secondly, sometimes it is taken in a more special signification and includes these two last remaining, to wit,*

Deacons,
Widows.

As in that place, *Phil. 1:1. a place very remarkable, when Paul in his salutations begins with the whole, and so proceeds to*

33

the several officers, he thus writes; *To all the Saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi: There is the body of the Congregation, and then adds with the Bishops and Deacons. In these two expressions all the Rulers are to be understood; Pastors, and Doctors, and Elders are comprehended under the name of Bishops, Paul styles them, Act. 20:28.*

Where observe, 1. There were many Bishops in one Church, not one over many.

2. That amongst these there was no Metropolitan, or superior Arch-Bishop. For then *Paul* had been much to blame, in passing him by, or omitting his title and due remembrance.

The second word is *Deacons*, such as administer to members weak in their estates, as the poor, or weak in their bodies, or such as be sick; and so both these are comprehended in *1 Cor. 12:28. by those whom the Apostle calls Helps.*

3. But lastly, when it is taken most strictly, and as it concerns our purpose in hand, it sets out such officers, who are designed by the Church to dispose the state & treasure thereof to those several purposes for which God hath appointed, the occasions & necessities of the body & any member thereof may require.

1. That this is a distinct office in the Church, several Scriptures give in undeniable evidence: *Rom.* 12:8. *He that distributes.* Here the Apostle reckons these, as a distinct kind, from those that went before.

1. It being the Apostle his aim, by a similitude drawn from the body, *ver.* 4. to discover several parts by the actions, which were in a peculiar manner appropriate to them. As there be many members in the body, and all have not one office or action: so in the Church there be many members, but there be several offices appropriate to them.

Whereas, was this a Christian duty common to all, the Apostle should overthrow his own purpose: For he should have shewed things agreeing to all alike, when he should have shewn that some things are peculiar

Obj. *If it be said that this was done before, and now he comes to set forth such duties as appertains to all.*

Answ. The words of the text bear down that conceit. Because that which went before, and that which comes after are public officers, and how can these be private? Add unto this, That the following words, *ver.* 9. begin a fair alteration at the first view.

34

The acts are so general, that the Reader should not miss the aim of the Spirit, if he would but lend the least wary attention. Besides, the words hold forth a plain distinction continued in the several members of it. Now the members of a division are opposite one to another, and therefore must have something peculiar one from the other.

2. The Apostle intending to lay out the several officers of the Church in a summary way (as we have formerly heard) he addresseth himself to against description and discovery of this Officer, as select from the other of Elders, *1 Tim.* 3:8, 10. Deacons must be grave, and being approved and tried, let them exercise the Deacons office.

3 And lastly, Do we look into *Acts* 6:1, 2, 6. we may see the ground and occasion of the institution and scope of their calling, and at what it especially aims, when there fell a murmuring betwixt the *Grecians* and the *Hebrews*, in that their poor were not so comely and comfortably attended, as they desired and expected: the Apostles perceiving the multitude increasing, and that it would take up their time and pains too much to give full attendance thereunto, as the necessities thereof did require, they therefore directed, that they should choose men amongst themselves fitly qualified for that purpose, and they would settle them in that employment. According to the Apostles counsel, the Church elected, the Apostles prayed, and laid on their hands and appointed them to the performance of that service. Whence it is apparant,

1. That this was a public Office, because they were elected in a solemn manner thereunto, and received a solemn institution from the Apostles, and so from Christ, for the undertaking of that service.

2. That this their service it was about the attendance of *Tables*, because the provision for the maintenance of the Widows and poor, by a daily supply as the condition and necessity of the Church did at that time require, gave occasion hereunto; *ergo*, that name is used, and implies the dispensation of the treasury, state, and provision of the Church, for those ends and purpose as should appear useful, and behoveful for the benefit of the Church, or any member thereof, as far as served for a spiritual end.

35

3. The full and careful attendance unto this work could not stand with careful, constant, and conscientious attendance unto the Ministry of the word, as the Office of a Minister so employed did require, as the words of the text witness; *It is not fit for us to lay aside the care of the word to attend tables*, v. 3. *ergo*, *provide men fit for this thing, and we will give our selves to the word and prayer*, v. 4. q.d. these cannot stand together, we must either lay aside the one or prejudice the work of both. These conclusions being fair and infallible from former grounds it appears, What the Episcopal Ordination of a Deacon is where-

by they make him half a Priest, or a Priest in preparation, and invest him with power to serve the Priest in the distribution of the Supper, to look to the Poor, to Marry, to Bury, Baptise and Preach, if he shall be counted worthy to have a licence granted thereunto. But to consecrate the Supper of the Lord, that is wholly forbidden him, until he be made a complete Priest, which at the next time of Ordination he may attain, if he can provide money to pay for the Parchments and Orders. Thus the mystery of iniquity hath eaten into the frame, and wholly defaced the institution of our Saviour, so that there is nothing of an Evangelical ordinance, that can be discerned.

The first error (which was indeed the first inlet into the usurpation of the Bishop, and exaltation of *the man of Sin*) was, that they lifted him up above his own place, and crowded him into a corner of the Pastor's Office, giving him right to Baptise, which is directly cross to the order of Christ.

1. That which is made by Christ, a distinct Office from Pastor and Teacher, that cannot be any part of either, or preparation to them; But so the Office of a Deacon is.

2. That Office which is to attend tables, that hath nothing to do with Pastors' or Doctors' place, either of preaching or administering Sacraments. But this is to attend tables *Act. 6:3*. If any man shall say, they may attend both: The practice and profession of the Apostle will confute and confound such a conceit, *Act. 6. We will give our selves to the word and payer*. They conceived and concluded, they could not do both, but they should wrong both.

1. If the Apostles, who were extraordinary persons, could not, shall men of ordinary abilities be sufficient to undergo both?

36

2. Shall the Apostles directed by Christ sever them, who will dare to conjoin them, unless he will go against the direction of the Lord Jesus?

3. *The gifts of Deacons*, which are described by the Apostle, (*1 Tim. 3:8.*) are such as will not furnish a man to be a Minister, (for of him it is not required) he should be apt to teach; to be a teacher and not apt to teach, is to be a Bell without a Clapper.

1. *Obje.* 1. That *Stephen* a Deacon preached, *Act.* 7.

2. That *Philip* Baptised. *Act.* 8>38.

3. That Deacons, by ruling well their office, purchase to themselves a good degree, *i.e.* a degree to the Ministry.

Ans. 1. *Stephen's* speech was not a sermon, but an Apology made by him, for the clearing of his person and cause from the accusations and aspersions that were call upon him by his adversaries.

2. That *Philip* was an Evangelist, and so appointed by God, as afterwards appears, and by virtue of that, and not of his Deaconship, did baptize.

3. That βαθμὸν, mentioned in 1 *Tim.* 3:13. is not a degree of the Ministry; but he that doth so, and is so, shall purchase a good landing in the Church, whereby he may boldly administer his office, and with more fruit. For as we have formerly said; If a man may be a fit Deacon, and yet by some impediment in his utterance can never be a Ministry then is he not by his Deaconship in any necessary preparation thereunto.

The limits of the office will appear, by shewing

1. What he must do.

2. How he must do it.

I. What he must do.

This Deacon being the steward or Treasurer of the Church, the thing for which he is mainly to be employed, as for which he was ordained, it is, *for the husbanding of the estate and temporals of the Church*, as may be every way most behoveful for the benefit of the body, according to the rules of the Gospel. And this his service will shew it self in three things.

1. He must address himself with much observance to revive those provisions, which shall or ought to be committed

37

to his trust. I say, due observance in gathering in the state of the Church.

1. It is for him to inform himself by advice and counsel from the body, what every man's free-will-offering should be in making provisions for supplies & payments of the Congregati-

on. For though the Church-contribution be a free-will offering, in regard it should willingly and with a ready heart be tendered unto God: yet neither in the old Testament, nor under the new, the thing it self, nor yet the measure was left to a man's own dispose or liberty. Compare *Deut.* 16:10. with: *Levit.* 12:18, 19. If God hath blessed a man with so many Oxen, he must not offer so many Goats.

Upon this information and direction given by the Body,

2. He must observe, whether each member perform this his due and duty: and in case he shall fail he is to admonish him, as swerving from a rule: and in case he reform not, he must follow the action against him, by the rule of our Saviour provided in that behalf, and bring him to the censure of the Church.

3. What is not offered or given, but promised, he must give attendance with the first to require it, that thus being observant to gather in the flock and provision of the Church, he may not be to seek; nor succour may be wanting, when supply should be tendered.

II.

As thus he must give attendance, as Christ's receiver, to gather in his rents and revenues of the Church: so he must be careful to keep it, when it is in his custody, so that no lack come thereto; neither mispend it himself, nor suffer it to spoil in the keeping, nor lend it with disadvantage, so that it should return less in worth, or be unready, when the Church hath occasion to have the improvement thereof.

III.

He must be prudent in the dispersing and disposing of it to such uses and to such persons as the body of the congregation shall, according to the rules of the Scripture, require at his hand herein, because the weight and work of his office is especially to be seen here; *ergo*, this is especially and particularly mentioned, *Rom.* 12. *He that distributes:* and this implies and includes all the rest.

Thus his office is said to attend tables. *i.e.* To lay out the revenues and treasures of the Church, as may be bthoovest ill: For to provide Elements for the Lord's table, when that should be attended: For *the table of the poor*, *i.e.* for all their wants, that they may be supplied. For the tables of the Minister, *i.e.* what ever provision the Church shall put into their hands, as by them to be administered to them, according to that debt which the Church owes to them in the way of wages.

And here his providence, faithfulness, and pains will fully be employed.

CHAP. II.

Wherein the name of Ordination it discussed, and the 17. Chap. of Mr REUTERFORD it considered, and answered, as touching the power he giveth to a Pastor in and over other Congregations beside his own.

THE *Reasons* which are in the 16. *chap.* alleged and answered by Mr R. we are content they should stand or fall to their own masters, not intending to weary our selves, with the maintaining of other men's works: what we conceive to be suitable to the truth, and we shall make use of, we shall endeavour to vindicate, and make good against all opposition in their proper places. Whereas it is said *cha.* 17. *p.* 264.

That we make Ordination and election of Pastors all one, by a mistake: I suppose, it will appear, that we are herein wholly mistaken, if that which follows be impartially attended. We shall therefore for the clearing of this coast inquire after some particulars, which appertain to the full understanding of this head of *Discipline*; and so much the rather we shall be willing to bestow our thoughts about this subject, because of the *difficulty* and *obscurity* of it: especially, because *misconceivings here* draw many inconveniencies with them, and *disturb almost the whole frame*. As in an unjointed body, or misplaced building, when any special part, and *main pillar* is out of place, it brings a weakening, yea a declining of the whole, and spirits

both the firmness and fashion of the frame. We shall take leave therefore to insist upon these particulars by way of inquiry:

1. *Whether ordination is in nature before election?*

2. *Whether ordination gives all the essentials to an Officer?*
3. *What this Ordination is, and wherein lies the full breadth and bounds of the being thereof?*
4. *In whom the right of dispensing lies, & by whom it may be dispensed?*

I.

Whether Ordination if in nature before Election.

To the first of these, that which occasions an inquiry here, is the words & expressions of worthy Mr R. *ch. 17. p. 265. Ordination is that, which formally makes the man a Pastor. The peoples election doth only appropriate the man's Ministry to such and such a people. It is one thing to make a gold ring; it is another thing to propyne & gift the ring to such a person. 267. It is presupposed by order of nature, that A. B. is first called and ordained a Pastor by Christ, and the laying on of the hands of the Elders, 1 Tim. 4:14. before the people can elect him for their Pastor. For if A. B. be no Pastor, the people cannot choose him to be their Pastor: neither doth the people's election give any such power to A. B. That power is given by the Presbyteries Ordination, which by order of nature is before the people's formal Act of Electio,. As the husband who in a Lapidaries shop chooseth a gold ring for his wife, and putteth it on her finger, presupposeth it was a gold ring before the choosing thereof; neither doth his choosing make it a gold-ring, but only make it his wife's gold ring, by application to her. It st [?????] so peoples Election appropriateth such a man who is already a Pastor, to such a charge: but doth not make the Pastor a Pastor, but chooseth him only to be their Pastor, p. 269.*

I confess, I find some such expressions as these in Bellarmine. *Disputabimus primò de ordinatione, turn de vocarione, postremo de electione: which implies, That election comes after the vocation of a Minister, but Dr Ames seasonably tells him, he placeth the cart before the horse; Hoc non est distincte et ordine, sed præposterè et confusè disputare ordinationem præponere vocationi et electioni, est equis præponere curorum.*

Anti Bellar. Tom: 2. l. 3. c. de ordinat. p. 76.

I know also, that it is a *Popish* course, which our *Prelates* use (the reason whereof we shall discover in the proper place

thereof) that they *ordain* a *Priest* and when they have laid their hands upon his head, and put his parchments into his

40

box sealed with the great seal of the *Bishop's office*, he sends the man to take possession of his parish and tithes, and the *poor multitude differ* themselves so far to be befooled and oppressed with the tyranny of the *Prelate*, that they are constrained to submit to him in their practice, whom often they cannot but justly loath in their hearts; as being either very scandalous in his life, or inefficient in learning and abilities.

But I cannot meet with any *Judicious writer*, who either knew or maintained the course of the *reformed Churches*, that placeth ordination before election. Nor did I ever conceive that to be the order of Christ. For I have taken it for granted what *Cyprian* says, *Videmus de divinâ autoritate descendere, ut sacerdos, plebe præsentē, sub omnium oculis delegatur, et dignus et idoneus publico iudicio et testimonio comproquetur.*^a

I ever conceived that true of *Chemnitius*,^b

Ne citò manus alicui imponus, ne communices peccatis alienis, approbando scilicet electionem aut vocationem non rectè factam.

I have judged with *Musculus*^c *Legitimè electi, ab episcopis et senioribus, qui electioni aderant, oratione et impositione manuum confirmabantur et ordinabantur, et hæc forma electionis ad Cypriani tempora duravit* ^c.

I was ever of the opinion with the *Magdeburgenses*,^d *Delegebatur episcopus et plebe, cujus episcopus futurus erat, præsentē, et accessit manuum impositio.*

I ever contented formerly to that of Honourable *Plesse*,^e *Semper tamen prinsquam ordinantur et collocantur in ministerio suo in universum concurrere populi ordinisque ecclesiastici consensum; idque diduci probationis causa per omnia sæcula posse, st controversum foret.* So that he concluded it a course beyond controversy, and the practice of perpetual antiquity.

I took it in former times for confessed, what *Calvin* writes^f and with whom *Beza* consents, *Superest ritus ordinandi, cui ubi locum in vocatione didimus. &c.*

To conclude, I have apprehended it as an everlasting truth, which *judicious Ames* delivers in his *Medulla* (*libro nunquam satis laudato*)^g *electionis adjunctum consequens et consummans est ordi-*

natio, quæ nihil aliud est, quam solemnis quædam introductio ministri jam electi in ipsius functionis liberam executionem. It is but *adjunctum*, And that *consummans*. To which agrees his expression in his *Bellarm. Enervat.*^h election gives *jus ad rem*, ordination

a *Cyprian li. 1. Epist. 4.*

b *Exam. p. 2. do Sacram. ord.*

c *Loc. com. 8. Ministr. ordin.*

d *Magdeburg. cent. 3. cap. 8. de retib. circa ordin.*

e *Pless. de Euchorist l. 2. c. 7.*

f [?????] *ustit. lib. 4. cap. 3. h. 16.*

g *Med. Theol. li. 1. c. 39. p. 34.*

h *Tom. 2. li. 3. ca. 2. de vocat. Minist. p. 76. lib. 3.*

41

jus in re. As the *Election* of the *Prince* authoriseth him in his Regal powers *Coronation* only invests him into his place. And some of the *Jesuites*, most ingenuous, affirm at much.

Issue all with *Gerson Bucer*: which argues not only what his opinion was, but what was the constitution of all the Churches where he was. [i] *Postquam Præsbyterio consensus Ecclesiæ innotuit, succedit ad extremum Ordinatio.* And in the following discourse, I hope it shall appear, That *Ordination* doth depend upon the *peoples lawful Election*, as an *Effect* upon the *Cause*, by virtue of which it is fully Administred; So that in the very *Apostolical* times, the liberty of the very *Apostles* was not so great in *Ordaining* as was the peoples in *Choosing*. For as in *Acts. 6.* it's said of that Office of the *Deacons*; *The people* were first appointed to *choose* and to present the persons to the *Apostles*: and then they did readily receive the parties, not once questioning what they did; or by withdrawing their *Ordination*, refuse to second and establish what they had done. And if the people had this liberty in an *under-Officer*, there was greater reason they should have the like in an Officer of *higher degree*, in whom they had greater interest, and by whose Administration they were to receive greater good: so that none were to be *Ordained*, but such whom they did choose; nor did they, or according to rule could they, refuse to *Ordain* them so *Elected*, unless some just exception was against them, and then also the people were to make a new choice, they were not in that case of error and aberration from the rule, to take the choice into their own hands. The proof of this

will appear in the explication of the other particulars propounded, and therefore we shall proceed therein. *The second thing then to be attended is;*

2. *Whether Ordination gives all the Essentials to an Officer.*

Where there be *two things* come to be scanned.

1. *How far the Essentials of the Ministry or Minister may be given by man.*

2. *If they may be given and conveyed over by man: BY WHAT MEANS men are said to do this, whether by Ordination, or by any other appointment of Christ.*

The *first* of these calls, for some special disquisition. Because it will appear upon trial, that the contrivement of these

42

truths is so secret and subtle, that it drives men into divers conceivings, at not being able to discern, how in the work of the institution of the Ministry, the essentials come to be woven together; the thread is so fine spun, that the dim eye of man's discerning, can hardly find it, or follow it, much less cut it.

And because there is here no small difficulty, and it is the *very hinge* upon which many weighty consequences, and in truth, controversies turn; I shall be bold to offer some things to confederation, which at least may cause further inquiry by such, who are better able to fathom these depths. And here as Sea-men use to do, when the Bay or Haven is unknown, or being known, yet hard to hit; I shall as it were found the Coast by several *conclusions*, That I may find where the channel of the truth, in the full strength and dreams of it runs.

1. *Conclusion.*

There is a Causal virtue put forth in a subordinate way by some under Christ, to bring in the formality or specific being of in Ecclesiastical of in to a person, or party that is called thereunto, or stands possessed thereof.

1. I say, [*this is done by some*] because it is confessed of all hands that an *external call* is or necessity required: only some lay the weight of it in one thing, some in another: but *all agree in this*, whose conceits have but the colour of common sense in them, (the frenzy of some *Familists* and *Anabaptists*

only excepted, who cashiere all *Governments* and *Governors* or *Rulers* out of Churches and Common wealths; but this madness and folly labours almost with the loathsomeness of it self) All, I say, that are willing to be led with the light of any reason, do readily grant there should be an *outward call*. In the lowest order and office of a *Deacon*, this was observed by direction Apostolical, they must not, they could not administer, before they were called and appointed thereunto. *Acts* 6:5. And it's a staple and standing rule, which teacheth all by proportion. *No man takes this honour to himself, but he that is called as Aaron*, Heb. 5:4.

Secondly, that *there is a causal virtue put forth in the communication of this power,*] I shall shew, and they will easily confess, yea when they will express themselves freely, their own words evidence as much: unless they be forced by the fear of

43

the approach of some Argument which might hazard some conceit, which they are loath to leave and lay aside, then happily they may mince their language, that nothing may be gathered from thence against themselves. I find that expression in the Apostle, *Gal.* 1:1. *Paul an Apostle not of man nor by man*, οὐκ ἄπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου. Men did not institute the office of an Apostle, as the Authors of it: nor was it *by man* as the *instrumental cause*, conveyed over unto *Paul*: but it was *every way immediately from God*. There is therefore in reason (as all Judicious collect out of the place) these TWO WAYS of *dispensation* to be attended.

First, when *God immediately* institutes and appoints out of his good pleasure any *place of authority*, and *immediately* also from himself appoints the *person* thereunto. Thus the *Calling* and *Persons* called, *viz. of the Apostles*: were from God immediately.

2. *Way of dispensation is mediate*: when the Institution of the office issues only from the good pleasure of the Lord, yet he may and doth use other instruments for the communication of this authority, and the inverting of a person with a right to exercise, and yet still the office be truly said to be his alone. And herein the *Popish* usurpation in appointing orders & the orders appointed by them appear to be totally *An-*

tichristian as the rabble of that wretched crew of *Monks, Friars, Cardinals, Chancellors, &c.* Because they are *of man* and *by man*, mere human creatures which the pride and ambition of the heart of the man of sin, the froth and vanity of his mind, hath brought forth into the world, all which profane beasts he hath provided, as so many rotten pillars, to prop up the the throne of his *Antichristian* power and *Prelacy*.

But those which the *Church*, according to the Institution and allowance of Christ takes up, those are *wholly from him*, as the Author and Institutor of them, yet are they *by the Church*, to whom he hath first delegated power and in a subordinate manner by such instruments, as he sees fit, conveys a right to some persons, that they may possesse such places, and exercise such offices, according to him without the lead impeachment of the royalty and sovereignty of his rule, which yet resides in himself alone.

To come a little nearer home, that we may lend a little

44

help unto the weakest Reader, that he may lay his finger upon the several things, and see how they lie distinct in the frame of the Institution.

First, it's a truth, there be no orders nor officers, which have been received or are to be retained in the Churches of Christ, but it is the prerogative royal of the Lord Jesus as King of the Church to appoint them. They are parts of his worship, and there, what he doth not *appoint*, he doth not *approve*: the instituting and using of any other is merely *will-worship*. And therefore all such persons and performances, as they issue the folly and froth of man's brains, and *never came into his mind*: so are they abhorred and *loathed by God from his heart*.

² *Chron.* 13:9.

¹ *King.* 12:31, 32.

Beside, all these places and offices they are appointed for *spiritual* and *supernatural ends*, and so to effect *supernatural works*, even the conversion, sanctification and salvation of such as God hath purposed to bring unto himself. *He then alone* must appoint the office, who can *give a blessing* to the *office*

and the *officer* to attain their end: and this none can do but the Lord Christ alone by the virtue and power of his Regal authority; who now being *ascended, and sitting at the right hand of the Father*, he gave and doth bless by the presence and operation of his own Spirit. *Ephes. 4:8, 11. When Christ ascended up on high, he gave gifts. Some to be Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors, some Teachers:* These offices are coronation-mercies, of the greatest worth and excellency. And the Psalmist gives the *reason* from the *end*. *Psal. 68:19, 20.* He gives these gifts, *that God might dwell amongst the rebellions.* And by them the Churches are *gathered and perfected*. *Ephes. 4:12, 13.* And hence it is by way of *Emulation*, because *Antichrist* saw there was no means to underprop his kingdom, and promote his tyranny, unless he had slaves of his own making and creation, that would serve his turn, by taking up blind obedience, in doing his will, though they saw no rule nor reason for it: when, therefore *the Pope ascended on high to the chair of Antichrist*, he also sends his *emissaries and instruments* as the swarms of *Locusts out of the bottomless pit*, for the destruction of the Church, and perdition of millions of poor miserable souls; He being himself the *man of sin*, and the son of *perdition*.

Rev. 9:4.
2 Thess. 2:4.

Secondly, it's also certain, That mert are furnished and fitted with graces and abilities inwardly for so great an employ-

45

ment; with willing and ready minds also^a to give up themselves to so holy services: this also is wholly from God in Christ. He makes us able Ministers of the Gospel.^b *He calls, he sanctifies.*^c *He is the Lord of the harvest, he thrusts forth labourers.*^d This is termed *the inward call*: this only comes from him. Graces and abilities are in his hand, are his gift.

Thirdly, He sets the *laws and limits* of the *place and callings*, sets down all the *rules*, according to which they must act, both *order* and be *ordered*, according as the quality of their places do require: do they must no other things, nor after any other manner than he prescribes. There was a pattern

prescribed of all the things in the Tabernacle from the least unto this greatest, which must be observed in all the several thereof. So in that of *Ezekiel's vision*.^e *ordinances, laws, figures, fashions*. All must be attended, according to the mind of the Lord, without *adding thereunto, or detracting therefrom*.^f It's but reason that a *Master* should set down the laws and orders of *his family*?^g

Fourthly, but all this while, there is no officer nor office put upon any man, nay though there were never so many, and those fitted and gifted every way, they are *no officers, i. e.* they have not received, nor are invested with *a right or jus, according to the rule of Christ, and order of the Gospel*, by such means, which our *Lord Jesus the King of his Church* hath ordained, to leave the impression of authority upon them to that purpose, Which, *how* it's done, we shall anon inquire: but *that this must of necessity be done*, we see it plain.

First, because; without *this Call*, none can *warrantably* do any *act* which belongs to an *officer*, and therefore without this, he hath not the *Specific form* of an officer.

Secondly, without this, what ever is done in that behalf, and for that end, is *void* and of *none effect*.

Thirdly and lastly, the *strength, validity, and efficacy* of an *outward call*, herein appears beyond gain-saying, if it proceed from such, who may give it by rule: Because who ever in a regular way: hath received this outward call, he is then a *complete and true officer*, and may act any part of his office, though *not inwardly graced and fitted worthily* to such a place or work *by God*. The *Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses chair. i. e.*

a *Rom.* 1:15.

b 2 *Cor.* 3:6.

c *Jer.* 1:2.

d *Matth.* 9:38 and 28:20.

e *Ezek.* 43:11. *ch.* 44:5.

f *Deut.* 12: and last.

g 1 *Tim.* 3:19.

had this outward call to that office. Therefore, they must be heard by God's own charge; though they were, most unworthy men had neither *sufficiency of parts*: to do the work of the place, nor yet *sincerity of heart* and life to endeavour, much less

discharge the weight of the services which should be done by them; Being blind *Guides*. *Painted Sepulchres*, grossly hyprcritical and scandalously vile in their general course, corrupting the *law* by their false and unlearned glosses, and perverting the simple people by their lewd carriages, polluting all God's ordinances by their corrupt handling and administration thereof.

Math. 22:23. 2. 3.
v. 16. v. 27.

And therefore there is more then *Mediatio subjecti*, considered in the giving of this *outward call*, if we look at the rigour of the phrase: though (if the Authors will give leave) I would take their meaning to include as much, as what I mention; because I love not to trouble my self and the world with words, or to make any needless contention about that, which may admit a fair and rational construction in any things This *mediatas subjecti* then is to be attended, not so much in regard of the parties that are taken to office, but in regard of those, who, in a subordinate way, are *instruments* under Christ, and so as *instruments* put forth a *causal*, virtue to leave the impression of an *office-right* upon another. For otherwise, we shall not be able to find and maintain any mediate calling.

Suppose as *Matthias* & *Joseph* were set before the Lord, there should be two persons set apart for the ministry, were there no *causal* virtue coming from those, who were to call, and outwardly to auhorise one to the place, rather then the others there could be no mediate institution conceived in regard of the parties: they *both equally* and *immediately* are *presented* as objects to the call; and *equally* and *immediately* (in regard of themselves) lie *open to the call*. *Joseph* stands not in the way to the call of *Matthias*; nor doth *Matthias* come between *Joseph* and the call.

But *herein* lies the *mediateness*. of the call (that however in regard of themselves, they are equally objected to what call comes) yet *Christ* hath, given a *virtual right* to such as he pleaseth to a point, and that he will not dispense immediately a call from himself to either party; but *they as a mean between him and them*, shall leave an *impression* of a *right* of power upon

47

one of the parties to exercise such a place.

This is also that which they call [*Designatio personæ*,] the *designation of a person* to a place. If by that they mean, that they put forth a *casual* virtue, to *imprint the formality* of the power of office upon such a man; that is the sense I would give, of what they say, and so do willingly grant what they speak. But if by *Designation* to a place they would *darken the truth with words*, as *Elihu* speaks, and make that the meaning of the expression: *to wit*, That all the *essentials*, namely, the *material and formal* constituting *causes* of *external office-power* was in the party before, and so he had a complete specific being of a call; but *they only* point him *the place*, and tell him it's fit he should exercise his power here; so that this *designatio personæ*, is only an adjunct to the office he had before without them, but puts forth no causal virtue (as subordinate instruments under Christ) to bring in the *being* of an *outward call*. Then I say, by *designatio personæ* in this sense, neither the truth is discovered, nor is the thing done that was intended by it.

For upon this, explication, what *difference* can be found betwixt an *immediate* and *mediate* call, which we heard out of the *Galatians* to be founded in Scripture, and confessed by the *Apostle*? For if all the essentials of both inward and outward calling are equally only from God; then both the callings are equally immediate, since that call is immediate which is conferred without any means.

Secondly, I can see no cause to hinder, but that an Officer, which is ordinary, may execute his place *without any call* in the Church; for I would thus dispute, *He that hath all the causes of his call inward and outward without the Church, he hath power and right to exercise his call*, and none hath power and right to hinder him.

But *ex concessis*, they have all the causes, if this conceit be true, that *designatio personæ* doth add no *essential* to the constitution of an outward call (for I suppose there is nothing else outwardly to be added to make the call:) *Suppose* there were two persons fully, yea, equally gifted and furnished with all graces, abilities and willingness for the work of the Ministry, which now is wanting to some Congregation, and they both

desired that work of Christ: if there was required no more to be done, to bring in all the causes, and so the being of the

48

power of office, then *both* these *had equal right to officiate*; and though they should officiate any acts *without designation*, they were true acts of an office; whether consecrating or administering Sacraments, they were valid: And if they have right to administer, who hath right or authority to hinder?

Nor can the words admit any other logical respect to be put upon them, but *cause* and *effect*. In Acts 14:23. *When they had made or appointed them Elders by way of choice*. The scope of the place is to shew what provision the Apostle made for the Churches, in supplying them with Officers, and furnishing them with Rulers, which before they had not, but *now*, by God's appointment, they, under him, *gave a being of an outward call* to such persons, to sustain that place unto which formerly they had no power to execute.

Conclusion II.

Hence it follows from the former ground, that *It is an act of power as an Instrument or means*, under Christ, *to give an Officer the being of an outward call in the Church*.

I desire the Reader here to recall to mind what formerly hath been expressed and proved, that the minds of the simple may not be troubled, or taken aside from the truth by the ambiguity and mistake of words.

When we speak of *power*, the word is of *general sense* and signification, and hath an influence into every act of judgement, *Yea, judge those that are within*, 1 Cor. 5:12. So that there is no *Admonition*, either when one tells another alone, or takes one or two, and convinceth a brother; but there is a process, in a way of *juicial proceeding* according to the Laws and Government of Christ; which is the difference betwixt a *Church-admonition* and a *Christian-admonition*. Between such as are not under such bonds, there is an admonition of *Christian-duty*: Here is an admonition issuing from *Christian-power*, which they have by reason of *the places* in which they are set. Sometime the word *Authority* is taken thus largley, though most frequently used otherwise and in a narrower signification: And so, there

is also a power which is proper to *Officers* and when we would speak properly, or understand distinctly each thing in his proper nature and place, use then mean, *The power of Office, leading power, ruling power, or Superiority of power.*

1 *Thess.* 5:12. *Hebr.* 13:17. προεγουμένοι 1 *Tim.* 5:17. οἱ προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι.

49

This being conceived and kept in mind, the demonstration of the conclusion is open: *To give power is an act of power*; he or they who give the external call, or leave the impression of the power of office upon another, they have the *power of judging* that other; they cause that *virtually* which another hath *formally*, not they themselves.

And thus we have done with the first Branch of the second Head, which we propounded to be debated.

2. The next thing that comes to consideration is,

*By what means the Essentials of this Power
may be conveyed?*

And here also because we meet with many shoals and sands of several opinions which cross us, that we cannot make a straight course, we shall be constrained to tack about a little, not proceed in a perfect method, but shew negatively what doth not give this Power, and then affirmatively what doth.

The NEGATIVE we shall lay forth in two *Conclusions*.

Conclusion I.

Ordination (as it is Popishly dispensed under the opinion of a Sacrament, and as leaving the impression of an *indelible Character*) *doth not communicate the essence of this outward call.*

What is the *Popish sense* here, the *Prelates* being their proper Successors, who tread in their steps, and keep their path for the most part in Church-discipline, cordially and privily maintain, though they be not so willing openly to profess; and therefore, though they will not have all the world know that they hold seven Sacraments (and so *that of Order* to be one) by *full* expression, yet they *intimate* some such thing by the *ambiguity* of their language, which those who are their familiars can easily sent out: as namely, there are but two *Sacra-*

ments absolutely necessary to salvation: q.d. there are more, and those necessary, though not absolutely necessary to salvation.

Lord *Brooks* Book. English Catechism in the Book of Common-prayer.

But for the *indelible Character* that should come from hence to make up the *formality* of a Priest, that to mine own knowledge I have heard stoutly defended and determined in the Schools of the University.

50

It were worth the while, if we could pry a little narrowly into this conceit, that we might discern what is the *fashion of this Character*, when it is expressed to the full; that we might find some footstep for a man's *fancy* to stay upon.

The refined secrecy and subtilty of this speculation is so high, that it forced the Schoolmen to snuff the candle so near, that they put out the light.

For first, they will have it to be a quality divers from grace, only a preparation thereunto.

Secondly, it must be common to all that receive the Sacrament, truly or feignedly such.

Thirdly, it must be fixed and engraven in the soul in that indelible manner, so that it cannot be blotted out, nor burnt out in the flames of Hell: And in truth, we cannot easily see the flight and cunning in carving out *this Character*; for the *aim* of this device was threefold.

First, *That the dignity of the Episcopacy might be advanced*: and thence it was, whatever action carries an eminency in any kind, or might cause and cast a reflection of respect upon it, that must be given to *It*, that so men might have an eye *thereunto*, and a special reference and dependance *thereupon*.

Secondly, *That the honour of Priesthood* (as Papists and Prelates speak) *might be maintained*, some special excellency must be left upon it: And Because the baseness of the carriage of that Popish crew might bring their persons and places out of esteem, therefore they must have some Character that could not be defaced: because their loudness and wickedness was such, that it would deform the very impressions of morality, therefore they devised such a Character that should be engra-

ven so deep, that the most abominable prophaneness of Hell it self mould not eat it out to eternity.

3. Because the right of the one, in what he gave, and the worth of the others, in what he received had *no reality*, therefore they must *join* something, as a far fetched *conceit*, that the secrecy might hold men in *admiration* of, that which passed their apprehension, and thence came theminting of this *mysterious nothing*.

This indelebilis character comes out of the forge of Popery, and is so besooted with the smoke of the bottomless pit, and carried along in the fogs of the mysteries of iniquity, that

51

by a secret sleight it hath eaten insensibly into the *orders of Christ* before the world was aware.

And hence it is, the *School*, who commonly when they attend their own liberty of dispute, will speak out: they are so dazzled in their own sayings, that they do in issue, as much as profess, *they know not what they say*.

Some, that it cannot be gathered from the sacred Scriptures, nor the testimony of the Fathers, nor from natural reason.^a

Others, that authority only gave it life, and that *nonmultum antiquam*.^b

Some, that reason doth not demonstrate it, nor evident Authority prove it.^c

Nay, *lastly*, that the determination of the Church (in whose bowels it was bred, and had its being, if any where) is not express in the point.^d

And hence they cannot tell *what to make of it*; one while its *ens relatum*, as *Durand* and *Scotus*. Another while it must be *ens absolutum*, as *Thomas*. Whether to refer it, they cannot conclude.

Some will have it in the first species of a quality.^e Some in the second.^f Others choose the third.^g Others the fourth.^h And all these are like the *Midianites*, at daggers drawing among themselves, seek by might and main how to confirm thiiir own imagination, how to confute other.

Thus, when they would have it, they cannot tell *where* to find it, *where* to set it.

Some will have the *understanding* to be the subject of it, as *Thomas*. Some the *will*, as *Scotus*.

That it is *no saving* grace, they will all confess; because the worst of men may have it.

That it is no *commm* grace, because it doth appertain only to some persons in order.

But it must be a supernatural quality which perfects the soul, and makes a man like to Christ, and continues with him in hell. *A pretty tale*.

A man must have a supernatural grace, and have it for no end, when he hath it, and that to conform a man to Christ in hell. This must perfect the soul, when the soul hath all evils in the full source and perfections of them.

It's a common quality in regard of man's nature. It's not

a *Scotus* 4. sentent. distinct. 6. quest. 9.

b *Cajetan*.

c *Gabriel* 4. sent. dist. 6.

d *Ibidem*.

e *Vasquer* 3. qu. 63. disp. 154.

f *Thom.* 3. qu. 63. Art. 4.

g *Alliodorens.* l. 4. Arr. 3. c. 2.

h *Marsilin.* 4. qu. 4. Art. 1.

52

omni nor *solī*. And it hath no special inseparable principle in the soul, which should make it inseparable.

So the sum which returns, after so much ado, is this: We have found a *mysterious nothing*, which cannot enter into the imagination of a rational man; only, if any will *admire* and *adore the device*, that he is not able to discern, he may, and truly make his *ignorance the mother of that devotion*.

Thus we have taken leave to *sport* our selves, as it were in this weary travel, with this speculation of the Popish vassals and the Prelacy; which is not altogether unuseful, if it was for nothing else but this, to shew how *wily the vain mind of man it, to coin devices, to darken the truth of God, and to delude it self*.

We come nearer home, and our second Conclusion is,

2. Conclusion.

Ordination administered according to the method and mind of Master R. namely, as preceding the

election of the People, it doth not give essentials to the outward call of a Minister.

Argum. 1.

For its cross to the Apostles institution, given in express charge, Acts 6:3. *Look out from among you seven men of honest report.* Contrary to their present practice, ver. 5. *And the saying pleased the people, and they chose, and they set them before the Apostles.*

If none but these, who were first elected by the people, should be ordained; and all such who were so chosen could not be refused. Then to ordain before choice, is neither to make application of the rule, nor communion of the right, in an orderly manner: and so in issue defaceth and makes ineffectual the frame of the institution; and it is too hastily to invest a man in a place, who hath no reality of right to it.

But the *first* is plain from the place alleged. Nor need that stumble any in this base, becaust the instance is given of *Deacons*, which are Officers of a *lower ranks*; since the *reason* is the *like* in both, or rather forceth a *fortiori*, as we speak. For they have as great interest in the one as the other; nay, have a *greater dependance* upon their *Rulers*; and are engaged to a *greater subjection* to them; and to *provide* for their honour in a

53

more especial manner, both *reverence* and *maintenance*; therefore *Quod ad omnes spectat, ab omnibus debet approbari*: Whence it is, that the Apostle ever hath an especial eye to the people in this, as their peculiar privilege.

Object. If that be here objected, (which is often and ordinary in the mouth of the Prelates, and their followers) *Tit. 1:5* That the Apostle delegated this authority to *Titus*, and put the dispensation of it into his hand: For *this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain Elders in every City, as I have appointed.*

Answ. True, the Apostle did appoint *him* to do this work, but to do it *according to his mind*; and in the *order* which *Christ had instituted*, and of which he had given him a *precedent* by his own practice; namely, when the Elders were elected and presented by the Church, he then laid on hands upon such, and such only, according to the order of Christ in that behalf.

That manner of Sovereignty in proceeding, which the Apostle would not take, nor use in the Churches, in reason he would not allow his Scholar to arrogate to himself.

But shall we take *Paul's practice for a precedent* in this behalf? his course is plain, *Acts 14:23. When they had created them Elders in every Church* (or as the *Geneva* reads it, *when they had ordained Elders by election in every Church*) *and prayed and fasted, &c. they commended them, &c. to God, &c.*

Certain it is, that the Officers were complete in their institution, and had a *full call*, and *full right* for the execution of their places; and therefore *laying on of hands*, either was not of necessity required, or else it was included, and is to be understood in that they *fasted and prayed*; so that the *people had the chief hand* in the calling of Officers, they first choosing, before any ordination could be orderly dispensed.

And that this was the mind of the Apostle, and the meaning of his charge to *Titus*; the words or the text shew, for its added, *that he should redress things amiss*; and must not this be done by the Officers; and the Church also, according to the rule of Christ?

Argument 2.

It's not the scope of Ordination, by God appointed; to give the essentials of an Officers call; therefore, from thence it is not to be expected man orderly way.

54

The force of the *consequence* is so full and undeniable, that it gains consent without any gainsaying.

The *Antecedent* only needs proof, and to that we shall apply our selves; That the *scope of ordination* is *not* by the intendment of the Spirit, to *give the essentials* of an outward call. I suppose it will appear from that *famous place*, 1 Tim. 4:14. which is this Treatise of Mr R. hath so often been alleged, and conceived also to carry another since.

Let us therefore in God's fear address our selves to a serious consideration of the severals in the Texts, that when through search and examination is made, we may then see what certain *conclusion* can be inferred therefrom, and so ease

our selves for future times of any further trouble from this Text, when ever it shall be alleged against us.

Three things then require special explication in the Text.

1. *What the gift is*, here said to be in *Timothy*.
2. *How it was given by Prophecy*.
3. *What the laying on of the hands of the Elders adds*, and why used.

I. *What this gift is.*

The word *χάρισμα*, translated here *Gift*, hath according to the divers acceptions of it, occasioned Interpreters diversly to express their apprehensions: we shall leave each man to his own apprehension, and crave liberty to weigh each particular, according to the balance of the Sanctuary and where the truth casts the seals, our judgements may willingly be carried that way.

The word then in the first place signifies, *such graces and gracious dispositions of heart*, which are *freely given us of God*: and thus it is most common, and frequently used; whether they be common graces which are bestowed upon such as have no interest in Christ, as *1 Cor. 12:9, 28. 1 Cor. 7:7*. Or *such*, which in *saiving manner* belong to those that are effectually called; as somethne the H. Apostle, *we hope better things, and such of accompany salvation: Better graces and gifts then ordinary, and better then those*, the common and ordinary men of the world, attain unto; because they are such as *have salvation* attending upon them; thus *Rom. 6:23. & 11:28*.

Hebr. 6:9.

Sometime it is put for *the offices and places*, unto which men

55

are through grace fitted, and out of God's good pleasure called, so *Rom. 12:6*.

It lastly implies the *gift of grace*, which through the obedience of Christ is given us for our *Justification*, *Rom. 5:15. ὄυτο καὶ το χάρισμα*. And *Chamierus* conceives, it's never taken in this sense but only in this place.

This last sense beyond all question suits not with the place, as all the circumstances in the Text give in evidence, and therefore Interpreters fall upon the former.

p. 24.

Some understand Docendi facultatem, Chrysost. Theodoret, Oecumenius.

Some, Docendi officium; and this is the common current, and carries the consent of the most with it: Anselmus, Lombard, Thomas, Cajetane; and Gersome Bucerus, a man of an accurate judgement, conceives and concludes this to be most suitable to the hope of the place, dissert. de Gubernat. eccl. p. 340.

In this variety, I suppose there is liberty for any to lean to that opinion which he likes best; and I must confess freely, when I have weighed all things, I rather incline to the former of the two: for all the leading, yea, calling circumstances of the places seem to carry it that way, to wit, that by gift must necessarily be meant, those spiritual and gracious abilities, which Timothy received by the Spirit in way of prophecy (of which presently) and by which he was fitted and furnished to that extraordinary work of an Evangelist, being the office appointed him of God; so that though the Office is not here firstly and primarily intended, yet these extraordinary gifts and endowments bestowed upon Timothy, are attended with an eye, and certain reference thereunto; and therefore that is not altogether excluded, but taken into consideration in the second place: or more narrowly, These gifts are looked at as they look that way, are bordering and butting thereupon: for it is not only a frame of speech which we hardly find used; we are not wont to speak thus, forget not the office that in IN YOU, when a man is not only more properly, but more truly said to be IN HIS OFFICE; nay, the very nature and reality of the thing requires this also: An office is a relation adjoined to a man, not inherent in him; Retatio est adjunctum adhærens, non inhærens qualitas.

Besides, that place which is parallel to this, and speaks expressly to the same purpose, 2 Tim. 1:6. Stir up the gift χάρισμα,

56

which was given thee by the laying on of my hands: the sense therefore must be the same in both. A man is not said to *stir up his office* that is in him, but to stir up the grace that is in him, being put into office. We have done with the first.

The second thing that comes to be enquired is,

2. *How this was given by Prophecy.*

For the understanding of this, because sundry inconveniences attend upon the mistaking of this passage, we must know, Though the *office* of an *Evangelist*, both for gifts belonging to it, the nature and the continuance thereof, (they being raised up as waterers of that Doctrine, whereof the Apostles were first and extraordinary planters;) though, I say, *the calling was extraordinary*, yet it is *not necessary* it should be *immediately always*, since the Scriptures seem evidently to allow a large breadth; namely, *sometimes* it is *immediate* by the operation and peculiar inspiration of the spirit: sometimes *mediate*, the Ministry of man interceding.

Of the first of these we have an instance in *Philip* the Evangelist, who before the dispersion and scattering of the Church, was called to the place of a *Deacon*; but after the dispersion, without the privity and knowledge of the Apostles, he went into *Samaria*, and there preached the Gospel, and is styled an *Evangelist* by the spirit of God, *Acts* 8:12, 26. compared, and 21:6.

Of the second sort, we have an instance in the present Text concerning *Timothy*, whose choice to his office was not left to the judgment of men, but was determined by the immediate dictate and direction of the spirit: *quod affirmat Calvinus: non humano suffragio, sed divinâ revelatione inquit Theodoretus: spiritus mandate, interpretatur Oecumenius.*

This way of divine revelation, styled prophecy in the place, was acted in a double manner: *Sometime* the Spirit, by some Prophet present and raised to that purpose, did *point out*, as it were, by the finger and voice of God, such a one to such a place, or to such a special design in the place unto which they were called; so *Acts* 13:2, 3. *When they were falling and serving the Lord*, in that solemn manner, *the holy Ghost said*, [*i.e.*] by some Prophet stirred up he gave that intimation, *ver.* 1, 2.

Sometime the Spirit did by special revelation dictate to the

57

Apostles, and prophetically discover who those were, that they should call to such a service, and whom he would enrich and furnish with graces, to so great a work as that was.

And this Bish. *Bilson* observed in his Book of the government of the Church: *for if the spirit of God* did immediately direct the Apostles in their *travels* and *journeys*, and point out their *places* expressly whither they should go, in reason we cannot but conceive and conclude, the *holy Ghost* would not be wanting to discover to them what *companions* were most fit to further their comfort, and the work especially commended to their care, because there was greater need of direction, and greater good and benefit could not but redound, by the right choice of the one, then the other.

Cap. 7. 120. & cap. 9. 167.

And *this last sense I conceive most suitable to the present place*, (leaving each man to his own choice) namely, he enjoins him to stir up the grace, which by the imposition of his hands (*being directed by the spirit of Prophecy*) he did according to God his *special appointment* communicate unto him; As that was the usual ceremony taken up for that end and purpose, *Acts 19:6.* by the Apostle in conveying the graces of the Spirit.

And thus all things suit comely: the words are *διὰ προφητείας*, not *διὰ προφητων*; and *διὰ ἐπιθεσεως χειρων*, and *διὰ προφητείας*, aimed at one, and are the explication each of other.

3. The third thing to be enquired is,

What the laying on of the hands of the Eldership adds.

This being in short opened, we shall issue *the proof of the ARGUMENT* with evidence of dispute from the place.

The Eldership here, notes not the Office but the Officers; for as Mr R. elsewhere well observes, *the Office hath no hands*; nor is the word ever found so used in all the new Testament: and were this the sense here to be attended, let the words be expressed and set down in that signification, not only reason would reject, but the *very care* would not relish such an unsuitable sense; *Forget not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by*

Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the OFFICE. How harsh and unpleasant is such an expression?

By *Eldership* then is meant the *Officer*: but whether they were the *Pastor and Teacher*; and the *ruling Elders of one Congregation*, called a *Consistory*; or whether they were the concurrence

58

of the *Officers of many Congregations* together, termed a *Classis*; I could never yet hear any arguments that did evince either, by dint of undeniable evidence, *Didoclav.* 160.

Either apprehension will serve our turn, and therefore we will not disquiet the Reader with any needless debates. We say, then, This imposition of hands added not to the constitution of Timothy, his office, gave not essentials thereunto; but only a solemn approbation, thereof, and this we force by double REASON from the Text.

1. *That which was beyond the power and place of the Presbytery, that they could not communicate.* Nothing acts beyond the bounds of its own being.

But to give the essentials of Timothy his office, was beyond the power and place of the Presbytery, either Congregational or Classical: For the Office was extraordinary, their places and power ordinary: that was to cease, and is now ceased; which should not be, were it in the power of ordinary Officeecs (who yet remain in the Church, and shall do to the end of the world) to give being thereunto.

2. *Beside, it hath formerly appeared and been proved, that the gift here named, was not the Office, but the Graces which were in Timothy, which should be stirred up by him, and therefore discovers those gracious abilities and qualifications, whereby he was apted and enabled to that extraordinary, work; whence the inference,*

The outward gifting and fitting an Officer to his place, especially extraordinary, is beyond the power and place of a Presbytery.

But the first is here.

Ergo, in short, the natural and native sense of the place is only this; Despise not those gracious qualifications which God by his spirit in the extraordinary way of Prophecy hath furnished and betruſted thee withall: The laying on of the hands of the Eldership by way of consent

and approbation concurring therewith to thy further encouragement and confirmation in thy work.

And thus the woof of the words lies fair and even, and the whole frame goes on pleasantly: And hence it is that studious and judicious *Didoclavius* observes seasonably and truly, *the difference* betwixt those two expressions; where the *χαρισμα*, given to *Timothy* is spoken of with reference to *Paul* as having a *hand* therein, then the phrase is, 2 *Tim.* 1:6. διὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ;

59

but when it's spoken with respect to the *Eldership*, the phrase then is μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρισβυτεπίου: *it's* *By the hands of Paul*, there is a causal virtue, under Christ, of constitutions but it's *WITH the hand of Eldership*, as concurring by way of *approbation* only.

This ground being gained, many things follow for our further direction.

[*Quære.*]

Hence it is plain, that *Ordination therefore* presupposeth an *Officer constituted*, doth not constitute; *therefore* it's not an act of *Power*, but *Order*; *therefore* those who have *not the power of Office*, may put it forth; *therefore* though it be most comely, that those of the *same* Congregation should exercise it, yet the *Elders* also of *other* Congregations may be invited hereunto, and interested in the exercise of it in another Church, where they have no power, and upon a person who hath more power in the place than themselves: Thus it was here, *Timothy* was an *Evangelist*, and therefore by virtue of his *Office* was to move from place to place, to water where the *Apostles* had planted, as either the need of the people did require, or the *Apostles* did call, and in those places, *where* the *Elders* who laid on their hands had certainly nothing to do: they might reasonably approve of that power which they could not give nor exercise.

Argument. 3.

That *action which is common to persons and performances or employments, and applied to them, when there is no Office at all*

given, that action cannot properly be said to be a specifying act to make an Officer, or give him a Call.

For if it was such an act, that would certainly bring in the form of an Offices where that was, an Officer would be.

But the action of imposition of hands, is applied to persons and to performances, as special occasion is offered, when there is no Office given, nor indeed intended.

Therefore it is not an act which gives in the essentials to an Officer.

The *minor* is evident by instance, Acts 13:2, 3, 4. *As they were ministering, some Prophets and Teachers, the Spirit said, Separate unto me Barnabas and Paul, unto the work which I have called*

60

them: and when they had fasted and prayed, and laid on their hands, they let them go.

Where for our purpose in hand, *these particulars* are presented to our view.

First, the Spirit *had formerly* called *Paul and Barnabas* to the work, and therefore, the words are in the Preterperfect tense, *προσκέκλημαι*. Nay, secondly, we read of *Paul* his Call and Commission given him express, *Acts 9:16, 17*. And lastly, the Office being *extraordinary* and *immediate* from God, it could not be, that the Officers or Elders of the Church could be the cause of the call, for that implies a contradiction, to be *mediately* and *immediately* called.

Secondly, that the Church by her Officers were therefore appointed to separate them to that service, unto which they had been before called of the Lord.

Thirdly, this separation is signified & performed by prayer, and laying on of the hands of the Officers; which was *not* to put a *new Office* upon them, but *confirm* their sending unto the Gentiles, *Chamierus lib. 4. de Sacram. N. T. cap. 24. p. 25. Non putamus hanc impositionem manuum, ullam fuisse ordinationem ad novum munus Ecclesiasticum, sed confirmationem missionis, &c.* whence it's plain, That imposition is an act which is common to persons, and applied upon other occasions; *therefore is not a specifying act to bring in this call of an Officer.*

And upon this ground it seems it is, that the Church of *Scotland* is so far from conceiving laying on of hands necessary

in Ordinations, that they do not only not use it, but judge it unlawful to be used, unless some special considerations be attended; as it may appear in that accurate work called, &c.

Argument 4.

If Ordination give the essentials to an Officer before Election, then there may be a Pastor without People, an Officer, sine titulo, as they use to speak, and a person should be made a Pastor at large, as to follow Master R. his similitude: the Ring that is made and completed in the Goldsmith's shop, it's ready for any man that comes next, who will buy, being made to his hand.

61

But this individuum vagum, or a Pastor at large is irregular and cross to the order of the Gospel: For,

First, in this (as Master *Best* saith) an Apostle differeth from a Pastor, that the Apostle is a Pastor through the whole Christian world; but the Pastor is tied to a certain Congregation out of which he is not to exercise Pastoral acts.

To this Master R. answers, “*We allow of no Pastors ordained without a certain flock.*”

I reply, *Quid verba audiam, cum videam facta?* what they allow in word is one thing; if their opinion of necessity infer what they seem not to allow, is another: their grant hath, a constraining power to conclude what Master *Best* alleageth. For if a Pastor may have all his essentials without a certain flock, then he may be a Pastor without it, there being no more required to the essence of his Office. And I strange how Master R. remembered not what he wrote two pages before 263. “*That A. B. is made indefinitely a Pastor for a Church.*”

“*Suppose a people should reject a Pastor, and that upon just grounds, (he confesseth not many lines before) that they cannot make him no Pastor, yet they can make him be without a certain flock.*”

That which is added doth not loosen the knot, but eyes it faster; for where it's said, “*An Apostle was Pastor to all the world, yet might be exercise Pastoral acts of Preaching and Praying towards those people, who would not receive his Ministry.*”

Reply. The same may be said of this *Individuum vagum*; upon the former ground and grant, he may exercise his

Pastoral act even to Heathens, who reject him and his preaching.

That which is lastly answered yields the cause wholly, for these are the words, p. 266. “*And a Pastor is ONLY the Pastor of that flock over the which the holy Ghost, by the Churches authority, hath set him as their Pastor; but yet so as when he preacheth in another Congregation, he ceaseth not to be a Pastor, howbeit not the Pastor of that flock.*”

WE ARE THEN AGREED, and the conclusion is granted.

If a Pastor be [ONLY] only the Pastor to that flock, then is he not a Pastor to any beside, then can he do no Pastoral acts to them; To whom he is not Pastor, to them he can do no Pastoral acts; but in that place and to that people he is not a Pastor, therefore to

62

them he can do Pastoral acts, *Quod suit demonstrandum?*

True, while he preacheth to another Congregation, he ceaseth not to be a Pastor: it's that, we all say and grant, but yet he doth not preach as a Pastor: He expounds in his own family, and prays as a Master of his family, but not as a Pastor, and yet he ceaseth not to be a Pastor whilest he doth that work: He is such while he doth it, but doth it not as such.

It's obvious to each man's apprehension; a thing may have many relations, and may act by virtue of one only; though it have the other, yet nor doth, nor can act by those other in that place.

A Constable in a Town, a Major in a City, they are Officers while they are in other places, but can do no acts of their Offices but only while they are in their own places.

Hither belongs that QUESTION which MASTER R. propounds, p. 261. and MAINTAINS.

“We hold that a Pastor may officiate as a Pastor without his own Congregation.”

His ARGUMENTS are four which come in order to be scanned,

1. *Argument of Master R.*

“*That which the communion of Sister-Churches require to be done, that Pastors may lawfully do. But that a Pastor as a Pastor may officiate, this the communion of Sister-Churches require: as in necessary absence of the Pastor, to keep the flock when gainsayers trouble, to convince that they may not pervert the flock.*

REPLY. The *assumption* is to be denied, and is left wholly destitute of proof: for supply may be lent in those propounded cases of necessity, by *Christian council*, and by *mutual consociation of advice*, though there be *no* expression of *Ecclesiastical jurisdiction* in that behalf: Nor can we be said to *take communion away* from Churches, where, *God never granted any right* of communion.

No man is said to take the communion of Cities a way, when he denies the *Major* of one to exercise authority in *the jurisdiction* or corporation of the other; for that was to take away their privileges and proprieties, not communities, as it will appear presently from Master R. his own principles.

63

2. *Argument of Master R.*

“*If Ministers may labour to convert unbelieving strangers, and to add them to their flock, that they may enlarge Christ’s Kingdom, then may they exercise Pastoral acts, over and above others, then those of their own charge. But the former it true, ergo, the Assumption is clear, Prov. 9:3. I Cor. 14:24.*

The Reply is, the proof is added where there is no need, that which is feeble and false, that is not at all confirmed, nor any attempt made to that purpose; and that is the *consequence* of the proposition, which hath not a shadow of truth in it.

When the Apostle stayed in *Jerusalem*, and the Church was persecuted and scattered, those that were scattered were *no Officers*, and yet *preached*, Acts 8:4.

Apollos a Christian Jew, *eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures*, *conferred publicly the Jews*, Acts 18:28. *edified much those that believed*, ver. 27. and yet *no Officer*.

And that it is the duty of all Christians to labour to convert unbelieving Strangers, Scriptures give in abundant testimony; and that many have been converted & more comforted by the labours of Christians, experience makes it more then evident.

The 3. Argument labours of the like Disease, namely;

“*Because divers Congregations are to keep visible communion in exhorting, rebuking, &c.*”

This I say labours of the like disease with the former, since all these may be done where no *Pastoral act* is, or *can* be done regularly, as out of Master R. his own principles it shall thus appear.

Those whom a Pastor cannot judge, over them he can exercise no Pastoral act; for that is one special act of a Pastor.

But Pagans and Infidels a Pastor cannot judge, p. 226. to them notwithstanding he may preach. Ergo, *barely to preach to a people is no Pastoral act.*

Again, a Pastor of one Congregation may preach unto another; a Pastor of *one Classis* or *Province* may preach in the assembly of *another Classis*, and in *another Province*; yet in none of these he can do any *Pastoral act*, as I shall prove from Master R. his grant.

Over whom a Pastor hath no power, over such he can do no Pastoral act, for that is an act of principal power.

64

But over these a Pastor hath no power; so Master Ruterford: “*We hold, that one Congregation hath no power over another, nor one Classis over another, nor one Province over another.*”

Thirdly, let this be considered, *If acts of Pastoral preaching, administration of Sacraments, and Church-censures, at convincing, rebuking, &c. be required by Church communion,* then there be *no acts* which a Congregation hath proper to it self; and this was not only to maintain *communion* but indeed to breed *confusion* in all the Churches.

Fourthly, *where a man hath right to administer Pastoral acts, there he hath Pastoral power;* where he hath right of Pastoral power, there he may by *right challenge the execution* of this Pastoral power: *therefore the Pastors of several Congregations without the Classis, may notwithstanding, crave liberty to press into the Classis assembled, to join their vote and censure, and sentence with the Classis, either to hasten or hinder any act; which were to whorry all things on heaps, and disturb the order of all Assemblies.*

And hence it was that the ancient Councils and Canons have ever added so much caution to curb and *confine* the power of *Bishops*, that they should not stretch the arms of their authority beyond the compass of their own Diocese.

That they made then a *Diocesan*, it was a *human device*; but yet they found it necessary to *restrain* the extravagancy of such; which did it belong to them *as Pastors indefinitely* to oversee *all*, they should not only have *wronged* them, but the *rule*, who so much enlarged their rule and jurisdiction.

And that which learned *Junius* speaks of the largeness and lawfulness of the extent of the Bishops rule by human grant, that to go beyond his bounds is to be *Ἀλλοτρι επισκοπος*, or *παρ-τεπίσκοπος*. I may truly apply to a *Presbyter*, who is staked down *τῷ ποιμενεῷ*, to the *flock over whom he is made overseer*, to play the *Bishop in another man's Diocese, or in every man's Diocese, is a last too big for his foot*.

That which is alleged touching the *partaking of the Sacrament by some of one Congregation in another*, hath of all the greatest difficulty, because the administration of the Sacrament is a *Ministerial act*, and can be done but *by a Pastor or Teacher*; and what *authority* hath he to do it, or *they* to receive it from him, to whom he is *non Pastor*?

65

To which I shall *Reply* thus; first, that it hath been a course which ever I have questioned; and against it many years since I have alleged many arguments, and therefore I could readily ease my self of the Argument, by professing the course unwarrantable. And that the course of the Churches in *England* in their corrupt way, hath given in some such like intimation; forbidding any to receive at another place, but only where they properly have their abode, and constant dependence upon the Ministry of the place.

But *supposing* it to be *lawful*, we will see how far the *Objection* will go, at the least how far it toucheth the cause in hand.

First then, these particulars are plain and beyond exception:

1. The Minister hath power to consecrate the elements in *his own place* and charge.

2. In that he *there* consecrates and administers, HE doth not go beyond HIS Pastoral power.

3. *Nor can he reject, whom the Assembly lawfully admits.*

Secondly, therefore now the question grows; *What title any of another Congregation have to come to the Sacrament, and by what right the Church can admit them?*

For the clearing of which proceeding, I shall offer these things to consideration, having an open ear to hear and learn.

First, a person hath *his first right* to a Sacrament, because he hath an interest in the *covenant of the Gospel*, of which it is a seal; but must come at it *in a right order* of Christ, *i.e.* the party must be *member of a visible Congregation*; because the seals can there only be rightly and orderly administered. I say *it's sufficient* the party be a member *of a visible Congregation*, not *this* or *that* particular.

Secondly, Hence, who ever is thus qualified, may *lawfully* be *admitted* to that ordinance *by the Assembly*; therefore cannot *lawfully* be *rejected* by the *Pastor: quad erat demonstrandum.*

So that *such an administration* doth not evidence that the Ruler doth any thing *beyond* his place, or hach any power *out of HIS* place or particular charge, or yet, that the *receiver* shares in any thing more then *His* right

The fourth and last Argument of M. Ruterf.

“That opinion must be reasonless and without ground, the special reason and ground whereof is false: but the special ground and reason of this opinion is false; therefore.

“The assumption is proved, because we are said to maintain, That election and ordination of Pastors is all one; and that Pastors have essentially their calling from the election of the people.

The Reply is.

The *assumption* and the proof of it, I never saw it writ, nor ever knew it practised by any amongst our selves. The utmost that ever I knew was ever acknowledged or avowed, is that of

Doctor *Ames*, namely, that *Ordination* it is *adjunctum consummans*; the *completing of the essence of a Pastor*, by an especial perfecting adjunct; but enters *not* into the *essential constitution*: but that *it and election* should be *all one*, I never yet knew it maintained.

We see therefore the *proof*, that should be the main pillar to bear up the stress of the argument, breaks all in pieces, and is a *mere* mistake; so that the force of the argument melts away like snow before the Sun.

That which remains as *part* of the *proof* of the *assumption*, That we say, *Pastors have essentially their calling from election*, we shall in the following discourse make good, Christ helping.

OUR FIFTH AND LAST Argument is:

If Ordination gives the essentials of a Pastor before election, the by THAT ALONE he hath Pastoral power: Against which I thus reason:

He that hath complete power of an Office, and stands an Officer without exception, he cannot justly be hindered from doing all acts of that Office. For to be an Officer complete, without an Office; or being complete in his Office, yet according to rule, to be hindered from doing any thing belonging to his Office, implies a contradiction: for it's all one as to say, a man is bound to a rule, and yet by a rule he should not do it.

But this is the condition of a Pastor, ordained, without the election of the people: He may according to the rule be justly hindered from executing any act of a Pastor. Suppose all Congregations fall; they may justly deny him any leave or liberty to Preach

68

or administer, either seal or censure amongst them. And so he shall be an Officer complete and without exception, and yet shall be justly and according to rule hindered from doing any act of his Office; which is cross to reason, and the rule of an Office-bearing.

By this time we have passed all the shoals and sands, which crossed us in our course, and have finished the Negative part of our Discourse, *viz. what it is that doth not give the essentials of the call of a Pastor.*

We are now come within the sight of the point, if through mercy we shall be able to weather it safely, we shall satisfy our selves.

For the AFFIRMATIVE PART, our

Conclusion then is this:

Election of the People rightly ordered by the rule of Christ, gives the essentia to an Officer, or leaves the impression of a true outward call, and so an Office-power upon a Pastor.

Argument 1.

It's taken from that *relation*, which God according to the rule of reason hath placed betwixt the *Pastor* and the *People*, whence the dispute grows.

One Relate gives king and the essential conflicting causes to the other.

Hut Pastor and People, Shepherd and Flock, are Relates, Ergo. Mr R. seems much to be moved with this reason, p. 262. but gives no proof at all of what he says; but only takes that for granted, which is the question in hand, or else he knows will be denied, and that deservedly.

For *his grounds* are these:

“Election doth not make a Pastor, because Ordination doth; which he barely affirms, and he knows is constantly denied, and hath in our foregoing dispute beene disproved. He adds, Election doth not make a Minister, but only appropriate him, being formerly made to the Church. Again, A. B. is indefinitely a Pastor to a Church.

68

These are bare assertions, which may be with as much right and ease denied as affirmed, and have been proved in our foregoing conclusions to be disagreeing to the truth. Laying aside then all prejudice, let us look over the several proportions of the Argument, and see where the doubt can arise.

The *Proposition* is supported by the *fundamental* principles of *reason*, so that he must raise out the received *rules of Logic* that must reject it: *Relata sunt, quorum unum constat e mutuâ alterius affectione*: and hence all men that will not stifle and stop the passage of rational discourse, forthwith infer, that therefore

they are *simul naturâ*, are together in nature one with another: a *father*, as a relate or father, is *not before his son*, buying before selling, selling before buying.

Assumption. That *Pastor* and *People*, *Shepherd* and *Flock* are relates, no man that hath sipped on *Logic*, hath a forehead to gainsay.

The premise being so sure and plain, the *conclusion* must be certain and undeniable.

And hence also it will follow, that they are *simul naturâ* and the other one cannot be before the other; *there cannot be a Pastor before there be a People, which choose him. Episcopalis ordinatio sine titulo, est æque ridicula* (says *Ames*, med. Th. l. 1. c. 39. p. 35.) *ac si quis maritus fingeretur esse absque uxore.* And indeed it is a ridiculous thing to conceit the contrary.

And hence again it follows, that *Ordination*, which comes after, is *not* for the *constitution* of the *Officer*, but the *approbation* of him so constituted in his *Office*. For, *Relata* are *unum uni*, says the rule, and completely give mutual causes each to the other.

Argument 2.

It's lawful for a People to reject a Pastor upon just cause (if he prove pertinaciously scandalous in his life, or heretical in his Doctrine) *and put him out of his Office, ergo, it is in their power also to call him outwardly, and to put him into his Office.*

The *consequence* is plain from the staple rule, *Ejusdem est instituire, destituere.*

The antecedent is as certain by warrant from the Word; Beware of wolves, Matth. 7:15. Beware of false Prophets, Phil. 3.2.

Master R. answers, p. 265. "it's true, the People have power to

69

"reject him from being their Minister or Pastor, but their power reacheth not so far as to reject him from being no Pastor.

Reply. If this be true, then a species may be destroyed, and the general nature in it preserved; the particular and individual nature of *Thomas* or *John* may perist and be dissolved, and yet that general nature of *Thomas* or *John* shall still be safe and maintained, which is, I confess, beyond my understanding.

1. *However*, this I am sure of, unless the fundamental rule of reason fail, *Sub;ato uno relalorum, tollitur alterum*, and they are but *unum uni*; and therefore if that relation betwixt them *two* fail, it *fails altogether*.

Lastly, this rejection cuts him off from being a member in that Congregation where he was, and so from every visible Congregation, therefore cuts him off from having any visible Church-communion with Christ, as a Political head of the visible Church, therefore from being any ministerial member, and so an Eye, or Hand, or Officer in that Body,

Argument 3.

It is taken from the *manner of the communication and conveyance of this power*, which we do conceive doth of necessity require, it must be derived by way of *election*.

Here we must crave leave to prepare for our dispute, by some previous *excitation*, that so the force of the argument may appear with fuller evidence; and it may be also, the whole cause and carriage of this part of Discipline may receive some discovery, that will not be altogether unwelcome to the Reader.

Know then we must, that conveyance of power is done two ways: either by

Authoritative Commission; or delegation from Office, or Office-power.
Or *voluntary subjection*.

Authoritative Commission is, when a particular person, or body and corporation, *delegates power* to another of themselves, and *from themselves alone leave an impression of authority upon another*: and then its certain, the person or the body must have the *power seated in themselves*; because all the causes of that power issue out of themselves alone, in that there is none

70

other to join with them, or concur by any causal virtue with them to that work.

Hence, the *superior* may delegate to the *inferior*.

Hence, he may give *some* part of his power to another, and *keep* to himself the *chiefest*. As he that is Lord of divers Mannors and Towns, may give away both Land and Lordship, over the places and persons to others, and reserve some roy-

alty (as they call it) to himself. So a *King* or *State*, or some supreme power, in whom such authority is seated, may make *under-officers*, as *Sheriffs*, *Bailiffs*, *Constables*, &c.. *Nay*, may leave his power wholly, and give it up and his place also unto another, as in ordinary course is usually seen and observed. But to *give* his power *wholly* to another, and *yet* to *keep* his place and authority he cannot; and therefore to make another *fully equal* with him, in the full power he had, and now communicates, *that he cannot do*. A Prince may divide his Possession and rule into two portions, and make others share with him therein, and that equally (namely, equal to what *now* he hath, not what he *had*.) And hence it comes to pass, when *ordination* was conceived to be *authoritative delegation* (I speak only of a *Ministerial* manner of dispensation) and put into the hand of the *Bishop*; He presently begins to challenge place of *superiority* over those to whom he delegates. That the whole care and cure of the *Diocese* belongs to him, and he commits *several portions* to several men, that they might *share* in *partem sollicitudinis*, when HE had *plenitudinem potestatis*, as they use to speak.

And therefore *hence* came that woeful generation of *Curates* and *Vicars*. And that *device of ordination sine titulo*, when the *Bishop* left *some impression of his power* (as it were in *deposito*) until there came a fit time to dispense it.

Hence came *the mangling of Offices* into broken parts. There must be one *ordination* to make him *Deacon*, another to make him *Priest*: and when all is done, the poor *Devotiatory* must have yet a further *Licence* to Preach. By all which, not only the Fees of the Court and the Bishop's Officers came to be replenished; (but which is, and was the *main*) that it *might hence appear*, that the power was seated in him, and he carves out such pieces and portions thereof to his underlings, as suits best with his pleasure.

70

Some of these pangs of *Popery* and *Prelacy*, like the *moths* of the *Mystery* of iniquity, have eaten into the *Presbytery* in some measure. *They have taken power to themselves to ordain before election*, and to make *indefinite Pastors*; which argues they must have power seated in themselves; *all the causes* of this Office-

power *arising* from themselves: *they clip the wings, nay in truth cut off the hands of the Congregation in the work of censure*: For they have taken this liberty from them. For that Church that may speak to the offender, that Church in case he hear not, may excommunicate the offender. But they say, the Classis only can do that.

From the former ground it also follows:

1. That he who is of the lowest administration, or whose Ministerial power is the lowest in his kind, *he cannot delegate to another*: for then, to a lower.

2. That he who is bound to officiate or execute his own place in his own person, he cannot delegate it, or any part thereof to another.

3. Where a person never had power to rule, he cannot there give power to rule.

From which grounds I would reason:

If a Person, and so a Presbyter, have Ministerial power, and that in the lowest kind of it, and are bound to execute their own places, in their own serious alone; Then can they not delegate their power or any part thereof to another.

But the first is true; therefore,

I would here demand, *what that power is*, which is conceived they do *delegate* from themselves *alone*? I say [*alone*] (*ut supra*) because all the causes of the power issue out of themselves alone.

It cannot be a *supernatural saving quality*, because it is given; to such who have no saving grace.

It cannot be a *common grace*, because then there would certainly be found some real change, by the conveyance of such *babies*, and that upon such a sudden, as the laying on of hands, which we see there is none; and then the loss or *defacing* of such common qualities would take away the *essentials* of the call, and nullify the essence of an Officer; which we see it nor doth, nor can, as it appears in the *Pharisees*.

What then is communicated? (we here see what use we have of

the consideration of Character, *indelibilis* before;) to speak home at a push, *if any be communicated, it must be a relation*; so Durand confesseth, speaking of the character, which is left (as

they dream) by the Sacrament of *Order*, when he could find no footstep of any reality, *where* to set it, and *what* to make of it, be *ingeniously professeth it is a Relation*, because that answers all the ends of this intention. And herein he says true, but withal overthrows what they intend by what he says; for *if it be a relation: where are the termini or foundation betwixt whom this relation stands?* here we are utterly at a loss, and that the rest of the Popish crew easily perceived, and therefore would not give way to this, because they clearly perceived, that the *Pastor* was in *relation to his people*; and then the *essence* of this *indelibilis* character, and so this power also must *arise from his people*, which would quite spoil the fashion of the Sacrament, and the *sovereignly* of the *Bishop's* ordination.

Sentent. 40. qu

Secondly, there is a communicating of power by VOLUNTARY SUBJECTION when, though there be *no Office-power, formaliter* in the people, yet they willingly yielding themselves to be ruled by another, desiring and calling of him to take that rule; he accepting of what they yield, possessing that right which they put upon him by free consent; *hence ariseth this Relation and authority of Office-rule.*

The reason;

Those in whose choice it is whether any shall rule over them or no; from their voluntary subjection it is, that the party chosen hath right and stands possessed of rule and authority over them.

Hence many things.

First, there is an *act of power put forth in election.*

That which causally gives essence and Office-power, that puts forth an act of power, *Ergo*. And therefore the similitudes (which would darken the declaration of this truth used by Master R. p. 265.) do not hold. “*Now Ordination (says he) is an act of jurisdiction, such as to send an Ambassador: but that an Ambassador consent to go (such as is election) is no act of jurisdiction. For a Father to give his Daughter in marriage to one, is an authoritative act of a Father; but for the Daughter to consent to the choice is no act of authority.*”

The Reply is easy.

Election in the *concrete* (as we call it) implies two things;

1. The *choice* on the people's part:
2. The *acceptation* of the call on his part.

True, *consenting* argues no power; but *their giving of him authority* over them, their calling and by willing *subjection*, delivering up themselves to be ruled by him in Christ, is an *act of Power*.

Vocation esentia est in electione ecclesiæ, & acceptatione electi, Ames medul. lib. 1. c. 39. sect. 32.

Hence the power that the *Pastor* hath, extends no *larger* nor farther than *his own* people; he hath no more then what they give, no more but this: for their *subjection* is only from themselves.

3. Hence such may, by a *virtual power*, bring in the impression of a *ruling power*, who neither have the power formally nor can exercise the act of that power and place lawfully.

The Church or people can *make a Pastor* (as we say) by election, who *cannot do a Pastoral act*, as administer a Sacrament, &c. which is in this place especially to be observed, because the collection is full and fair from the conclusion proved, and the weakness, feebleness and falseness of the contrary collection, which Master *Ball.* and Master *R.* in several places take up, is here evidently discovered and answered, when they thus collect, "*If the people could virtually give being to Pastor and Teacher, then they might execute the Office of Pastors and Teachers:* the contrary whereunto hath been, evicted by the former Argument, and daily and ordinary experience yields the like.

The Aldermen choose the Major, Soldiers choose their General, and none of these have the rule of such Officers in them, nor can execute their places lawfully.

Whitaker contro. 4. c. 15. s. 2.

4. Hence persons may *virtually communicate* power to another, who *are inferior to*, and ought to be ruled by that power so communicated, because they gave both place and power to the Officers by *voluntary subjection*, investing them with rule and

right to govern, and promised reverence, submission and obedience to the rule and authority in their hands: so that when they walk according to the laws of that place and authority they have, they are to submit to them in the Lord: but when

74 [75]

they go beyond their place and power, they may by the rules of the Gospel reform there.

5. Hence, lastly, we see the feebleness of that conceit, which is mouldy with the tang of the mystery of iniquity, by which it was conceived first, and hath been maintained; *to wit*, that *episcopps general patres*, and this made a piece of the royalty and peculiar privilege belonging to his place.

We shall add a fourth Argument.

If he essentials of a Pastor be communicated from the Eldership or Bishop merely; then there will be Pastor of Pastors, and that in propriety of speech.

For the Pastor that is made by them hath reference to them, and dependance upon them as Pastors properly; for it is *that* which is contended for here in the question in hand, that it should be *appropriated to their places only to make Officers.*

But this Master R. condemns, and reason gainsays: for it would breed and bring a condition amongst all Offices and Officers, and it is charged upon us and our cause, as an absurdity, often by Master R. we desire they would take the charge home to themselves, to whom it justly belongs, as being firstly, guilty of it: and so at length we have done with the second thing.

We are now come to the third thing to be considered.

3. *What Ordination is.*

The premises formerly considered and drunk in, we shall only nakedly propound the description, not trouble the Reader with any tedious dispute about it; because the most and chief of the difficulties, which concern the nature of it, have been discussed fully before.

ORDINATION is an *approbation of the Officer, and solemn settling and confirmation of him in his Office, by Prayer and laying on of hands.*

The *severals of the description* have been cleared, in the foregoing conclusions; only that which is added, *touching the ceremony of laying on of hands*: though there be no convicting arguments in the Scripture, which will infallibly conclude it;

75[74]

yet, because it is most commonly received, and seems most probable out of that charge to *Timothy*; *Lay on hands rashly on no man, neither communicate with other men's sins*. I am willing to follow the rode, when I have no constraining reason to go aside.

Only I shall add in this place. That from the description now propounded, the explication and confirmation which hath been given before, it seems to be a *fair inference*, that *Ordination is not an act of supreme Jurisdiction, but of order rather. It gives not being or constitution to an Officer, but it rather the admission and confirmation of him in his Office,*

And though each ordinance of God hath his weight and worth; yet we should not lay greater stress, or *put more necessity* upon it, then the Lord himself doth: when we see, it hath appeared by former dispute, that *election* hath a greater hand in giving *being* and *essentials* of Office-power to any, then this: let it have his place. But to put so transcendent greatness upon it, will not pass current, when it comes to the scanning.

And therefore *Gersom Bucerus*, a man completely furnished with all manner of learning and language, makes a professed dispute against the comparative excellency of it; *Manus imperitio, quid est aliud, juxta Canonem, nisi oratio super hominem?*

Bucer dissert de gubern. eccl. 337.

Augustine his determination; *Ordinaire, quid est aliud nisi or are?*

Chrysostome, (1 *Tim.* 3.) calls it *ferme nihil*.

The issue is, The main weight of the work lies in the *solemity of Prayer*; which argues no *act of jurisdiction* at all.

Thus much then may suffice for the third thing propounded.

The fourth and last, which offers it self to our inquiry, with which we will end this dispute, is:

4. *To whom the right of dispensing this Ordinance doth appertain.*

Here we will first *state* the *Question* aright, that our opinion may not be mistaken, and so misjudged by prejudice. Secondly, we will add *an argument* or *two* to settle the *conclusion*, which we shall own, and so leave this head of Discipline to the Reader's judgement. The plain *state* of the *Question* may be presented in these particulars very shortly.

76

1. *When the Churches are rightly constituted, and completed with all the Orders and Officers of Christ, the** *RIGHT* *of Ordination belongs to the Teaching Elders; the Act appertains to the Presbyters constituted of Ruling and teaching, when an Officer, is invested in his place: for of these it is expressly spoken, even in the letter of the Text, 1 Tim. 4:14.*

* Reader, whether it be *Right* or *Rite*, or *right use*, we could not discern by the copy, it being not fairly written in that word.

So that to appropriate, this to a Bishop of peerless power, who is a mere human creature, invented merely to lift that man of sin into his chair, where there is not a syllable in the Text that founds that way, as he shall go against the Text that shall endeavour it; so it will be a course void of reason to trouble the *Reader* to confute it, which hath been done to our hands, by many judicious Pens of *Baynes*, *Bucer*, &c. whose arguments never yet had, nor will have answer; when its more then evident to him, that will not shut his eyes, or hath not blinded his eyes with the lustre and pomp of a worldly Prelacy, that *Paul's Episcopus* and *Presbyter* are *all one*.

2. Though the *act* of Ordination belong to the *Presbytery*, yet the *jus & potestas ordinandi*, is conferred *firstly* upon the *Church* by Christ, and resides in her. It's in them *Instrumentaliter*, in her *Originaliter*.

They dispense it immediately, she by them mediately. So *Junius contro. 5. l. 1. c. 7. not. 9. 45. Zanch, Bucerus, Hæc potestas (loquiter de potestate constituendi publicos Ecclesiæ Ministros) penes omnem eccesiam est, authority Ministerii penus Presbyteros & Episco-*

pos: ita ut Romæ olim potestas Populi fuit, autoritas Senatus. But most pregnant, and indeed impregnable is the testimony of *Melanchthon; Quum Episcopi (inquit) ordinarii fiunt hostes Ecclesiæ, aut nolunt impertire Ordinationem, Ecclesiæ retinent jus suum. Nam ubicunque est Ecclesia, ibi est jus administrandi Evangelii. Quare necesse est Ecclesiam retinere jus vocandi, eligendi, & ordinandi Ministros: & hoc jus est donum datum Ecclesiæ, quod nulla humana autoritas Ecclesiæ eripere potest, sicut Paulus testatur ad Ephes: cum ait, Ascendit, dedit dona hominibus, & enumerat inter dona propria, Ecclesiæ Pastores & Doctores, & addit, dari tales ad ministerium, ad edificationem corporis Christi; ubi igitur est vera Ecclesia, ubi esse necesse est jus eligendi, & ordinandi Ministros. De potestate Episcoporum argumento secundo.* What can be more plain, unless it was writ with the beam of the Sun? and as his judgement is full and clear, so his Argument is strong.

Bucer in Mat. 16.

77

All these *Officers* are *coronation-mercies* given to the Church; the *extraordinary* are given *immediately*; the *ordinary*, *mediately*; namely, that she should have power not only to *preserve* them when she hath them, but to *provide* them when she wants them: and unless she could do the one, she should never do the other. For were it so, that ordinary Pastors should be made, and then given to her, how were they not as immediate as the other? Most express to the same purpose is *Whitaker*, contr. 4. q. 2. c. 15. p. 2. *Ecclesiæ potestas data est suos episcopos & pastores nominandi & curandi: & quanquam tota non potest fungi hoc munere, potest tamen eligere & ordinari, qui eo fungantur.*

Thirdly, in case then that the face and form of all the Churches are generally corrupted, or else the condition of the Church is such, that she is *wholly destitute of Presbyters*, she may then out of her *own power*, given her by Christ, provide for her own comfort, *by ordaining her own Ministers*; and this according to the regular appointment of our Saviour, and the order of the Gospel.

Christ hath firstly the whole power of Ordination in himself, the Church as his Spouse hath it communicated to her; and *this power she exerciseth after a double manner*; either she *pro-*

vides, elects and ordains a Presbytery, by which she may ordain in future times; or having constituted and ordained such, she *preserves and maintains them*, that she may use them as *instruments* to ordain: the first of these ways she useth in *raising and renewing Churches after great apostacies* and universal departures from the sincerity of the truth: The second, in time of peace when *all the Ordinances of Christ are in their pure and constant use*, and Officers continued by an un-interrupted succession, in the profession and maintenance of the truth.

And touching this third all the difficulty lies and the difference is betwix us; we shall shortly therefore settle this conclusion by some few arguments which follow from the former dispute, and confirm this with undeniable evidence.

First, *If the power of ordaining rest firstly in the Church, then she may, and in this case having most need, should provide for her own supply: but the power of Ordination is given first unto the Church*, as hath been forced by Melancthon from ungainsayable grounds, ergo.

Secondly, *If the Church can do the greater, then she may do the less*; the acts, appertaining to the same thing, and being of the same kind.

78

But the Church can do the greater, namely, give the essentials to the Pastor, ut supra, ergo.

Thirdly, *That which is not an act of Power but Order, the Church may do in an orderly way.*

For the reason why it's conceived and concluded, that it's beyond the power of the people, it is because it is an act of supreme jurisdiction.

But this is an act of Order and not of Power.

Lastly, Most certain it is, that this cannot belong primarily to a Classis.

If a Classis must be ecclesia orta, and made of the Ministers sent from divers Congregations, then did Congregations provide Ministers firstly; for a Classis did not receive them from a Classis.

But the first is true, even from the constitutoin of a Classis, Ergo. And it is as certain, that it *cannot firstly belong to a Bishop*, which by human invention and consent is preferred before a Presbyter in dignity only, if they will hold, themselves either to the precedent or patent, whence they raise their pedigree:

And it is from that of *Hierom ad evagrium unum ex se electum in altiori gradu collocarunt.*

If Presbyters elected and gave first being to a Bishop, then were they before him, and could not receive Ordination from him. At primum ex concessis, ergo.

Chap. III.
Of an Independent Church.

Wherein the state of the Question is opened, the distateful term of INDEPENDENCY cleared, and the right meaning put upon it; Master R. his arguments in the thirteenth Chapter debated.

IT is the *subilty of Satan*, when he cannot wholly destroy the truth, which he especially desires, he labours to deface it what he may, and to present it in such unseemly appearances unto men, that either they reject it wholly; or if not *that*, yet

79

they are long before they receive it; or if they do, it being under jealousies and suspicions, they receive it but in part, and not with that full approbation as they might, and it deserves.

And hence through the *envy and distaste* of some, the *headiness and rashness* of others, men put such unsuitable expressions upon it, like an ill-shaped garment upon a well-composed body, that it shews somewhat deformed at the first sight.

This hath befallen the cause now in hand, by the term of *Independency* put upon it which because in common use it carries a rankness of Supremacy, which easily disrelisheth with the spirits of men, being used here somewhat improperly, at the first appearance it easily provokes a nauseous distaste in the spirit of the hearer, that is not acquainted so fully with the compass of the cause now under hand.

We shall take leave therefore to lay open *the state of the question* nakedly as it is, and narrow the expressions a little, where because of their unfitness and wideness, they leave a kind of ill favoured appearance upon the truth.

The state of the Question then may thus be conceived:

When we speak of the *Church*, as in this place, we look at it not as *totum essentiale* only, as they use to speak, as it is *made up* and constituted of *visible Christians*, gathered in the fellowship of the faith; but as *totum Integrale*, or *Organicum* (as *Ames* expresseth it, lib. 1. *medul.* cap. 33. part 18.) as it is *furnished* and *completed with all such Officers*, which Christ hath given to his Church for the perfecting thereof: for *then and not before*, the Church is said to be *able* in a right order to act and exercise all the ordinances of God.

2. When this Church is said to be *Independent*, we must know

That INDEPENDENCY implies two things;

1 Either an *absolute Supremacy*, and then it is opposed to *subordination*.

2. Or else a *sufficiency* in its kind, for the attainment of its end, and so it's opposed to *imperfection*.

Take that word in the *first sense*, so a *particular Church or Congregation is not absolutely supreme*: For its subject unto, and under the supreme power politic in the place where it is; so that the *Magistrate hath a coactive power* to compel the Church

80

to execute the ordinances of Christ, according to the order and rules of Christ, given to her in that behalf in his holy Word; and in case she swerves from her rule, by a strong hand to constrain her to keep it. He is a nursing Father thus to the Church, to make her attend that wholesome diet which is provided and set out, as her share and portion in the Scripture. Nay, should the supreme Magistrate unjustly oppress or persecute, she must be subject, and meekly according to justice, bear that which is unjustly inflicted.

Again, she is so far *subject to the consociation of Churches*, that she is bound, in case of doubt and difficulty, to crave their counsel, and if it be according to God, to follow it: and if she shall err from the rule, and continue obstinate therein, *they have authority to renounce the right hand if fellowship* with her.

In the *second sense*, the Church may be said to be *Independent*, namely, *sufficient to attain her end*; and therefore hath *complete power*, being rightly constituted, to exercise all the ordinances of God.

As *all Arts* are thus *complete* in their *kind*, and have a complete sufficiency in themselves to attain their own end; and yet are truly said to be *subordinate* each to the other in their works.

The Word, then, in its fair and inoffensive since, imports *thus much*, *Every particular Congregation, rightly constituted and completed, hath sufficiency in it self, to exercise all the ordinances of Christ.*

And thus there is no harshness in the Word that offends the Hearer; nor is the sense hard or difficulty which may load the cause with any loathsome distaste at all, was the mind not prepossessed with prejudice.

For it's granted or all, that it hath *this sufficiency* in the exercise of *some* ordinances; as to Preach, dispense Sacraments, without either craving or needing the content of the Classis; nor was she to yield to the judgement of the Classis, if they should forbid her to execute her work.

And if she have a completeness of power in the highest Ordinances, why she should be denied the like in those that are of less excellency, I know not: or why the one should be conceived so strange, and the other so ordinary and equal

81

I see not; the Apostle knew no dispensation of so choice an excellency as *Preaching*, which he prefers before any other; *I was sent to preach the Gospel, not to baptize*: q.d. that was the chiefest part of his errand. If *Ordination* or *Excommunication* had been of so great eminency above all other, certainly he would have mentioned some of them.

It was the old kind of reasoning, which went current, without any gainsaying: *predicate potest, corpus Domini consicere potest, ergo, potest etiam consecrare*; Plesseus apud Gers. Bucer, dissert. de gubern. eccles.

It's granted also by Master R. that in Islands which are separated from the main land, and therefore cannot enjoy the societies of neighbouring Churches, with that comfort and conveniency, as their occasions may require, that among them *ordination*, and so *excommunication* may be performed by the Congregation.

This being an ordinary and common case, which falls out in the usual and constant course of providence, and many such, which carry a proportion hereunto; I say, hence it appears, that the power natively and naturally lies in the Congregation.

For to think that *these occasions* should put God to such *extraordinary dispensation*, as to cross his ordinary rule; or that the exercise of the act of Ordination should again return into his own hand, to be immediately dispensed by himself, is too weak. As the Jesuits in the like manner are put to their shifts, when they cannot tell what is become of the power supreme that was in the *Pope*, when he dies; because there must not be two Popes on earth; they are therefore forced to say, that it is *re-assumed into the hands of Christ*; the feebleness of which conceit is confuted and condemned by all our Writers, *Wkitak. Junius, Ames*. The like may be here said: and to put the Lord Christ to immediate and extraordinary ways, when according to the course of ordinary traffic and commerce, as the States civil, in such places have intercourse with other States, so might the Churches have with other Churches: It hath no shew of Scripture or reason; especially if we add, That the first Synod, which is made a pattern to all the rest, was a concurrence of such Churches, which were two hundred miles off one from another.

87

Lastly, it shall anon appear, that he maintains such a *sufficiency* of acting all God's Ordinances amongst those, who are yet *not independent* in this opinion, and therefore the one may stand with the other.

Come we now to the consideration of such Arguments which Master R. allegeth against this *Independency* now propounded.

Argument I.

“If then be not a patten of such an Independent Congregation by precept or practice, when one particular Congregation with one Pastor and their Eldership did or may exercise all the power of the keys in all points; then such an Independent Congregation may not be holden.

“*But the former is true, There it no precept or practice of any such Church, ergo.*

He instanceth in Ordination, and desires either precept or practice to be given of that.

Answer.

Let it here be remembered, first, that the difference betwixt Master *R.* and us, is not in *cases*, either of *separation of Churches* one from another; or *special restitution* after great defections, and apostacies.

Secondly, *But the difference betwixt him and us is here; When the Churches are completed with all their Orders and Officers,* then it is not in the power of a particular Church to dispense Ordination: but *Ordination* is to be acted by a *Classis*, or *College of Pastors*, and *that before Election.*

Taking this *consideration* along with us, as the conclusion to be proved, *to wit,* “*Ordination must be dispensed by a Classis of Pastors, and that before election.*

I shall readily reply many things; and the rather, because this dish hath been so often set before us, and is brought in as one, in all services almost unto nauseousness: referring therefore to that, which we have formerly writ, we add here.

First, there is not the least shew, in all the Scriptures, of *Ordination before Election*, so dispensed; all the places alleged have not the least appearance of proof of this conclusion.

Secondly, when Churches were completed with all their

83

Officers that then Ordination was afted by *College of Pastors*, there is not a syllable in the text that saith any such thing.

Examine we particulars by a sudden survey, and both these will be evident at the first sight.

In the first of the *Acts*, there is but *one Church*, and no *Ordination* at all, “*For that is an act of supreme jurisdiction,* as Master *R.* But that the Apostles had supreme power to call an Apostle, whose calling was immediate, implies a contradiction.

In *Acts 6.* the Church there was not complete with Officers, and the *Apostles as extraordinary persons did act there*, as they might

in all other Churches that mould be erected; therefore this reacheth not our conclusion.

In *Acts* 13:1, 2, 3. There is no Oidination to Office at all, for the Apostles had their Office before: secondly, the Officers of *one* Church (for so the words go *in the Church of Antioch*) did what was done in an ordinary way; therefore no precedent for the Pastors of many Churches, what they either may, or should do.

But that out of *Acts* 14:23. how it can be haled in to the purpose in hand, it is beyond my apprehension.

First, for there is no mention made of the *laying on of hands*, but *lifting up* the hands.

Secondly, here are not Officers of many Congregations completed, but *Officers* to be made in each particular Congregation.

Thirdly, here is no act of *Ordination* mentioned but of *Election*.

Fourthly, and therefore that which is here alleged, was the prefer and *peculiar* act of *the people*, as all our Divines evince against Papists and Formalists; and the native signification of the word doth evidence, which must needs be here attended.

All which considered, thus to reason; If the people of one *Congregation*, *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordering the action, did choose their Elders; then ordination of Elders before election must be the act of the Pastors of many Congregations: this I say is wide the mark.

That of *Acts* 20:17, 28. is as far wide, if not further: for,

First, it cannot be proved that there were the Elders of many, but of *one* Church, as all the casting circumstances carry it.

84

Secondly, but certain it is, here is no act of *Ordination* performed or intended, and therefore nothing concerning that can be concluded.

The same is true of *Phil.* 1. 1 *Thes.* If there be any probability of dispute, it must be taken from that 1 *Tim.* 4:14. But it hath been proved before, that here was not an *Ordination* of an Officer, because it is beyond the power of ordinary Officers to give being to extraordinary Officers, such as *Timo-*

thy; and therefore *his laying on of hands* was like that *Acts* 13:2, 3.

2. “Master Rutherford adds, *If ordination of Pastors in the Word be never given to People or believers, or to Ruling Elders, but still to Pastors, as is clear, 1 Tim. 5:22. Tit. 1:5. Acts 6:6. Acts 13:3. 2 Tim. 1:6. 1 Tim. 4:14. And if Ordination be never in the power of one single Pastor (except we bring in a Prelate into the Church,) Then one Pastor with one single Congregation cannot exercise this point of discipline, and so not all points of discipline.*

Reply. This argument is the same with the former, as touching the substance, only some few places, (which might have been annexed to those that were mentioned before) are here added, which we may consider in the order as they are propounded.

To that *1 Tim. 5:22.* where *Paul* chargeth his Scholar, *To lay on hands rashly on no man:* To that also *Tit. 1:5.* which carries the same sense with it; and therefore they both receive the same Answer: we say,

First, *here it nothing in the Text,* that gives the least intimation of a *Classis*; and therefore the authority thereof can by no inference from hence, either be concluded, or confirmed, which is the thing to be proved: but the charge is directed expressly to *Timothy and Titus* in particular.

Secondly, *the manner* how Ordination is to be sifted by the one, or Elders to be constituted by the other (for the word is larger in *Tit. 1:5. καταστησης*) it is *not expressly discovered,* but we are called by the words to look *elsewhere,* for the pattern, by which this practice & proceeding must be ordered in both cases. *As I have appointed thee:* what this appointment of the Apostle was, this Text doth not discover; and therefore of this no man can determine it.

ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διαταξάμην

Thirdly, all the circumstances give in evidence, that *the*

Churches, touching whose ordering the Apostle here speaks, were *not yet completed in their Officers,* but being *newly founded* and planted, were to be furnished and perfected with Rulers, by

the help and direction of *Timothy* in the one, and *Titus* in the other place; and therefore in none of these the question is touched, according to the true nature thereof, as stated before? which is of *Churches furnished with Officers*.

Fourthly, it cannot be thought in reason, the Apostle would approve, much less appoint *another way* of ordaining Elders, then he *himself* practised. (I speak to that of *Titus*.)

But he ordained Elders by *the suffrages of the people*, and *established* them by the help of *their fasting and prayer*, *Acts 14:23*. That is all which is left there upon record; therefore this appointment *Titus* and *Timothy* must follow.

Fifthly, in all those charges, which are directed to *Timothy* and *Titus* in these Epistles, it never was intended, they should *act them alone*, but ever supposed, they should attend *the order* of Christ in his Churches, and have the concurrence of Officers, and members, in their *ranks* and *places*, as *the quality and nature of the actions* did require.

When it's enjoined *Timothy*, *That they who sin, he should rebuke openly*, *1 Tim. 5:20, 21. do nothing partially: Teach* he must things appertaining to *wholesome doctrine*, *Tit. 2. &c.* Will any man say, that these duties must not be attended by *all* the Elders of those Churches; and that they should see and provide they might be attended, and stood charged so to do, as well as *Timothy* and *Titus*.

Nay, let us go no farther then the place, *Tit. 1:5. rectify the things that are wanting*. Imagine there had been *Deacons wanting*, must *Titus* only attend that, and none else? and *he* do it *alone* without all other? Or, that he should, *as a Guide*, go *before*, and *see that others acted according to their places?* the people were to find out such as were fit to choose, and present them, and had there been Elders in the Church that they should lay on their hands, for the settling and investing of them in their places.

Laftly, *Timothy* and *Titus* are considered here, *either* as they be *Evangelists*, and so extraordinary persons; and then their actions are not to be made ordinary precedents: or else they are to be considered as expressing common actions of govern-

ment, which are to continue in the Churches, *with those who succeed them in such power*: and then it will follow, if we force this example, that,

As Timothy and Titus being particular persons, did put forth such acts of government: the like acts particular Officers may express in their particular Congregations. And hence the inference will be fair against Master Rutherford his assertion.

As touching that passage *concerning Ruling Elders*, that the ordination of the Pastor is denied unto him, as having no right or power therein; the fallenness thereof hath been evinced sufficiently elsewhere, whether I refer the Reader.

And from hence also the third allegation receives a satisfactory *Reply*; because indeed, that, which is therein contained doth in no wise conclude the thing to be proved.

“If Preaching Elders be charged to watch against grievous Wolves, Acts 20:29. be rebuild, because they suffer them to teach false doctrine, Revel. 2:14. and commended because they try false Teachers, and cast them out, ver. 2. If commanded to ordain faithful men, and taught whom they should ordain: Then one Pastor and single Congregation have not the power of this Discipline.

To which for *Reply*; I must needs profess, I can see no ground of reason in the Inference: For, first, those in *Acts 20.* were Elders of one Congregation, as the circumstances of the Text evidence: *secondly*, or suppose they were not; Doth *Paul* enjoin them, that when they are assembled in the *Classis*, they should watch against ravening Wolves? or that it doth properly appertain to them in their special charges, wherein they are set as *ἐπισκοπος* and Watchmen in an especial and particular manner. And *thirdly*, doth not *this watch* in its due proportion, concern the *Ruling Elder*, as well as the *Teaching*; if it be not more especially appertaining to his place, to be as eyes in the wings, to pane up and down in the Assembly, and make inquiry after the first and least stirring of any false opinion, when it is in the very hatching and brooding secretly, before it dare shew it false, and to give timely intimation to the *Teaching Elders* to fortify against the approach of such evils?

And is it not more then plain, that the *Teaching* and *Ruling* Elders of any particular Congregation, are so far bound to watch over the flock, that they should by private rebukes stay &

87

stop the venting of erroneous conceits; and if that will not prevail, they should then take two or three. If yet they *hear* not, nor will reform, they should tell it to the Congregation, and Preach publicly against it, and not suffer them to vent, or others to listen unto, their delusions?

Nay lastly, doth not Master *Rutherford* grant, *that the People have power to reject an unworthy Minister*; and therefore may they not try him, hinder him from Teaching, watch against him, and by the mouth of the *Riding Elder* both publicly rebuke him, and remove him? so that nothing can be inferred from hence, that these acts are peculiar, or appropriate to a Teaching Elder, much less to such only, when they are Assembled in a Classis. We have done with the first Argument.

Argument II.

“That government is not of God, nor from the wisdom of the Lawgiver, that deviseth means of Discipline to edify the People; but omitteth means of edifying the Elders of every Congregation by the Keys. But the Doctrine of Independent Congregation is such: ergo, The Assumption is evidenced by instance.

“Suppose Elders grow scandalous and corrupt, either in life or doctrine. There is no way to gain them upon this ground. For either they must censure themselves, and that is against nature and reason; or else they must be censured by a Classis, and that the Independencies of Churches will not allow.

“Or else they must be censured by the multitude of Believers. But this cannot be granted; because the Lord hath not given this rod of censure to the flock.

“Secondly, because this is popular government and worse; The Flock made OVERSEERS of the Shepherd, the Son authorized to correct the Father.

“Thirdly, We desire a pattern of this from the Word.

Reply.

There is nothing here, but hath been alleged and answered before.

The first part of the Answer makes the question, the proof of the question. For *the conclusion to be proved*, being this; That a particular Congregation cannot exercise, in a right order, all

88

God's ordinances, and so excommunication, as not having received the power from the Lord Christ; *The proof of this*, They have not received this power; *ergo*, they have not received it. This is to *crave* and not to *prove*.

To the second we have spoken at large. Thus much here shall suffice.

1. If by *Overseer* be ment an Officer, it is a mere mistake; for that is, and hath been ever denied. If a *Judge* and *brotherly helper* of his reformation, it is such a government which the Word doth not only allow: *Tell Archippus, Beware of false Teachers*; but it's that which all combinations, both civil and Ecclesiastic societies doth of necessity require.

2. Is not a Pastor a member in the body, a *Brother* as well as a *Father*? and doth not, should not, one member take care, and a memberly oversight each of other? are we not therefore called *Members each of other*? *Rom. 12:6. 1 Cor. 12.*

And is it strange to Master R. that a Son being in a combination or corporation with the Father, should be authorized to reject his aberarions and offences according to the rule of Religion and reason. Is it not easy to conceive, and ordinary to find in experience, that *Father* and *Son* may be *fellow Aldermen* in a Corporation? and in case the Father be a Delinquent, and prove justly obnoxious to censure of the Court of Aldermen, may not, nay, should not a *Son* pass his vote in a just sentence against his own *Father*? though he do not this as a *Son*, yet being a *Son*, and being in the same Corporation, by *virtue of that combination*; he may, and according to the righteousness of the cause, he should proceed to censure the evil of his Father. A pattern of this government we have given in before, and therefore *the third thing is answered*.

The *third Argument* which is taken from many *absurdities*, which follow from this cause, is made up of nothing but mistakes; some whereof are the very question in hand; some have been immediately handled in the forgoing reason, as the

second and the *fifth*, which are one and the same with the former; and therefore they partly have before, and afterward shall receive an answer, together with the things of this nature.

89

Argument 4.

“That Doctrine it not to be holden which tendeth to the removing, of a public Ministry.

“But this Doctrine of Independent Churches is such.

“The Assumption is proved, from the definition of a visible Church, which is this; It it an Assembly of true Believers, joining together according to the order of the Gospel, in the true worship.

“Whence this follows: that every twelve in a private family is this way joined.

Reply is;

Family-relation is one thing, and *Church-relation* is another; they stand by *virtue of divers rules, civil Oeconomics, and Ecclesiastical Politics*; and therefore though there were never so many *families*, and that of those that exercise Christian duties together; yet this would not make them a *Church*.

His second proof is, *“Because such a Church hath within it self the power of the Keys, and is not subject to any superior Ecclesiastical jurisdiction.*

The force of the proof will appear in the frame of it. *“If an Independent Church hath the power of the Keys, and is not subject to any other, then it tends to the removal of a public Ministry.*

Reply.

This *proof* is, in the reality of it, the *same* with the *proposition to be proved*: for to be an Independent Church, and to have full power of the exercise of all Ordinances, are all one.

Secondly, the consequence hath no truth nor strength in it, for the quite contrary follows.

Such an Independent Church can call and ordain Officers, and is bound so to do, before she can enjoy some Ordinances.

For none can consecrate and give the Sacrament, but only Pastors and Teachers, and therefore those she must provide,

before she can partake: and this is the most easy and certain means to provide and so to continue a faithful ministry, ac-

90

ording to *Christ's* appointment, to the end of the world. For both *Brightman* and *Ames* and the Truth also will make it appear, That *Christ never will want a Church of Believers professing his faith unto the end of the world*. Whereas Classes and Synods have totally failed, and come only to be restored and recovered by the help of particular Congregations.

His fifth Argument taken from *Mat.* 18:17. hath been answered before, whether I shall refer the *Reader*.

1

The third Part.

CHAP. I.

Of the Government of the church.

There were two things attended in Church-policy, viz.

{First, the *Constitution* of the Church.

{Secondly, the *Gubernation* of it.

We have done with the *first*, we are now to take the *second* into consideration.

This *Government* is, when

Severed,

What the *watch* is to be done *before* they come.

What the *behaviour* of all under it.

assembled in

Admission.

What is to be done *before* they come.

What when they are met in Assembly, in receiving of such

who are

No Members,

or

Com-Members from other Congregations

Dispensation of
Sacraments
Censures

We have thus set forth the frame of the severals to be considered; we shall suddenly treat of the particulars, as they are presented in their order, attending them so far, as serves our intended purpose.

The *work* which is of common concernment unto all the *Members, when the Assembly is dissolved*, is that WATCH which they stand engaged to express each to the other, for the good of the body so confederate, *above or before all others*.

2

First, for though *all Christians* are bound by the *rule of Christianity* to love and provide for the good of all Christians. Their Honours, Lives, Charities, Goods, good Names and prosperities, should be precious to us, and we are careful to preserve them in a way of love: we know it was *Cain's* voice, and argued a *Cain's* heart, *Am I my brother's keeper?*

Yet those have a nearer and deeper engagement, and beside the bond of Christianity, have the *hand of Church-confederacy*, which in a peculiar manner engageth the one to the other more then any other Christians in the world; so *Peter* preseth, 1 *Pet.* 2:17. *Paul* concludes, *Ephes.* 4:16. *By the effectual working of every part, &c.* and it seems to be the care unto which the *Israelites* were enjoined, *Josh.* 6:18. *And you in any wise keep your selves:* each man himself, and each man his brother; and this watch, neglected, involved all under the same guilt, *Josh.* 7:1. *the children of Israel had committed a trespass:* though *Achan* did it without their privity, yet they were guilty of the sin, in that they had not care to prevent it, by way of watchfulness each in other, and so in *Achan*, as they should.

Secondly, as they have a deeper engagement then other, as *Free-men of the same Corporation* have a nearer tie then all the people of the same County: So they have *special power one over another*, and that by virtue of the Covenant; for by free and mutual consent, they who were free to join in any other Society, they willingly yielded themselves unto this, to walk one with another in all the Ordinances of Christ, and to *be subject one unto another*, to be proceeded judi-

ally against, in case they should wrong that society: and hence the *process* that each hath against another according to the order of Christ, *Matth. 18. If thy Brother offend, tell him*, is indeed appropriate and peculiarly intended to *Church-corporation*. For that *Church that can judicially censure and cast out an offender by excommunication*, that hath power judicially to proceed against him in all the other degrees which may make way thereunto, as To tell him privately; and then Take one or two; we may admomsh, others Christianly; but we can lay an action and pursue, such as be in combination, judicially only.

Hence, if I tell another Christian of his fault, if he refuse to hear, I am not necessarily bound to follow *this law* against him; and if I do take one or two to fasten his conviction, if

3

he should refuse, I must leave him. But against Brethren we have *express law*, by which I am bound to pursue their conviction, and they are bound and will be necessitated to attend, and either come unto a reformation, or else suffer a just censure for their obstinacy.

Hence lastly, by virtue of that engagement by which I am tied, and the *power* I have received, I stand charged in a most peculiar manner, to prevent all taint of sin in any Member of the Society, that either it may never be committed; or if committed, it may speedily be removed, and the spiritual good or the whole preserved: 1 Cor. 5. *Purge out the leaven, that ye may be a pure lump*; not that each particular person only may keep himself pure, but that the whole may be so preserved: and this kind of watch reacheth any, and this kind of process is good against any of the Members: *Every Brother*; and therefore *Archippus* and any Elder, if he be a Brother, he is liable hereunto. *This is the watch which we must express towards such as be within*.

For the perfecting and increase of the body, we must attend *such as are to be brought in*; for this being a spiritual Corporation: as none can be constrained to join to it, unless *they willingly* subject; so neither can they join, unless the *body* do as *freely* and willingly entertain them.

It is *not dwelling* in the same City, Parish or Place, not the *being a subject* in the same Kingdom, that doth interest any in this privilege: and as the Church can compel none against their wills to join, so the *civil Magistrate* should not use any *compulsive* power, or by violent constraint, force the Church to receive, or any to join to the Church against their wills.

The civil power may compel them to come *under the call of God, and attend the Ordinances*, and force them to use means of *information: and conviction*; that so the Lord Christ may make them glad to seek him in the ways of his appointment, and more glad to find him therein: *But* the civil Magistrate is to leave the Church to follow the *rule of Christ* in her *Admissions*; for it is a *Church-work* to be acted by the *rule of Church-policy*, and therefore should be left to the power of the Church, not constrained by civil power: *Christ's people are a willing people*; faith is not forced.

4

In the ADMISSIONS, two things are to be attended; First, *what is to be done before* they come; Secondly, *what there, when* they are come into the Assembly.

First, *Before the Assembly*, that the proceeding may be carried on comely and orderly, the person that desires to join himself Member with the Church, he is to make his desire known to the *Ruling Elder or Elders*; for it's peculiar to his Office to lead the action of Admission, it being a work that falls not within the compass of *labouring in the Word and Doctrine*.

1. The desire of the party made known, he is then to enquire diligently, and carefully to inform himself, touching the *uprightness of the person's carriage* and conversation from the *testimony of others*, who know him intimately, and will in reason deal nakedly and sincerely therein.

2. He must take notice by way of conference, what his knowledge and acquaintance is with the things of Christ and his Kingdom: the *reason why* he should thus inform himself, is this, Because hereby the party may discover, and he may discern, *whether he be a visible Saint to the judgment of reasonable charity*, which we have formerly proved to be attended necessarily

according to the rules of Christ, and the right constitution of his Churches.

And Master R. his own grounds and grants will infer as much, by force of dispute; for if they who are to be admitted mud be *void of scandal* in their course, and freed also from *gross ignorance*, which in some cases, by Master R. his own confession will unchurch them: there must then be serious enquiry made, whether the persons who tender themselves to enter into this condition, be so qualified.

“The *profession* which Master R. requires, is of that *quality*, That it notifies to the Church, that there is saving faith in the hearts of such, and that they be invisible Saints, who desire to join themselves to a visible Congregation, l. 2. p. 196.

Therefore the Church is bound in an orderly way to inform herself touching such fitness, least she break the rules of Christ, and bring pollution and so ruin upon the whole.

After the Elder hath informed himself in the particulars formerly mentioned, he then sees way and warrant to *propound* the deities of such to the Church, that *they* also may use their

5

best information by their own experience, and take in the consideration of others, to be fully informed and satisfied, touching the unblamableness of their conversion.

And as for that, that the Members should at several times, by several companies; repair in *private* to them, to examine the *work & manner of their conversion*, I am afraid it is a *presumed kind of liberty*; which wants precept and example, for any thing that ever appeared to me in the Scripture. *Beside*, that liberty is as much as the office and duty of the Elder binds him unto, and therefore seems to entrench too near upon the propriety of his place. *Beside*, all such pains misseth the end and fruit of it; for the stress of the trial lies not there, nor can the last resolution of judicious and reasonable charity issue there, whether the person be a visible Saint or no: for there be many truly and savingly called, who *never knew the time and manner of their conversion*, and therefore cannot relate it unto others, and yet express the power of grace in their lives, and consequently had it effectually wrought in their hearts

though they did not *at the first* know how the spirit breathed in their birth.

Time of enquiry being thus granted, if upon serious observation & consideration, the Brethren find any just exception, as touching any scandal in their carriage, and after dealing with them, they can receive no reality of satisfaction, they repair to the Elder, leave their complaint with him, and that is sufficient to stay the proceeding for the present.

But if upon sufficient time of information, there appears nothing scandalous, the person doth shortly *give some reason of his hope* in the face of the Congregation, & is admitted *engaging himself to walk with them in the Covenant of the Church, according to all the rules of the Gospel, that either are or shall be made known to them.*

If it be here enquired, *What is the rule according to which satisfaction is to be regulated,* the Reader may be pleased to look back unto that which was largely debated, touching the visibility of the Saints, what it was which evidenced them to *rational charity.* In a word, if a person live *not in the commissions of any known sin, nor in the neglect of any known duty, and can give a reason of his hope towards God,* this casts the cause, with judicious charity, to hope and believe there is something *of God and grace in the soul,* and therefore fit for Church-society.

6

And that thus much is required, hath been demonstrated from Master *R.* his own principles; and that thus much is required is undeniable by the rules of right reason: for he that lives in known omissions of duty, or commission of sin, he professeth himself by that practice, not willing to submit to the rules of Christ, and therefore not fit to be his subject, or to enjoy the privilege of his kingdom, which reveals the authority of his Scepter: Nay, by such a practice he professeth to persist, and to be pertinacious in sin, and therefore in case he was in the Church, he was fit to be cast out and censured, not worthy, then, to be received.

This rule being received and agreed upon, it would marvellously facilitate the work of *Admission,* without any trouble, and prevent such curious inquisitions and niceties, which the pride and wantonness of men's spirits hath brought into

the Church, to disturb the peace thereof, and to prejudice the progress of God's Ordinances.

Hence also those sottish pangs would presently be calmed, when persons complain they *cannot join with such and such* and yet cannot shew a just exception: he that joins with the rule in his practice, he who hath but a teachable and meek self-denying heart, he will easily join with him. *This is the manner of receiving men.*

Quest. *What difference is there in receiving, Women, (you will say) whether any, or none at all?*

Ans. It's true, women are forbidden to *speak in the Church, (i.e.) by way of Teaching*; but they may so speak, when their *speeches argue subjection*, and so suit with their sexes; as to give in *testimony of repentance*, in case they were *censured*, and came to be restored again, so to answer a question propounded to them; yet because we find it by experience, the feebleness of some, their shamefaced modesty and melancholic fearfulness is such, that they are not able to express themselves in the face of a Congregation, and yet have the precious work of saving grace in their hearts, we are forced to take the *expressions of such in private*, and *make report of them to the Congregation*: and since this was necessary for some, and warrantable for all, *it's most without exception to receive all after the same manner*, that so the infirmities of the weakest may be relieved, and the seeming exceptions of others also may be prevented.

7

The last *Question* belonging to the head of Admission, is this:

Whether those that are dismissed from other Congregations, must necessarily make their confession afresh? or whether recommendations be sufficient?

I answer by the DIRECTIONS following:

First, the *testimony* of any *Church of Christ*, ought to be valued *according to the worth of it*, and received with all the due respect that is due to the Spouse of Christ; and therefore if by the testimony of two or three Witnesses, every word comes to be established, much more when any report or relation comes from so many in such a relation, we should sit down satisfied with the truth thereof, as with

out the least suspicion, as that the thing is sufficiently certified; and therefore *Paul* makes it the *highest evidence* of testimony that can be given, 2 *Cor.* 8:18. *The Brother whose praise is through all the Churches.*

Secondly, yet because the *Churches may decline* in regard of their practice, and walk at a *greater breadth of liberty*, either in respect of their *actions*, or of their *opinions*, then others can, and they indeed should; and because when they have used all the care and watchfulness they can, to search into the walks and ways of their Members, yet others that meet with them in their daily and occasional converse, may happily see more and discern more than they can. Each Church hath her liberty to follow the light of the Word, and the rule thereof, which will not err, nor can deceive; rather then to sit down merely with the allowance of men, but use their own search and care: and if upon enquiry and observation, either they shall appear *scandalous* in their lives, or *erronious* in their judgments and opinions, and those *dangerous* and *infections*; it is then left in the power of the Church, to require humiliation answerable to the offences, and to exact a profession and confession of the truth, and an open renunciation of such errors before they be received, because the care both for the reformation of the party, and the preservation of the Church in purity of life & doctrine is hereby attained: So *Paul* advised against those *ravening wolves* Acts 20:30. and the *Disciples* were marvellously cautious to meddle with *Paul* after his conversion, before they were fully

8

satisfied by some testimony, whereby these fears might be quieted, Acts 9:26. and not only in these cases, but in any other, the Churches have liberty to seek satisfaction that may suit their hearts according to rule, as requiring some *report of the work of God in them*, and the frame of their spirits towards him.

Chap. II.

Of the dispensation of the Sacraments.

WE have done with *Admission*; we are now with the same brevity to enquire touching the Dispensation Of The Sacraments, which are the *Brands* of God's sheep,

the *Livery* of his household-servant: for amongst many other ends of the Sacraments, this is one, that it's a brand-mark, and a separating note of the sheep off God's fold and *such as are without*. It's constantly to be observed in the Scriptures, how God's people have been judged to be privileged by these seals, and how they rejoiced in them, at peculiarly appropriated to them: *He hath not dealt so with any Nation*, so Rom. 3:1, 2. *What is the privilege of the Jew? much every way*. And these are of the chiefest of them. Nay, the Lord expressly forbad any *stranger* to meddle with the *Passover*, Exod. 12:48. And how frequently is the *Jew* known by *Circumcision*? as though the privilege came to be their *proper name*, Ephes. 2:11, 12. and therefore the *Gentiles* are called *uncircumcision by them who were called circumcision*. Our purpose is not to handle either the number or nature of these Sacraments, because that belongs to the head of Doctrine; but we look at them, as they come within the compass of *Church policy*, and how they come to be dispensed according to the order of Christ: And not to go beyond these bounds, we shall enquire of TWO things in the dispensation of the Sacraments, *viz.*

The

Parties who are *interested* in that work: both who have right to

Give,

Receive.

Manner

Common to both,

Public in Assembly,

With the Word.

Peculiar to each

Baptism,

One Element,

Once administered.

Supper administered

Frequently,

By distinct blessings, as there be *distinct Elements*.

9

First, for them *who have right to administer* the Sacraments; and these are called thereunto by God's command, the allow-

ance and designation of the Church, viz. *Pastors and Teachers* only; none else, as formerly we have proved: Commission is given to them authoritatively to *preach* the Covenant, and therefore by the same authority to dispense the *seals of the Covenant*.

It is a frenzy of the *Anabaptists*, which begins to labour with the loathsomeness of it self, *That any Christian gifted, who can teach or administer a word of instruction to win a disciple after him, that he in a corner may baptize him also whom he hath won to his opinion*: But as *Paul* said of *Jannes and Jambres*, *Their madness is made to appear to all, who are not willing to shut their eyes against the Sun, when it shines in its beauty*.

For if the Lord Christ in his infinite wisdom & kingly care conceived it necessary for the honour of the place, & the execution of the *work of a Deacon*, to appoint *choice men and solemn* [[Acts 6.]] *Ordination to authorize them to the work*, that they being called and fitted to the work, might be accepted therein of the people, and blessed by him, who did appoint them to that employment. In reason, *what greater need is there*, that persons who are peculiarly gifted and furnished with grace and ability, should be called to this *work of preaching, and dispensing these holy Mysteries*; a service above all other of greatest weight and worth.

Secondly, add hereunto, that the Apostle as by a flaming sword, doth stop the way to all pretenders, and therefore lays in this prohibition, *No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron*. He must have a special *call* from God, who must dare to meddle with a *service* which is of such *simliar* eminence in the house of God; yea, the Lord himself doth appropriate this, and that unto some persons whom he puts into place: *He gave some to be Pastors and teachers*, Eph. 4: 11. *Are all Apostles? are all Governors? are all Teachers? &c.* 1 Cor. 12:29. This would bring confusion, and so destruction to the whole.

These are the persons *who have received right from Christ to administer*; we are now to enquire,

Quest. 2. *Who be the parties who have right by rule and allowance from Christ to receive?*

10

And here it's agreed of all hands; Such who are come to ripeness of years, and are rightly received, and so stand members in the true visible Church of Christ; *such*, I say, have title to *all the seals* of the Covenant: being to the judgement of charity, not only really within the Covenant of Grace; but truly also within the compass of the Covenant of the *Church*: We will not therefore trouble our selves to prove that which hath approbation of all.

But rather trade in that which is attended with the greatest difficulty, and finds strong opposition, according to the strength of men's affections and apprehensions, who are engaged either way: There is then a *two-fold question*, which exerciseth the hearts, thoughts and pens of the most judicious at this day.

First, betwixt *us and the Anabaptist*, who willingly admit all Members of the true Church to both the seals, *but the Infants of all those Members*, they wholly exclude from partaking of *Baptism*, until they come to years of discretion, when they make actual profession of their faith, then they may actually share in the Sacrament.

Secondly, betwixt us and Master *Rutherford*; for we conceiving, that *confederating* makes persons members of visible Churches; those who are *not confederate* we conceive *no members* of a visible Church: and therefore in *that condition*, they have *no right*, nor in a right order can challenge the benefits or privileges of Members, nor *can any officer in a right order* dispense them unto such: Should an Officer by any power of his Office, attempt to exercise any authority, and therefore to enjoin such a person, *Non-member*, to come, to hear, to receive, he may justly refuse the command, and he cannot proceed against him, if he should refuse: Nay, did he persist obstinately to reject his authority, he could not convent him before the Assembly and cast him out of the body, who was never in the body: *And if an Officer have no authority to require him to receive the seal, no more hath he power to require the Officer to give the seal.*

The *Questions* then which offer themselves to our consideration in this place, are these two principally.

First, *Whether Infants of such who are Members of the Congregation may be baptized?* and this we affirm against the *Anabaptists*,

11

and refer the Reader to the *Treatises penned by judicious Writers* to this purpose.

Secondly, Which is of greatest difficulty, and therefore requires most serious search and consideration is,

Whether the Infants of Non-confederates, who refuse to be Members of the Church, should be partakers of Baptism, which is one of the special privileges of the Church?

First, we shall set down the *state of the Question*, least we should miss the right understanding of the cause by some mistakes. Secondly, we will lay down some *Conclusions*, which may lead the Reader by the hand, to look unto the grounds which yet keep us in this apprehension. Lastly, we shall *answer the arguments* which are made to the contrary.

To find the right *basis to bottom* the Question, we must know, that we now dispute *not about the wickedness* of men, while they remain *Members* of the Congregations, as though that could *prejudice* their privilege, while they *remain* in that State and relation.

True, *this wickedness* justly deserves they should be *proceeded against*, either to be reformed or removed: but *if the Church* either through *connivence, negligence* or *indulgence*, shall *tolerate sinfully such evils* and evil persons in that estate of Membership, they *cannot* then *deny* them the *privilege of Members*; So that while the *Prophets prophesied lies*, and the *Priests ruled by their means*, and the *people would have it so*, and grew corrupt while they were members (though corrupt members), they did share in the *Passover*, and their children were made partakers of *Circumcision*: So those of *Sardis*, of whom the spirit speaks expressly, *they were dead, though they had a name to live*; as long as the Church, through her carelessness, kept them in her bosom, as certain their children might and did partake of Baptism, as one of the Church-privileges.

It's not then the Question, *Whether wicked Members, while they are tolerated sinfully in the Church, they and their children may partake of the privileges?* for this is beyond question; nor do I know, nor yet ever heard it denied by any of ours; and therefore all

the Arguments alleged by Master R. lib. 1. cap. 12. are all granted without any loss to our, either opinion or practice.

The *pinch* then of the *Question* lies here, Whether persons *non confederate*, and so (in our sense not *Members of the Church*)

12

do entitle their children to the seal of Baptism, being one of the Privileges of the Church, their Parents (though godly) being yet unwilling to come into Church-fellowship.

Lubricus hic locus & difficilis; and that I may *shrive* my heart to the Reader and Master R. I shall nakedly, profess, that if I should have given way to my affection, or followed that which suits my secret desire and inclination, I could have willingly wished, that the scale might have been cast upon the affirmative part, and that such persons (many whereof we hope are godly) might enjoy all such privileges, which might be useful and helpfull to them and theirs.

But after all the stones I have turned, and the thoughts that I have spent in this kind, there be some reasons which yet arrest my understanding, and causeth me yet to make a defence for this cause, and the main pillar principle which fortifies the judgement against all approaching assaults, is the nature and truth of *Church-Covenant*, in which I must profess freely I am yet more confirmed, as I have been constrained to take it into more serious confederation; and the best of all those Arguments that men (of such eminency, and worth, and learning, that my heart doth highly reverence, according to thtir righteous desert) have raised to make a breach upon that part of the Discipline, which like braces in the building, binds all the parts together, have rather strengthened then stirred my judgement.

Let me here again crave leave to propound such thoughts as I have without offence, that I may (*cotis vicem supplere*, and) occasion such whom God hath furnished with greater light, to clear this cause and coast more fully then ever yet I had happiness to see, to the satisfaction of my judgment: and we do here in the estating of these privileges, as Lawyers use to do in the settling of Inheritances, enquire where the first right lies, and how it comes lineally and lawfully to be derived and established upon such and such parties; and this we shall

do by enquiring the Pedegree in the conveyance of this privilege in the following conclusions.

Conclusion I.

Children as Children have not right unto Baptism, for then all children of all Nations, sects and sorts of men should

¹³

be made partakers of it: the rule, is received, and admits no gainsaying, *a quatenus ad omme*. That which belongs to this, because it's this belongs to all of this kind.

But that all Children of all Nations, Turks, Pagans &c. should be admitted unto the privilege, is absurd: *Quosvis Infantes ad Baptismum admitti in toto vetere ecclesiâ in auditum esse*, &c. Beza in cap. 7. primæ ad *Corinth.* v. 14. and this Master R. grants.

Conclusion II.

It belongs not to any Predecessors, either nearer or further off removed from the next Parents, $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron$ and firstly, to give right of this privilege to their Children when I say Predecessors nearer or further off, I include and comprehend all, beside the next parent, Grand-father, great Grand father and so ascend, never so far into so many Generations going before; and of all these I affirm, it doth not belong to any of them, $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron$ or firstly to a thing, it belongs to all other because of that; to have a faculty of speech belongs to the nature of a man firstly, therefore it belongs to this or that man, *Thomas, John, Abraham*, so far as they have the nature of man in there: nor can any have this faculty, unless they have this nature. I need not study this plainness, but only that now I am to speak of a common point; and that of common, and yet great concernment to the meanest, and therefore it's needful to speak to the common capacity of such.

The conclusion thus expressed, is thus proved.

First, *That which belongs firstly to any predecessors nearer or further esse*, $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron$ *that belongs to all other by right received from them, because it lay first there:* the evidence of the terms and former explication gives in full evidence of this: *but the next Parents can give the privilege and title to Baptisms without any help of the Predecessors:* As suppose they were all dead, or all without any

knowledge or remembrance, were apostates from the Gospel, or opposers of it; yet the next Parents fearing God, and confederating in the Covenant of the Gospel, they do and can give right to their Children to share in this privilege, without any help from the Predecessors. Therefore the right is not firstly in them, now is firstly conveyed by them.

14

Secondly, *That which belongs καθ' αὐτὸ and firstly to the Predecessors, that they can do without the next Parents: otherwise they should not as soon have their hand in the conveyance of this right, as those to whom it did firstly appertain, and so it should not belong to them firstly.*

But the Predecessors cannot convey this right without the next Parents: for it's that paterna potestas which belongs to them, to dispose of their own. If they will depart and go from under all Church-power, and depart into places where there be no Churches: Or lastly, if both the next Parents were apostates, it's not in the power of all former Predecessors to bring the Child to the enjoyment of this privilege: so that if the next Parents be causa adæquata of entitling their Children to such spiritual advantages, then it belongs to them alone firstly.

But so they are: It's in their power, though all other Predecessors should oppose, to give right; it's in their power, though all other Predecessors should endeavour it, yet to hinder and deprive their Children of the right; for their apostacy takes off the *federal holiness* of the Children, 1 Cor. 7:14.

Hence it is (I cannot conceive but it is) a misapprehension and misapplication of that place, *Exod. 20.* because God hath promised, that *he will shew mercy to a thousand generations of them that love him, and keep his Commandments; that therefore the Predecessors, though far removed, can entitle Children unto Baptism, though their next Parents be such, who never love God, nor keep his Commandments; nay, be happily apostates and excommunicates.*

We will weigh a little the sense of the words, and the strength of the inference that is made therefrom, so far as it concerns our cauft in hand.

The current of Orthodox Interpreters carry the meaning of the Text this way; The Lord in the threatening and promise discovers the jealousy of his heart towards such as be professed worshippers of him: namely.

He is so tender of his honour in this case, which so nearly concerns him, as the conjugal affection of Matrimonial faithfulness doth the husband from the behaviour of his wife and Spouse, that out of jealousy he is ready and resolved to pu-

15

nish all falseness, and to reward faithfulness in that behalf.

Secondly, in the expression of his jealousy, he is more sparing and unwilling to execute his anger against such, who offend in the breach of his worship: but more enlarged in the discovery of his love and goodness to such, who shall maintain conjugal fidelity towards him therein; and therefore the certain numbers of the third and fourth, and thousands of Generations are here put for the large and uncertain extent of his displeasure to the one, and his kindness to the other; and therefore,

Thirdly, The Lord doth not tie himself strictly to a particular law or allowance in this case, but walks in a breadth as it best beseems his wisdom and good pleasure; and hence he doth exempt some in the third or fourth Generation from his threatening and punishment, and doth also withhold the expressions of his love from others in the thousand mentioned. Gen. 25:23.

Fourthly, the threatenng, and so inflicting of the punishment, it is ever in his order and manner; namely, those who imitate the sin of their idolatrous Parents, those may expect and shall certainly suffer their plagues: they who imitate the love and obedience of their faithful Parents, they may be assured they shall receive the mercies promised to their Parents in the footsteps of whose faith they persist. Ezek. 18:9, 13. 1 Sam. 3:27, 30.

Lastly, the mercy here promised is not so to be conceived as though all the particular blessings or privileges that the Parents were possessed of, shall in the severals be communicated to their Children; for we know it contrary by experience: The Israelites wanted Circumcision by the space of forty years in the Wilderness; and in the time of the Judges,

and the seventy years Captivity, the Israelites were destitute of several privileges, which they were made partakers of when they enjoyed peace and prosperity in the days of *David* and *Solomon*. Mercy here is that saving mercy, which God never fails to bestow on his Elect, grace here, and glory hereafter, reserving a variety of dispensations, in regard of divers privileges or benefits, as seems best to the counsel of his own will. Judges 5:8.

This being the received meaning of the words, by the common consent of judicious Interpreters, *Calvin, Zanchy, Junius,*

16

Perkins, in secundum præceptum. What inference can hence be made for the conveyance of the right of Baptism from remote Parents to Children, I must confess I cannot conceive: For the Generations the Lord promiseth to shew mercy unto must be such who imitate their godly Parents, by loving and obeying his Commandements, and especially that of the truth of his worship: and how doth this agree to Infants, who are not yet capable, being not come to years to put forth such acts?

2. Upon this grant, and the making of this ground good, *ubi standum*, where there will be a stop or stay made, I cannot see: for if a thousand Generations more or less have interest in Baptism by virtue of their fore-fathers, who were faithful within that compass then the children of Turks or Jews cannot be excluded this privilege and ordinance: some of their Predecessors are comprehended, without all question, within the bounds of a thousand Generations there mentioned, and yet all those Infants are excluded by their own confession, and by the peremptory and plain affirmation of the Apostle, *Rom. 11:17*. through unbelief the natural boughs were cut off from Church and Church privileges.

3. Take a new convert soundly brought home to Christ, yet through his weakness, not able to *discern the Lord's Body* aright; would this be a good dispute?

If God shew mercy to a thousand Generations, then this man, who had some godly Predecessors, he may be admitted to partake of the Lord's Supper: and if this be a weak collection, as each man will yield at the first sight, then the inference of Baptism upon the like ground, must have the like feeble-

ness in it: Nay, why an excommunicate may not upon this ground plead the partaking of the Sacrament, professing the true faith, but only censured for such a practice; especially, conceive him to be within God's election, I cannot see. God shews mercy, and so the privilege of a Sacrament, to such who had godly Predecessors within the compass or a thousand generations: but I had godly Predecessors within that compass, therefore I have title to that mercy, and so to the privilege of the Sacrament: this conclusion all men reject, and therefore they must also refuse the former collection.

Conclusion III.

The next Parent being *causa adaequata* of conveying or with-

¹⁷

holding the right of Baptism to their Children; hence it follows inevitably, That Children may either be deprived or possessed of privileges, by means of the sinfulness or holiness of their Parents, and that in a way of God's most righteous proceeding; I say most righteous, because the parity and proportion is most exact on both hands.

The faithful covenant of the Parents doth as fully entitle them, and so advantage them in the privileges thereof; as the careless rejecting of the Covenant doth disadvantage and debar them from the enjoying of the fruit and benefit of such special means. Deut. 29:11. Gen. 17:10.

And since it is consisted of all hands, and is most apparent in that Text, that temporal benefits are dispensed and continued unto undeserving children, for the faith and piety of their godly Parents; as unto *Ishmael* for *Abraham's*, *Esau* for *Jacob's* sake, Gen. 16:11. & 21:13.. and so frequently we have it recorded and repeated, *Yet for my servmt David's sake I will do so and so.*

It need not seem strange, nor can it to any seriously considerate, that temporal punishments are laid upon their Children to correct the sin of their wicked Parents: A man's Children are his Goods, *Job* 1. and it is not ordinary, that a person should be punished in his estate, by reason of his transgression, without the least appearance of any prejudice to justice?

Conclusion III.

Hence Parents must first have right themselves, before thy can convey it unto theirs; and they can deprive them of no more then they can give them.

There be two branches of the Conclusion.

First, a Parent must have a right before he can give it: A man must stand possessed of an interest in a title to a privilege before he can make over that unto another; otherwise he should give that he hath not, and the claim of the other is void, and his expectation will wholly fail hhn, because his challenge of his interest is from one that had none, and therefore he can receive none from him: *a non habente potestatem*, acts are frustrate, says the Lawyer.

And this is the order of God's proceeding with his people;

Deut. 29:9, 10.

18

and that according to the rules of infinite wisdom and justice: the Parent enters into Covenant for himself and his feed, so that Children are within the Covenant, because they came from Parents within the Covenant; in which they were included, and so received also by God.

1 Cor. 7:14.
Rom. 11:17.

And upon this ground its certain, That an excommunicate Parent cannot entitle any of his children to a Sacrament.

That right he hath not, he cannot give, *ex concessis*.

But he hath no right or title to any Sacrament; for by the consent of all, he is call out from any such communion: and therefore it's certain he cannot convey that right to his children.

Being thus a little helped, by these conclusions premised and proved, to see where the right firstly lies, and whereby children come to be entituled to the Privileges; and how it comes, according to the rules and laws of Christ, to be conveyed.

Let us now enquire what force those Arguments have, which are alleged to the contrary. All the Reasons brought by Master *R.* in his first book, do not at all reach the Question in hand, as it hath appeared in the stating of it; and therefore they are all granted without any gain to him, or loss to us.

Others which are alleged to this end, I find in two places, *lib. 2. p. 186. & p. 262.*

In the former place we have these allegations.

“We hold, that those who are not members of a particular Congregation, may lawfully be admitted to the Seals of the Covenant; first, because those to whom the promises are made, and profess the Covenant, these should be baptized: but men of approved piety are such, though they be not members of a particular Parish. The Proposition is Peter’s argument, Acts 2:38.

Answ. The Proposition is denied, because there is more to fit for the receiving of the Seals, then to profess the Covenant, and to have the promise of grace made to men.

We find Master *R.* confessing, That an excommunicate for some notorious facts, or for pertinacy in some practical evil, may yet profess all the truth of the Gospel; nay, may be truly gracious, and therefore hath all the promises in that kind appertaining to him, and yet have no title to a Sacrament, by his own confession, *l. 2. p. 232.*

19

The place of the *Acts* gives no confirmation, because, first, these were Jews and Proselytes, who were in visible Church-state: And secondly, it’s to be observed, that though that Church state gave ground of their Baptizing, yet by the Apostle his dispute, they must come at this Ordinance, according to Christ his method and manner: So that unless they had taken this way, they had not followed the direction of the Apostle, nor would he in reason have admitted them to the partaking of that Ordinance; and therefore *John* the Baptist did constantly exist this, at the hands of such as came to him; and upon no other terms received they it from him, *Repent and be Baptized.*

Secondly,

“Those who are not numbers of a particular Church, may be visible Professors, and so members of the visible Church; therefore the seals of the Covenant belongeth unto them.

The Frame at full stands thus:

Those who are members of the visible Church in general, to them the seals of the Covenant belongs.

But all visible Professors, though not members of a particular Congregation, are members of the visible Church in general.

Answer.

Both parts of the Reason fail, for there are no such members of the visible Church in general: Secondly, those whom Master *R.* conceives such, to many of them the seals of the covenant do not belong, by his confession, as to excommunicates: and I may add also, according to his opinion, scandalous persons, who by his grant, are not to be entertained as members with any particular Congregation, and therefore not into communion with them, *l. 2. p. 25.*

The *Assumption* also is to be denied: for it would bring in a new devised kind of membership, which neither the rule of reason, nor the constitution of a visible Church will admit; *to wit*, to be a member of the visible Church in general, and yet be no member of any particular Congregation: for,

First, take all particular Congregations in their full enumeration and induction, they are all the members where if the visible catholic Church is made up, as an Integrum of all his parts.

20

Those who are not members of any particular Congregations, come not within the rank, nor can be referred to any kind of members of a visible Church: But all the members that constitute the visible, are therein contained. And it is all one, as if a man should say, there be two parts or members that make up an entire man, and yet there may be a member of a man which is neither comprehended, nor can be referred to either of these, which is in truth to speak daggers.

Again, it is a fundamental rule of reason, that the general nature of any thing hath its existing, and so its working in the particulars; the whole nature of manhood or humanity, it exists and works in the particulars and individuals of *John, Thomas, Richard, Jeremy*, that are now in being upon the face of the earth; and therefore to affirm, there should be any part of manhood or humanity yet not existing in the particulars, is to forge a thing in a man's fancy without any reality at all: To be a member of the visible Church in the general, and yet to have no particular exigence of membership in any particular Congregation, is a mere conceit, which comes out of the same mint, cross to the principles of reason.

Lastly, it is a conclusion unto which Master *R.* hath given his full consent, That known scandals are ground sufficient to exclude a person otherwise professing the Covenant, from being a visible member of a Church (*lib.* 2. 243, 251.) and so by parity of reason exclude him from being a member of any the visible Churches on earth.

He that is justly excluded the membership, and so the fellowship of all the particular Congregations on earth, he is justly excluded from partaking of any privileges by their means.

But a person may be a visible Professor, and yet be excluded from Membership, and so fellowship with all the visible Churches on earth, *ex concessis*, and therefore he may have such a profession, and be excluded justly from all privileges which may corse by their means.

3. "*The contrary opinion hath no warrant in God's word.*

Answ. This is nakedly and rawly affirmed, and is as readily denied, and shall be made good afterward.

4. "*The Apostles required no more of those whom they baptized, but profession of belief, as Acts 10:47. Can any man forbid water, that*

21

"those should be baptized, who have received the holy Ghost as well as we? Acts 8:37. If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest be baptized: No more is sought for of the Jailor, Acts 16:31, 34.

Answ. The consequence deserves a denial; that because there is no more expressed then profession in these places, therefore no more is required in other places: for *Peter* doth plainly

require *more*, Acts 2:38. *Repent and be baptized*: The Baptist did constantly call for *more*, from all, to whom he administred that Ordinance; and the *general commission* in the open terms of it calls for *more*: *Make Disciples, and then baptize*; and this *making Disciples* being understood in the *full breadth*, which is not to *believe* only, as they did (*John 12:42.*) as thereby approving of the Doctrine of our Saviour, but did not *confess him*, or shew themselves his Disciples; and therefore those are put by way of explication, *John 9:28. Be thou his Disciple, but we are Moses his Disciples*; Yea, those that magnified the Doctrine and profession of the Apostles, yet *durst not join themselves to them*. If then this joining, this being made a Disciple, so as the Jews were to Moses, be added to an open profession, it then will imply, both their *subjection* to the Doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles, and their *acceptation of them*, and then it amounts to as much as we require, or *Church-confederation* calls for.

Other Arguments I find in *lib. 2. 262.*

“If the Infants of the Christian Church have right only to Baptism through the faith of the nearest Parents only, then is this to be conceived, either to be true and saving faith in the nearest Parents, or only faith in profession.

Answ. We grant the first member, it is not the saving faith of the next Parents. Let us hear how Master R. makes good the second, *p. 262.*

“If the faith of near of Parents, only true in profession and shew before men, give right to their Infants to be sealed with the seal of the Covenant, then (first) apparent and hypocritical faith conferreth the right to the Seals unto Infants, and that there is not required, as the Author saith, chap. 3. That the Members by the called of God, the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty, not only in external profession, but also in some sincerity and truth.

Answ. The *Qualification* of such who come unto the Sacrament, is to be attended in a *double respect*: first, as they stand in

relation to God, and the worthy partaking of the Ordinance, and then *God requires*, and also the Ordinance calls for *inward truth*. Secondly, as they stand in reference and *relation to the*

Church, and their outward dispensation of them, and then *that profession which intimates sincerity*, so far as the judgement of *rational charity* shall require, is sufficient, because the Church can judge *the tree (only) by the fruits*.

Obj. 2. “*God, upon this grant, hath warranted his Church to put his seal upon a falsehood, and to confer the seals upon Infants, for the external profession of faith, where there is no faith at all: This the Writers think inconvenient and absurd.*”

Ans. The conference is denied, as not having a colour of truth: for the Church doth warrantably give the Seals to such, who do unworthily receive them; the Church judging things according to rules of Charity: She knows not who are Hypocrites, but is bound to judge otherwise, if they appear otherwise; and therefore the Church in dispensing the Ordinances, and the alm and work of the Ordinances (according to their nature) is to seal up the truth of the Covenant. If unworthy Receivers deal falsely with God and his Ordinances, abuse them, and pervert their work, and partake unworthily of the seal of Baptism; (as many eat and drink their own damnation in abusing Christ’s Body and Blood) their sin and guilt lies upon their own head; God and the Church are free from both: And this none of ours, nor Mr R. his Writers once gainsay; only *Papists* and *Familists* cast in such cavils: and yet those, I mean of the Familists, who have not forsaken the reason of men, nor laid aside the forehead of modesty, are forced to yield as much in their own way; for no man thinks, unless he desires wilfully to blind and delude himself, that when all *Jerusalem, Judea*, and all the coasts about *Jordan*, came to be baptized of *John*, that all these had the reality of faith in their hearts. This is clear according to our principles.

But how Master R. will quit his hands of this Objection, according to the rules of his proceeding, I confess I cannot tell: for when he affirmth, lib. 2. p. 260. “*That we are not to cast any out for non-regeneration, even known.* If not cast out non-regenerates, then give them the seals; and then the Church gives such the seals whom she knows, out of reason and charity, have no title; and she is guilty of setaling a falsehood.

23

Obj. 3. “*Upon this ground it follows, that Excommunicates children are in no better case by this Doctrine, than the children of Turks and Infidels.*”

Sol. If in some particulars, Excommunicates are equal with Turks & Infidels, *let him be as a heathen*, it’s no wonder; nor yet cross to any reason, that in such particulars *their children also should share with them*; those inconveniences coming by the breach of Covenant, when the keeping of it would have procured the contrary comforts & privileges. Look at the particular enjoyment of the privileges, they are so far alike, have like title thereunto: though the advantages of the one be far greater than the other in many regards. As should a man reason thus; If he that is a member of a Church, and yet not able to examine himself, hath no right to partake of the seals of the Supper, (as the express word of Text testifies) then such in this particular are no better than Turks. The Answer would be easy, in point of *Non-right* they are alike, that is equally affirmed of both: but *in other privileges* and advantages which look that way, they are *far differing* one from the other.

These are all the reasons I find, *here and there*, in Milter *R.* which fully reach the cause.

We shall now, beside the grounds formerly given for explication, and which served mainly for the clearing and settling of this truth, *offer some Reasons to the consideration of the Reader*, and so leave this so difficult a head of Discipline.

First, its confessed on all hands, that Baptism is a privilege of the Church either Catholic or particular, and therefore “*not to be found nor enjoyed but in the Church*, as Master *R.* lib. 1. p. 175. and therefore *as Circumcision of old was counted the liverly of God’s household-servants, and brand of the sheep of his flock*, to difference and distinguish them who were Aliens from the common-wealth of *Israel*, Eph. 2:12. *so is Baptism now* in the time of the Gospel.

Secondly, it hath been proved in the conclusions foregoing, that only the next Parent can convey this privilege: upon which premises partly agreed, partly proved, the Argument issues thus:

Argument I.

They who have no right to Bapism, they ought not to receive it:

24

But children of Non-confederates have no right; which is thus evidenced: All the right which such have, is from the next Parents, as in the third conclusion; but the next Parents non-confederate can give no right; for that right which they have not, they cannot give: but non-confederates are non-members of the Church, and the seals are a Church privilege: and hence they having no right to Church-privileges, therefore cannot give them. Or more briefly thus;

Non-members of the Church have no right to the privileges of the Church, and so can give none.

But non-confederats Parents, are non-members.

The *second part of the reason*, where all the difficulty lies, hath been formerly evinced, when we disputed of the form of a Church, and that which gave formality to the members thereof, whether we refer the Reader, to what hath been maintained as the truth of God, *That confederation gives formality to a Church.*

And if Mr R. can prove *that visible Profession doth make a member of the Church visible, when a man is no member of a particular Church, or that profession doth make a man member of all the particular Congregations on earth*, I will freely yield up this cause to him.

Argument II.

If those children who were externally in Covenant, were only to be circumcised, then those who are externally in Covenant in the Christian Church are to be Baptised.

But these children who were externally in Covenant and born of confederate Parents were only to be Circumcised, Gen. 17:10. Master R. lib. 1. p. 165.

Master R. answereth to the Proposition, "*That the Covenant there mentioned was the Covenant of grace, but ours is the Covenant of the Church*, lib. 2. 202.

Answer. It is true, the Covenant of grace is ever included and presupposed in the Covenant of the Church, and so in this place: but that which is here attended in the ultimate confirmation is the Covenant of the Church, wherewith

the Covenant of grace was clothed, and that appears by this reason.

That Covenant is here understood that gives full right unto Cir-

25

umcision (as by comparing Gen. 17:7, 10. will fully appear) and so unto all other privileges in their order.

But the Covenant of grace doth not give full right unto Circumcision. For Job and all his friends were in the Covenant of Grace, and yet neither Circumcision nor Passover did appertain to them, nor yet to any other people upon earth, *Exod.* 12:48. therefore it is a mistake of Mr R. when he affirms the contrary.

Nor doth that help much which he alleged, that “*Job and his friends did sacrifice which was peculiar to the Jews.*”

Answ. It is a mistake: sacrificing was before the flood, and immediately after in *Noah* his time, and therefore could not be appropriated to the Jews, but as it was *peculiarly circumstantiated*, according to God’s appointment.

Nor do those expressions carry any weight, when Master R. affirms, “*That the Covenant in general was made with Infants of eight days old: and our Covenant it not made with Infants.*”

Answ. The affirmation is a great mistake; for we maintain according to truth, that the believing Parent Covenants and confines for himself and his posterity. And *this Covenanting* then and now is the same for the kind of it, and lays the foundation of the conveyance of all the right that children, have to this holy Ordinance of Christ.

Argument III.

Is taken from *Romans* 11:17. there the holy Apostle discovers the mind of God touching the communication of Church-privileges to the Gentiles, and he sets it down under this similitude; *If thou, being a wild Olive, wert grafted in amongst them, and with them partakers of the fatness of the Olive tree.* The Olive is the Church of Christ, visible in her profession: the *engrafting* is *entering into visible fellowship* with her: the *fatness* of this Olive, is the *Privileges and spiritual Ordinances* whereby spiritual good things are *communicated* to those that are so engrafted and received into communion. This is the conceived sense, by *Beza, Paræus, Piscator, &c.* and

the *frame of the Text* forceth as much; for *this fatness cannot* be the efficacy of *saving grace*, or spiritual dispositions issuing from the Covenant of grace? for *this fatness* is communicated from the *Olive*, but so saving grace is not conveyed from the Church to her Members: *This fatness may be lost*, for the

26

branches may be broken off, and so severed from the *Olive*, and so from all the juice and moisture that comes therefrom; but none can lose this saving grace, he shall at any time be made partaker of: once engrafted into Christ, never severed from him. The words opened, the Argument proceeds thus:

They who are not engrafted into the Olive, the true Church, they cannot share in the fatness of the Olive, the Privileges of the Church.

But children of Parents non-confederate, are not engrafted into the Olive, the Church: for their engrafting comes not from themselves, but from their next Parents, who are not entered into Church-covenant.

Nor will *that conceit* come in place of *answer*, that *the profession of the Parent is enough for the engrafting of themselves and their Posterity:* For

That engrafting or admission into the Church, is here meant, which excommunication out of the Church can take away; for that which the Church gives, that the Church can take away.

But profession of the truth excommunication cannot take away, as sense and experience evidenceth. Therefore that is not the engrafting here meant.

Argument III.

If a Pastor of any Congregation have no power by any rule to require a non-confederate to be baptized, or to bring his children to baptism: then a non-confederate hath no power by any rule to require Baptism of a Pastor of any Congregation, and consequently hath no right thereto: for if he had any rule and authority to require that privilege, he there had right to it. The truth of the consequence depends upon the parity and proportion of reason, which is equation both hands.

But *take a Pastor* or Teacher of any Congregation, and let him deal with a non-confederate that hath not joined him-

self to any particular society, and press him by all the authority he hath to come to the Ordinance; in case he refuse, let him proceed against him as an offender; and in case of abstinacy, execute the censure of excommunication; he will find himself at a loss, and that he hath gone beyond his line: His answer will be, I will not join with your Assembly, I am not bound to do it, nor can you censure me for it.

27

Beside, why may not any other Congregation censure upon the same ground, aad for the same cause, as not partaking with them, for they may make the like claim by the like reason.

Argument V.

Is taken from 1 Cor. 12:13. *We are baptized by one spirit into one body*: This body is not the *mystical and invisible*, but the *political and visible* body of Christ; and this visible body is not here attended, as the *Catholic visible Church*, but as a *particular Church*, as suppose at *Corinth* and *Philippi*; and therefore Baptism seals up the external communion with a particular Church; it supposeth our union to it, and communion with it, and that is done only by confederation, as before.

It is here answered, “*That the body and visible Church here intended is the Catholic visible Church, not a particular Church or Congregation.*”

Against which I shall thus *reason*, out of the particular circumstances in the Text; *that Body if here meant, in which Teachers are set up by Christ*, ver. 28.

But Teachers are not set up over the Catholic Church, but over the particular Congregation: It is such a flock *whereof they are overseers*, Acts 20:28. such a flock which is *amongst them*, and must be ruled by them, as their charge, 1 Pet. 5:2.

If Pastors be set over the Catholic Church visible, then either as it is taken in confederation as distinct from the particulars, or as it comprehends all the particulars in it.

But neither can be affirmed: not the *first*; for Pastors and Teachers are never set over a flock, they did never see, nor can tell where to find; and such is the Catholic Church. Not the *second*; if by the same commission they are set over all par-

ticular Congregations, then are they bound to bestow the same care and watch over all particulars, which no man will grant.

Secondly, *ordinary Teachers are set in the Church by ordinary means, and therefore by election*, Gal. 1:1. *Of God*, and *by Man* put into their places.

But election doth not set them over the Catholic Church; as sense will suggest on this manner: let three or four men be propounded for election, to so many Churches now needing and

28

craving supply, each of the Churches chooseth one, refuseth the other, as not so suitable to their spirits: If the election of the one gives power, therefore the rejection or non-election stops the extent and efficacy of that power; so that he can have no pastoral Office-power there over them.

We have now done with THE PERSONS WHO HAVE RIGHT to receive these seals.

We are now to enquire the Manner Of The Dispensation,

And that is either

Common to both, or
peculiar to each.

That which is *common* to both, appears in two things:

First, they must be *dispensed publicly*.

Secondly, they should have the *preaching of the Word accompany* their solemn administration.

First, *that they must be dispensed publicly, in the preface, and with the concurrence of the Church solemnly assembled*: for since the *seals of the Covenant, and the preaching if the Covenant go together*: the publication of the one must accompany the dispensation of the other; it is not in the power of the Church to confine preaching into corners, for *wisdom crieth openly in the streets*, Prov. 8:2, 3. and *of old* the Church of the Jews erected *Synagogues in every City* (beside the Temple set up in *Jerusalem*) for the hearing and preaching of the Word: our Saviour enjoined his Disciples, *what they heard in the ear secretly, to preach openly upon the house top*, Matth. 10:27. John 18:20, 21, 22. And he

compares the Supper of the Lord to their ordinary supper; so he opposeth manifestly the *Church or Congregation* to the *private house*, and declareth, that the Lord's Supper should be celebrated in the Congregation, as the Banquet should be kept in their private houses, 1 *Cor.* 1:20, 21, 22.

Yea, the scope and nature of the Ordinance calls for such an Administration; for since the Sacraments are badges to shew our separation from all other profane Societies, and to signify our communion one with another visibly in the profession and confession of the faith, as our spiritual union and communion with Christ our head mystically; therefore the administration of them should be such as should suit the na-

29

ture of the Ordinance, and serve the end of it: and therefore it is, that in times of persecution, when the Church dare not, nor is it meet she should shew herself to the enemy; yet not then, is the Word of God nor Sacraments privately preached or administred, neither yet ought to be; for though they be done in the house of a private man, yet because they are and ought to be administred in *the presence of the Congregation*, there is neither private preaching, nor private celebrating the Sacraments.

Secondly, *that both these Ordinances should go hand in hand, after the word opened the seals should be administered.*

The *practice* of the *Baptist*, our *Saviour* and his *Discipler*, are precedential to us in this behalf, *Matth.* 3:2, 3. compared with *ver* 5. for this last *verse* refers unto the former (the description of *John* his person and behaviour being put in occasionally) when *John* came *preaching in the Wilderness*, *Repent for the Kingdom*, &c. THEN *come to him the people from all coasts* and were baptized. And hence he is said *Mark* 1:4. *to baptize in the Wilderness and to preach the Baptism of repentance*, because there was a concurrence; the one made way for the more clear understanding, and the effectual working, and fruitful entertaining of the other.

And *that collection* seems to be fair, which is observed by some Interpreters (who comonly search more narrowly unto the text) *Acts* 19:4. *Paul* meaning to confer the gifts of the holy Ghost, which the twelve Disciples at *Ephesus* were to re-

ceive by the putting on of hands, unto the performance of the truth, by the performance of the promise figured by Baptism, and *so to join the sign with the thing signified*. In the fourth verse he sheweth *how John preached and administered that ordinance; first he preached that his Disciples should believe in Jesus Christ, which came after him: after in the fourth, that those Disciples of John (and not as is commonly supposed, those twelve Disciples of Ephesus) having heard John's preaching (and not as is supposed Paul's) were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus: this interpretation hath plain proof from the Grammar of the words, the two Conjunctions (which have relation one to the other, and cannot without force be severed) lead the Reader to this way, and lay forth the order of the administration, that after they had heard John Baptist preach, they were baptized.* THIS MAN-

30

NER OF ADMINISTRATION OF SACRAMENTS
IS COMMON *to both of them.*

There is something that is PECULIAR TO EACH, to which we shall add one word.

First, *Baptism is the Sacrament of our Initiation and ingrafting into Christ; and that is the usual phrase of the Gospel, ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Rom. 6:3.* our insition and incorporation into Christ, is signified and sealed up by Baptism: and hence Baptism is *once administred*, and never again to be repeated, because of the liability of the covenant of Grace: It is an everlasting Covenant, and they are the sure mercies that are there sealed up; the constancy of God's truth and faithfulness towards his, notwithstanding all their failing and infirmities, which overbear them in their daily course; *whom Christ loves once, he loves to the end: his gifts and calling are without repentance; and therefore whom he calls effectually, he preserves for ever through faith unto salvation; that no man shall, and therefore they cannot, take, themselves out of his hand, unless they be more then men: no falling away then totally or finally from the Covenant, and therefore no repeating of Baptism, which seals up our entrance into the Covenant.*

That which occasions some kind of further confederation here, is that which hath been a little stirring of late, *viz.*

Whether Baptism is to be administered by pouring of water, and so washing the body therewith, or by dipping the body into the water? for herein lies the very hit and turn of the question, as it is now controverted: for

First, it is confessed of every side, that the word βαπτίζω *properly* signities to *Dip*: we say to *Dip*, for so it is sometime used by the seventy: Ruth 2:14. *Ruth dippeth her Bread into the vinegar*; 1 Sam. 14:27. *Jonathan dipped the end of his rod into the honeycomb*; Thus it signifies to *Dip*, but seldom or never to *Dive*, as learned *Beza* interprets and explicates the propriety of the word, when he intends to lay forth the limits of it in its own bounds, *Mat.* 3:13.

Secondly, in ordinary course it is commonly used among Authors, and in Scripture, for *to Wash*, *Luke* 11:38. the Pharisees wondered at our Saviour, that he did not *wash before dinner*, βαπτισμοῦς, so *Mar.* 7:4,8.

31

Thirdly, *washing* is the *main thing intended by our Saviour in the institution*, and to be attended in the signification of the life of the water in the Sacrament of Baptism: and this is evidenced by these testimonies, which speak expressly to this purpose.

The Apostle, 1 Pet. 3:21. points at this, by special description, to be the *intended signification of the outward sign, unto which Baptism now answering, saves us*. But the question might happily arise, what of Baptism is here meant? for there be two things in the Sacrament; the *outward sign*, and the *spiritual part, the thing signified*. The Apostle therefore by way of prevention, and by a special description, distinctly interprets himself; I mean *not the putting away of th efilth of the flesh, i.e. the washing of water*, which is the signification to be attended in the use of the outward sign, and is the outward part of the Sacrament; but I mean the inward and spiritual part. To this agrees that *Eph.* 5:26. *Tit.* 3:5, 6. God is said to *save us by the washing of the new birth, and the renewing of the holy Ghost*, which is said to be *poured out upon us*; following the resemblance of *water poured, in the washing of Baptism*.

Nor can *that phrase* rationally admit another construction, *Acts 1:5.* when our Saviour promiseth his Disciples they should *be baptized with the holy Ghost not many days after*, as *John* baptized with water.

As they were baptized by the spirit, so they were baptized with water, for so the proportion requires; and therefore it is an utter *mistake* to think that βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι implies the *dipping into the water*, when the proposition [ἐν] as most frequently with the Hebrews, and generally amongst all *Grammarians*, notes only the *cause* or *instrument*, and so it carries *causa* and *effectum* with it; to baptize in water as a means used to signify and seal up the Covenant; and therefore the like is used, βαπτισθήσεθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; *not* that we are *dipped into the holy Ghost*, but that the holy Ghost is *poured upon us*, and therefore *Luke* expounds it by the *shedding and pouring out of the holy Ghost*, *Acts 1:33.* and therefore I could wish that these particulars might be considered.

First, *As we are baptized by the Spirit*, so by proportion we are said to be *baptized with water*, so the Text, *Acts 1:5.*

But we are baptized by the Spirit, when that it applied to us first; as the practice expounds the promise, *Acts 1:5.* with *chap. 2:33.*

32

Secondly, the *nature of Baptism, and the administration thereof, answers the work of application*; because it is to seal and confirm the Covenant to us: As it is agreed, so communicated and sealed.

But the applying the water to the body firstly, answers the work of application: for Christ by his Spirit doth apply himself to us first, *Phil. 3:12.* *we apprehend as we are comprehend*: the promise comes to us before we can come to it.

Nay, the Argument grows yet stronger.

That which crosseth the nature of the Covenant, that administration of the Seal suits it not; but Immersion intimateth, that we apply our selves first to Christ, and so to the Covenant, and this, crosseth the nature of the covenant; and therefore this administration suits it not.

Thirdly, *That which best resembleth our implanting into the similitude of the death and resurrection of Christ: That administration fits the nature of Baptism.*

But the applying and casting the water upon the body best resembles the nature of Burial, as sense will suggest: the dipping of the body into the dust, doth no way so lively remsemble Burial, as the casting out and mold upon it.

THE MANNER OF ADMINISTRATION PECULIAR TO THE SUPPER, is in two things,

First, it is a Sacrament of our nourishment, and our growing up in the Lord Jesus, and therefore it is appointed by him to be frequently used, as being one of the standing duties which the Lord Christ hath provided for the daily diet and the household provision of his faithful ones, who are his family, 1 Cor. 11:26, 34. *as often as ye eat this bread, &c.*

And to this purpose, our Saviour is here presented to us, as the spiritual food; nay, as the choice, and complete feast of the soul, such as may answer all our wants, and our desires also: *Bread sustains the hungry, Wine refreshes the thirsty, both satisfy to the full: Christ saves perfectly all that come unto him, Heb. 7:25.*

And hence secondly, in the *admistration*, as there be *distinct parts* of the Ordinance, so there is a *distinct blessing*, which was expressed by our Saviour in the first institution, and is to be imitated by all his Officers: For the words are open; *He took Bread and blessed it; after the same manner he took the cup and blessed*

33

it also: For one action is expressed, and the rest are implied, the very frame of the words, and order in which they are set forth, imply as much.

For *blessing of the Bread commeth immediately after the setting of it apart: Hence that blessing came before the taking of the Wine, and setting that apart for that spiritual end*, and therefore before the blessing of that Element; and therefore *there must be a distinct benediction used from the former*; and that best suits with the distinct nature of the several Elements which are appointed by our Saviour, and are to be used and received by the Communicants in that distinct consideration: for though whole *Christ spiritually* be in each part of the Supper, it is not a piece of Christ, as Bread and Food represented to

the Receiver; yet there is *not all Christ Sacramentally, but in both.*

CHAP. III.

Of censures.

THE Lord Christ being a tender hearted father to his Church, as his family and household, he hath not only provided wholesome and choice diet, his holy and spiritual Ordinances for the food and refreshing of the souls of his faithful, that so they may grow up into him in all things, and increase with the increasings of God.

But he hath laid in *Purgatives* as well as *Restoratives*; and out of his infinite wisdoms, who knows, to how many corrupt distempers, as so many hurtful and noisesome diseases the Saints are subject unto: he hath appointed *Church-censures* as good Physick, to purge out what is evil, as well as Word and Sacraments, which, like good diet, are sufficient to nourish the soul to eternal life.

And his earning compassion hath made him here so careful, that he hath appointed *each particular Brother*, as a skilful Apothecary, to help forward the spiritual health of all in confederacy with him.

Hence all the members are made (as we have heard) *watchmen* over the welfare of their Brethren, and by virtue of their consociation and combination, have power over each other, and

34

a judicial way of process against each other, in case of any sinful aberration, to proceed legally and judicially again It them, according to rules and orders of Christ provided for *that* end: and herein members of the same Congregation proceed not only *christianly*, but *judicially* against offences; at in civil bodies, *special corporations* have special advantages this way.

The *proceeding in the dispensation of centres a double*, according to the double quality of offenders and offences,

Which are either

Private,

Public.

Private offences appear only to few, one or more; and therefore they only are to proceed against them, in *covering* and *biding* them from the apprehensions of others, as much as may be; provided, they can thereby attain an healing of them.

The *rules* here to rectify their proceeding, that they may not neglect their duty, in not endeavouring reformation, or else through unskilfulness encrease sin and trouble, when they would remove the one and prevent the other.

The RULES I say, to regulate *their proceedings by*, are these:

First, *such human infirmities*, which unavoidably attend the best Saints breathing upon earth, while they carry a body of death about them, are not to be taken as matter of offence intended by our Saviour, nor have we any just cause to stumble at such straws, or be taken with distaste against the carriage of a Brother in that case; and therefore they come not under the nature of an offence in this advicte of our Saviour, *Matth. 18:15.*

Secondly, *If the sin be such*, which is like a *stone of stumbling in our Christian course*, and therefore needs to be reformed in *him that commits*, and to be removed out of *the way of him that sees it*, we must here attend our duty, and the direction of our Saviour. *Mat. 18:15. Levit. 19:17.*

Thirdly, but if yet it be not *so clear, but doubtful* to us only, though our thoughts and apprehensions lead that way; it is not yet ripe for any Church-process. But if fears and suspicions pursue us, as fearing we do not what we should, for the good of our Brother, nor for the settling of our affections to

35

him: we may enquire by way of doubt, to be satisfied, and to have our hearts quieted, but not adventure to censure it: for it is a safe rule, *Where we have not found ground of conviction, we have no reason to administer an Admonition.*

Fourthly, if the offence be such, which deserves a censure, and that we have evidence enough of Argument and rule to convince to our apprehension, it is yet the fairest way to *enter into a serious debate and consideration of the evil, and to bear fully and freely what can be said by the offending party, for his defence*: The grounds which are good to bear an admonition, will then be

more clear, all shifts by discourse being fully discovered, we may better see how more fully and undeniably to fasten a convicting reproof upon a Brother, which is that our Saviour counsels, *Mat. 18:15. ἔλεγξον*. If this fear and wariness were well attended, those ordinary mistakes, clashings, sayings and gainsayings, and the many offences committed amongst Brethren, while they come to reform one offence given, would easily be prevented through the help and assistance of Christ, if the party that comes to rebuke, would be sure,

{First, that *the sin was committed*.

{Secondly, that he hath evidence, either by the *confession* of the party, or *witness of others*, that such a Brother committed it.

{Thirdly, that such a *rule* is fair *and full to convince of such a sin*.

The majesty of Christ's Ordinance would appear with much evidence, and with much ease and comfort on all hands, in all the degrees of it; whether it be between thee and him, or whether in case of not hearing, you take one or two; or if need require, in bringing it to the Church, *Thus of private Offences*.

But if the *offence be FAMOUS AND NOTORIOUS AT THE FIRST PRACTICE OF IT*, as open drunkenness, swearing, stealing, lying; or that a Brother, according to the rule of Christ, by reason of another's *obstinacy*, be constrained to tell it to the Church, and make it public.

In this PUBLIC PROCESS two things are to be attended:

1. *The preparation to the sentence.*
2. *The execution of it.*

36

First, By way of *Preparation*, the offence must,

First, be *brought to the Elders*, and by them debated and delivered to the Church; for they are *guides and leaders of the Church*, Heb. 13:17. *the watchmen and overseers of it*, and therefore they must know the causes and controversies to the full in all circumstances, difficulties, windings and turnings thereof, that they may be able to lead the Congregation in

the ways of peace and truth; which they cannot do, unless they know the way the way themselves.

Secondly, to them it appertains *to judge whether the things be of weight and worth*, and so need and require the pretence and assistance of the body to expresse their judgment against them, and the party guilty of them or no: for if they be petty businesses, and altogether unfit and unworthy to trouble the Congregation withal: it is in their power to prevent such causeless and needless disturbance, and therefore to suppress any further proceeding therein.

Obj. It will be said happily, By this means, and under this pretence, if the Elders be corrupt in their judgement, or partial in their affections, they may silence the weightiest cause that can be, and so prejudice the innocency of those, they are not friendly affected unto, and hinder the reformation of those, whom in a corrupt and partial way they sinfully savour.

Answ. Therefore as it is in their power to suppress such petty occasions which are not worthy the time, pains and disturbance that must be spent upon them; so yet to prevent in justice and partiality in such cases, the party who takes himself wronged, *may complain of the Elders* in that behalf: And if *the Congregation* see apparently, they have dealt unjustly and partially, *it is in their power to rectify it*: but if the complaint prove unjust and unreasonable, be it at the peril of him that complains, for he is to be censured sharply and severely, as out of pride and perversness, refusing to listen to the seasonable advice and counsel of those who were set over him by the Lord: as also, because he hath needlessly disturbed the peace of the Congregation as much as in him lieth.

Thirdly, this preparation is, to be made by the Elders, because *the body of the people*, if numerous, they will be unable with any comely conveniency, to *consider and weigh all the cir-*

37

cumstances, with all the emerging difficulties, which will certainly and necessarily occur in such agitations: nor can in reason bestow their time and pains upon them, as the intricacy and perplexity of the work will sometimes require.

But when all things are cleared, the native and naked state of the controversy laid forth and presented in the severals of it, even *the meanest in the Congregation* will generally be able to see cause to join their judgments with the truth.

This *preparation* of the action on lies in two things:
the

Cause must be examined
Examination recorded
presently.
exactly.

In the examination of, controversies (because the eagerness of some spirits is inordinate in the pursuit of an offence too rigidly; and the pride of all men's hearts generally is such, that though they can do shamefully, yet they are loth to bear the shame of it; and therefore out of their waywardness wiliness of heart, are ready to wimble and wind out devices, that they may put by the dint of a discovering and convicting Argument.) HE THAT COMPLAINS MUST KNOW TWO RULES.

First, that he must not dare to complain to the Elder of a Church, *unless he can plainly and peremptorily lay in his accusation of another, touching* such speeches and carriages, of which upon through search, he is well assured: I say, *peremptorily accuse* of things whereof he is groundedly assured, because I would prevent such weak and windy kind of expressions, as too often we meet withal, out of men's too sudden pangs and heedless mistakes. *I take it so; I conceived it so; it was so reported; I met with it on that manner, &c.* when upon the search, all these vanish as mistakes: The *word* is, we *must rebuke convictingly*, Mat. 18:15.

Secondly, as his accusation must be, plain, *so his proofs must be direct and pregnant*, that such words, for the substance and reality of them were spoken, and such things done; there must be *two witness to establish every word*, except the things be otherways evidenced sufficiently, as by confession of the party, &c.

On *the* ELDERS PARTS TWO RULES, if attended, make a great riddance, of occasions, and prevent distempers.

First, *let the accusation be presently and exactly recorded*, together

38

with the *answer* thereunto in like manner: for experience teacheth, that in multiplicity of debates, parties are apt to forget, or else not willing to remember, and sometimes ready to mistake, add, alter, vary in expressions, as they see there may any advantage come to their own, or disadvantage to the contrary cause: All again by this means is easily prevented, and the truth made open to the apprehension of the stander by.

Secondly, *let the Elders confine all parties to the point in hand*, and not suffer them by extravagancies to darken the truth, disturb the proceedings, and bring confusion to the whole debate. They are also, by their authority put into their hands, *to forbid and refrain all personal and passionate expressions*, and constrain both sides to speak to the cause, and only to the cause in hand.

Thus the preparation is done, the cause rightly stated and cleared, doubts answered, mistakes removed, and by proofs fair and sufficient, the truth confirmed; now the cause is ready and ripe for judgement, and may easily be determined in half an hour, which cost many weeks in the search and examination thereof.

The EXECUTION of the sentence issues in four things.

First, the *cause* exactly recorded, is as *fully* and *nakedly* to be *presented to the considrration of the Congregation*.

Secondly, the *Elders* are to go before the Congregation in *laying, open the rule*, so far as reacheth any particular now to be considered, and to *express their judgement and determination thereof, so far as appertains to themselves*.

Thirdly, unless the people be able to convince them of error and mistakes in their sentence, they are *bound to join their judgement with theirs, to the completing of the sentence*.

Fourthly, *the sentence*, thus completely issued, is to be *solemnly passed and pronounced* upon the Delinquent *by the ruling Elder*, whether it be the censure of *admonition* or *excommunication*.

Touching this last,

Of EXCOMMUNICATION.

There be *several cases* which offer themselves to further search

39

and consideration, of which we may briefly, and in order enquire, having an eye and reference to what hath been said touching the first *subject of the keys*, where all these disputes had their *first rise*, and shall receive their *last resolution*.

The first Question is, *What is the order of the Gospel in the process of this great and dreadful Ordinance of Excommunication?*

Answ. First, the *execution* of this sentence against the Malefactor, against whom it is passed, concerns all the body, because they are all bound to reject all Church-communion with him, and that because he hath renounced the rule of Christ, and is therefore justly *delivered up to Satan, to be his slave in the kingdom of darkness, who would not be a subject to Christ in the kingdom of light*: they are to renounce all *voluntary and unnecessary familiarity with him, even in civil converse*, that they may, as much as in them lies, *without any breach of any bond or relation that lies upon them*, discountenance him in his course, and cause him to be *ashamed*; and therefore in some particulars he is below the degree of a Heathen: 1 Cor. 5:11. *with such a one eat not*; and yet 1 Cor. 10:27. *if an Infidel invite to a feast*, we may go by allowance from the Apostle; and by parity of reason, we may invite such occasionally: but the like carriage we may not express to an Excommunicate.

Now because the execution of the sentence concerns all, therefore it were to be wished, there should be an unanimous consent of all unto it.

Secondly, *hence excommunication being an Ordinance of so great terror, and of so common and great concernment unto all, (if we look at the manner) it must be proceeded in with much moderation, pity, patience and long-sufferance*: if there can be a healing of a corrupt member, we must not be *hasty to cut it off*: If we look at the matter, it must not be for *petty and small aberrations*, but for *such evils as the mind and conscience of a man, enlightened by the truth of God, would condemn in himself or any, upon the first serious consideration*, was his understanding lest to the liberty of reason, to act thereby, and not crack-brained and perverted with prejudice and selfishness.

Thirdly, such evils which are either heinous and abominable, as *fornication, murder, adultery, incest, treason, &c.* or if not so gross, yet *carry the face of evil in their forehead, upon the first*

serious and well-grounded consideration of reason; and have been pertinaciously and obstinately persisted in, after the improvement of all

40

means upon them for conviction and reformation: *these only deserve excommunication* by the rules of Christ, 1 Cor. 5. *Mat.* 18:17.

Fourthly, when such evils are presented to the Church, and there is a *mutual and joint concurrence of all*; every particular Congregation hath received power from Christ to proceed to excommunication without any more ado.

This every one grants, may be done by a Church in an Island; and every particular Congregation hath as much power and right in that censure (as formerly hath been touched, and shall more fully be proved afterward:) the like also may be done *if some few should dissent*, in case their reasons be heard and answered, and they silenced by the power of Argument.

Fiftly, but in *case things prove doubtful* (which rarely they will, or can in truth, if rules formerly mentioned be attended) and *the difference grow wide and great, it is then seasonable to crave the counsel and help of neighbouring Churches*; not to receive any power from them to execute the censure: but that they may see the truth cleared, the erring parties may be convinced, the way also warranted; *which being done, either all will agree, or else the major part of the Church hath power and right to proceed and pass the censure according unto Christ; and the rest of the Church dissenting, are bound to sit down satisfied therewith.*

But *in case the counsel of the consociated Churches shall advise to withhold*; the case will then appear doubtful, and want ground of conviction of the Churches part; and therefore they will want ground of execution, as hath been said; and therefore *they must stay their proceeding.*

The second question is, *Where lyes the HIGHEST TRIBUNAL where this sentence issues?*

Answ. Before we can lay forth the rule of proceeding in this censure, and the order and rank that each person must keep, according to his power and place: we shall speak something, first, by way of *explication of the nature of the censure*; secondly, lay forth the *bounds according unto which the people should*

confine themselves in putting forth their power: lastly, give *in the reasons* shortly of the question so stated.

First, this censure of excommunication, and the admonition that makes way for it, is to be attended in a double regard,

41

either as it

Legally prepared.

Dogmatically propounded by the Elders, as leaders to the Congregation: or

Judicially passed and executed.

For the understanding of the first, you must recall and remember, that it appertained to *the place and office of the Rulers*, by through search and examination, to ripen the cause, and to clear all mistakes, and settle the truth by sufficient and undeniable witness; and therefore in case things were doubtful, and admit no serious or through proof, the Congregation should not be troubled with such things: where no conviction can be gained, there no censure of public admonition or excommunication mould be administered. But when things are fully testified, then they are dogmatically to discover the mind of God, and the rule of Christ, according to which a Congregation should proceed.

Secondly, their judgements thus expressed, the compass according to which the people should confine themselves in putting forth *their power and judgement*, may be conceived in THIS RULE.

The fraternity have no more power to oppose the sentence of the censure, thus prepared and propounded by the Elders, then they have to oppose their doctrine which they shall publish. But they have as much power to oppose the one as the other. We will touch both the parts of the *Rule*.

First, they have no more power to oppose the sentence of the censure thus prepared and propounded by the Elders, then they have to oppose their doctrine which they shall publish; (let it be here attended, that I speak of the censure as *dogmatically propounded*, not of *the judicial passing of it*, when it comes to be executed, and then) the proof is plain.

First, because *they have the same authority in dogmatical propounding of the one, as in promulgation of the other*; They are acts,

which alike issue out of their office, in which they are placed, and unto which they are called of God, and bound to be leaders to the people, as in preparing the cause, that it may be ripe and ready for the censure, so in laying open the rule, as it reacheth the several particulars, and to express their judgement and determination thereof.

Secondly, that their power is equal in both, appears pal-

42

pably thus: when the cause is cleared and proved by evidence of undeniable witnesses, *the Elder may refer it to the Word, and out of the word preach it as a Doctrine*: so that the sentence the Elder will pass, shall be a point he will preach; and therefore none shall oppose the one, but he shall oppose the other.

And hence it follows, which was formerly intimated, that if the people cannot convince the Elder of his error or mistake in the sentence, *they are bound to join their judgement with his in the completing of the sentence*, without impertinent questions, needless scruples, wilful and disorderly gainsayings; for if they cannot confute his Doctrine, they are bound to entertain and establish it.

Therefore they must do so with their censures, as the inference forceth.

And this kind of proceeding in judicature discovers so much wisdom, care and faithfulness of the Lord Christ, in providing for the comfort, honour and safety of his Church, as the like, is not to be found in all the governments upon earth, wherein the greatest excellency ever appeared, to the apprehension of the sons of men.

For behold the Lord Christ is so tender and companionate over his Church, that the meanest member thereof shall not be touched in the least measure in his liberty, but he hath fitted, called and appointed his Officers, wise and holy watchmen, that shall secretly and seriously examine all things with all exactness, shall receive nothing but upon such proof, as that whereby every word shall be established; and yet when all this is evidenced, they shall not proceed against them in private, but they shall present all these evidences to the view and consideration of them all; lay open the rule of truth before them, and nothing shall be done that they shall oppose, but must approve and set their hand and seal unto, as suitable

to the rules of truth, and righteousness, and love. And this proceeding is held in all things to all his members: the like is not to be found on earth.

The second part of the Conclusion is, *That they have as much power and right to oppose their censures, so propounded, as their Doctrine. For their power is alike in dispensing the one, as the other, as hath been proved: and therefore if they can oppose the one, they may so far oppose the other.*

Since then it is yielded on all hands, *that the fraternity may*

43

renounce and condemn the false, erroneous and heretical Doctrines of an Elder, and hinder them that they may never be entertained nor established in the place, yea reject his opinions, and take away his Office from him: they may do as much by parity of reason against his false and unjust censures propounded and concluded, and so interpose and oppose proceeding, as that they shall never take place and be established in the Congregation, only the method and order prescribed before in case of difference, must be attended.

The conclusion then is, *The fraternity put for the causal power in the censure of excommunication, whence it receives its complete being, and here lies the supreme Tribunal in point of judgement, and public proceeding in censure against an offender: the reasons of this we have given formerly, when we entreated of the first subject of the keys, whether we refer the Reader; only we may recall two or three for the present, that we may not leave this place wholly void.*

First, that Church that can publicly admonish the Elder or Elders, in case he do not hear one or two, that Church can excommunicate, being not heard, Mat. 18:17.

But the Church of the fraternity, in case the Elders offending will not hear one or two, may also admonish: For if one or two may admonish privately, according to degrees of process prescribed by our Saviour, why all may not admonish publicly, I see not, by the same parity and equality of reason.

If a Brother, *i. e.* any Brother.

Nay, the case may be such, that they only will be lest to admonish: for suppose three Elders in the Congregation two of them are under offence, in which they do persist, not yield-

ing to the first or second admonition, to what Church must now the complaint he made; *one Elder is not a Church*, therefore the complaint must be made to the fraternity with him; therefore they must admonish and therefore may also cast out, if their admonition be not heard.

Secondly, *that placing of the supreme power, which crosseth the proceeding prescribed by our Saviour, that is not orderly and regular.*

But the placing of the supreme power in the Elders doth so.

The Assumption is thus evidenced:

That which makes the guilty party the Judge in his own Cause, that crosseth the proceeding prescribed by our Saviour.

44

But this doth so: For in case the Elders offend, and are complained of, to whom must the complaint be carried? the text saith, To the Church: the Church (says this opinion) is the Elders, and therefore they must be complained unto as their own Judges.

Thirdly, *that power which it appointed by Christ in his Church to reform evil* (that being managed according to his appointment, and that in time of peace) *that power can and will attain its end*, otherwise there should be an imputation laid upon our Saviour, that either he wanted wisdom or power in his institutions, in that such were appointed which were not able to attain the end, for which they were provided and appointed. *But if the power of the Censures be placed in the Presbytery, for the removal and purging out of the leaven of a pertinacious sinner, it cannot attain his end:* For suppose the body of the people will keep him in, converse with him, and maintain full communion, their excommunication will not do the deed, which shews the arm is too short to manage this power to the full extent of it, as it was intended by our Saviour.

And hence Master Rutherford grants, *lib. 1. p. 44.* That it is the constant received and maintained opinion of Divines, ancient and modern, that excommunication be done, *consentiente plebe.*

Nay, Zepperus, Zanchy, Beza, Bucanus, Paræus, think the Eldership should not excommunicate, *sine consensu.* Nay, Peter Martyr goes further, *Unde concluditur non absque consensu ecclesiæ quempiam excommunicari posse*, loc. com. de excom. sent. 9. *Jus*

hic ad ecclesiam pertinet, nec ab illa eripi debet, sent. 10. Cartwright in 1 Cor. 5. against the Rhemists: *Magdeburg*, Cent. 1. lib. 2. c. 4. *Claves toti ecclesiæ sunt traditæ*.

The ground I conceive of this joint judgement, thus constantly requiring the consent of the people, doth in truth imply, that *their consent* was not matter of complement, but carried a causal *virtue* with it, for the completing and accomplishing of this censure.

And let it be supposed that where there be three Elders, two of them should turn Heretics and continue so; how could the Church proceed against them, unless there was a *causal power in the fraternity* to accomplish this censure?

For (if by Church was meant the Eldership) how can *one be*

45

the Church? and if the people should consent, and yet their consent carry no causal virtue to this work, the inconvenience, which is cross to right reason, remains yet unremoved, *to wit*, that excommunication should proceed and be completed *by one man*, which is contrary to the grain of the words, and the process of our Saviour let down in the place, which is *to rise by increase from one to two or three, and thence to a multitude*.

This ground thus proved, being received, many *collections* flow naturally from hence, which will be instead of so many *Answers* to several *Questions*.

First, *the power of judgement and power of office* are apparently *distinct* and different *one from another*: The Elders in *point of rule* and exercising the act of their Office, are supreme, and *above the Congregation*; none have that Office-authority, nor can put forth the acts thereof but themselves: But in *point of power of judgement or censure*, the *fraternity* they are *supreme*, and above any member or Officer, in case of offence and delinquency: nor need any man strange at this distinction, when the like is daily obvious in parallel examples presented before our eyes.

The Lord *Major* is above the *Court*, as touching the ways and works of his Office, none hath right, nor can put forth such acts, which are peculiar to his place, and yet the *Court* is *above in point of censure*, and can answerably proceed to punish in a just way, according to the just desert of his sin. Thus the

Parliament is above the King, the Soldiers and Captains above their General.

Hence again, *excommunication* it not an act of power of Office, but of judgement, from grounds and grants formerly cleared, and therefore cannot be appropriated to Rulers, nor upon right confederation accounted an act of highest rule, but an act of supreme judgement, which is stated in the fraternity, and may be put forth by them in a right order and manner, as it hath been before proved; still that is a staple rule, which stands fast. *The whole hath power over any member and members, and can preserve her self and safety against any of their power that would annoy or destroy it.*

And this must be yielded by all those who give power of *excommunication* to Synods and Councils, in that Brethren as well as

46

Elders are members of the Synods, and the Acts of those Assemblies issue from *both Elders and Brethren*, as all the Orthodox prove against the Popish Impropiators.

Hence lastly, as long as *the Church* continues, and hath the being of a Church, *she hath right and power* of managing these censures, because it belongs to her καθ' αὐτὸ, and appertains to her as such a body, and therefore cannot be taken away, unless her being be taken away: As an Officer, while he remains in his Place and Office, he hath right and power to Preach and administer the Seals, though the exercise of those acts may sometime be hindered by violence and constraint: so while the members continue confederate in combination, and so communion with one another by free content, they have also power one over another, and in case the part prejudice the whole, it's subject to the power of the whole, to be removed from the communion thereof.

I

PART. IV.
Concerning Synods.

CHAP. I.

Wherein M^r. Rutherford's sixth Argument is debated, taken out of Acts 15. and the nature of that Synod discussed, and how far that or any other Synod can be said to bind by any warrant from the Word.

THE sixth Argument of Master *Rutherford* is taken from that samplar of a Synod propounded in the fifteenth of the *Acts*. Before we can come to give a direct and clear *Answer* thereunto, we shall be forced to speak some things to prepare way to that purpose, that it may appear how far the power of a Synod is confessed or denied, and wherein *the stress of the Controversy* doth especially consist; and that will be dispatched in the *conclusions* following.

I. *Conclus.*

The consociation of Churches is not only lawful, but very useful also, serving not alone to search out the truth, but to

2

settle the hearts of all sincerely minded in the right apprehension and profession of the same.

When many, and those select and eminent, lay the best of their abilities together, improve their parts and prayers, disquisitions, confiscations, determinations, to promote the knowledge and practise of the things of Christ, the establishment of the Churches, in the unity of the faith, and their eternal peace.

The *light of nature and right reason* forcing men out of their own necessities and experience to confess, That, *In the multitude of Councilors there is safety*. Plus vident oculi, quam oculus, &c. *The issue* of that *counsel* evidenceth as much, *Acts*

16:4, 5. *They delivered their Decrees, &c. and the Churches were established in the faith, &c.*

2. *Conclus.*

This *Consociation* is of *several sorts* and degrees, some *lesser* some *greater*, as *Classes, Syneds*; and these *Provincial, National, Oecumenical*.

3. *Conclus.*

The *power* which any or all have, is *not boundless*, or unlimited, They are all but men, and may err: their judgements are *not the rule*, but must be regulated. Their power is under Christ, only from him, and for him, wholly to be acted and ordered by his authority in his Word.

Thus far we agree. But

This authority is by several men severally considered; namely, it is either authority of

Church counsel.

Church jurisdiction.

Mr. *Ruther*. 271. near the end.

1. When the case is controversial, many doubts and difficulties arise, which cannot easily and readily be discerned or decided, The grieved parties crave the advice and seek the counsel of many Churches, and willingly submit to the truth of God appearing by their means.

3

2. *Authority of Church jurisdiction*, is, when the *Churches meeting* have not only authority to counsel, *but power to censure Ecclesiastically* in case the Parties whose cause comes to be scanned and considered, shall be found guilty and worthy such a censure.

5.

Hence the Churches thus meeting, may be said *to impose their determination* and such decrees; which result and arise out of their disquisitions and disputes either by authority of the Word

only, from whence their determinations are fetched and confirmed apparantly.

And then they are said to bind *materialiter*, in regard of the thing which is determined, being no more, nor other then that which is *evidently expressed, or infallibly collected* put of the Word, and so their *counsels* are no other then *God's Commands*, contain a Divine Authority which is now by them discovered, and *in his Name applied* to the particulars under hand, as the Counsel Act 15:20. enjoins them to abstain *from fornication*, which are the express Words of Scripture, from the Law in the Gospel.

But besides this they are said to bind *formaliter*, when it is *supposed* and taken for granted, that the *Decrees* are not only *required in the Word, but enjoined by such, who have Church-jurisdiction*, and in virtue of that Authority can impose, and in case of Refusal *have Power to censure Ecclesiastically*.

We conceive the *former*, id est, the *Authority of Brotherly Counsel*, is attended by Christ; Mr *Rutherford* expresseth much learning and labour to maintain and prove the *latter*, and to that purpose allegeth this Pattern of Act. 15. Which whether it be fit and full to this purpose, we shall make some serious inquiry according to our measure after we have debated the nature and quality of this Assembly and the proceedings therein; which we shall do in these Conclusions.

Of Acts 15.

1. Conclus.

THIS Synod was not extraordinary, either in regard of the infallible assistance of the persons in it, or the immediate revelation of the truths therein discussed and decreed

4

Its true, the Apostles were extraordinary men in regard of their Places and Office, but that was not here attended, nor in virtue of that they did act; There *is jus singulare*, and *jus commune* says *Junius*. The second is here attended. They were *Pastors* which had ordinary abilities, as well as *Apostles*, which

had extraordinary assistances, and they acted in the former relation.

For *in extraordinary* revelations and infallible assistances, men do not *join Ordinary Churches* in their consultations and inquiries; but so the whole Work was carried here: The *men disputed*, inquired; each man had allowed liberty to propound his thoughts, had recourse to the Scriptures, and reasoned out of them, Act. 15:7, 8 to 18.

And *ergo the Lord here leaves a Copy and Samplar to all succeeding Generations*, how to seek the truth by way of trial in the life of such means which he hath appointed.

2. *Conclus.*

Hence their sentence was *not therefore Scripture or Canonical* because they decreed it, as when they were infallibly assisted and acted by the H. Ghost. 2 *Pet.* 1.

But the thing or matter which was decreed, it was either *expressed pregnantly*, or *infallibly collected* out of the Word, and so being *Scripture*, it was therefore decreed by them, as the *instances* of the Decrees give in evidence.

To abstain from Fornication, which is one of the Decrees, it is the very letter of the Text; The *other Particulars* issue out of one ground, and thence have the strength of divine prohibition; for in things of indifferent use, (as those which were *strangled* and *blood*,) the rule of the Apostle admits no gainsaying 1 *Cor.* 1, and last *Rom.* 14.

They were not therefore Canonical Scripture because decreed, but *è contra*, because they were *Scripture*, ergo they were decreed.

And it is one thing to make *Mandatum, quò tale*, Divine Scripture; another thing, when the matter is by force of undeniable conference, gathered out of Scripture to give it out as a Mandate;

And thus I suppose that Phrase is to be understood.

IT SEEMS GOOD UNTO THE HOLY GHOST AND UNTO US. Vers 28.

5

By the *Holy Ghost* there must either be under stood, the *immediate revelation* of the Spirit, parallel to that of *Peter*,

ὕπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι 2 *Pet.* 1:21, and *this sense* the *Text admits not*; for there was no extraordinary Revelation, that can in reason be attributed, or conceived to belong to the ordinary Multitude; beside, the Argument formerly pledged, hath confuted this sense.

Or else it must be the *H. Ghost* as *freaking in the word*, which is open and easy to conceive; and we have the like Phrase in Scripture carrying the like sense, in that the severals of the sentence, follow by infallible inference from Scripture grounds, as the Will of the Lord, unto which the Spirit by dispute, collation and comparison of places, did lead them.

3. *Conclus.*

Hence the *Synode* may be said to *charge the truth of God* upon the Churches, and to load their Confidences with the Decrees they published by way of *authoritative Counsel*, because they have the *Divine Authority of the Scripture* commanding all that they decreed, long before their Decrees came out, the evidence whereof they now discovered, and the power whereof they *by way of Application* pressed upon their consciences in the particulars mentioned.

Taking this sense and interpretation along with us, that Mr *Rutherford* here and there opposeth as in the Answer to the 11. and 15. *Object.* pag. 210, 212. will easily be removed; for when he thus reasons,

Obj. *“If this Assemblies Decrees did lay a tie and bond upon the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, Then it did either tie them as a Counsel, or as a part of Scripture, or thirdly, as a Decree of an Ecclesiastical Synod,* pag. 212.

“If the first be said, this Canon doth not lay a Command upon them; the contrary thereof we find vers. 28. It layeth a burden upon them, Chap. 16:4. Decrees they must keep.

2. *“It cannot tie us a part of Scripture; for that which is proper to the Church, to Christ his second coming again, doth not oblige as Canonic Scripture; For Canonic, Scripture shall not be still written till Christ come again, because the Canon is already closed with a Curse upon all adders; but what is*

6

“*decreed according to God by Church-guides is proper to the Church &c. pag. 210.*

“*Ergo, They must tie as a Decree of an Ecclesiastic Synod.*

ANSW. The ambiguity and doubtfulness of the Phrase darkens all the dispute; the Explication of that will expedite an answer to all that hath been said with great evidence; *To bind as a part of Scripture*, admits a double sense.

1. Either *that which is decreed is clearly contained in*, and so infallibly collected out of *Scripture*, and so is *Scripture*, and hath the binding Power of *Scripture* with it.

2. Or that this *act of Decreeing* issuing from the immediate Revelation and assistance of the Spirit, *doth make that which is decreed to be Scripture.*

We take it in the *former sense*, and affirm according to what we have formerly proved, that the Decrees are express *Scripture*, or necessarily to be inferred from the *Scripture*, and *ergo* tie as a part of *Scripture*, which is there *alleged*; though the *Allegation* it self, in it self *barely considered*, hath *no such Power*, nor can lay any such bond at all.

As when the *Nicene Council* decreed that the *Son was Ὁμοούσιος* with the Father, as the Words of text evidence, *Philip. 2:6.* he counted it no robbery to be equal with the Father; *This Decree contains Scripture*, and *ergo* hath a Divine Power going with it to bind, not because decreed, but because it is *Scripture* which they have decreed.

And in this sense they did, and any Council may lay a Burden upon any mans Conscience; so any Christian that shall publish and preach that of *1 Cor. 6:18. Flee Fornication*; and every man that commits that sin, *He sins against his own Body*; He may press this Prohibition as binding the Conscience, and lay it as a burden of the Lord upon every soul, *not from the Authority* of him that speaks, but because it is *Scripture that is spoken*; and may lawfully lay an absolute necessity upon all his hearers, that they must keep that Charge, since it's God's Charge now published and applied by his Means.

And in this sense it is true, That which is proper to the Church until the coming of Christ again, that may oblige as Canonical *Scripture*; not because the formal publishing

doth make it Scripture, but because the thing is assuredly Scripture which is published.

7

Nay in the 209. p. immediately going before, Mr *Rutherford* affirms that which amounts to thus much, In his first Answer to the ninth Objection where he conjoins these two together; “*That the excommunication of the Incestuous Corinthian, The Appointing Elders at Lystra was Scripture; and yet the Decree of Excommunication and appointing Elders did bind with an Ecclesiastical tie only.*”

By the same proportion; the *things* that are *counselled* may be *Scripture*, and bind by a Divine Power, and yet the *publication* of these may tie by way of Counsel only in regulating of those that do publish them.

Before we part from hence it will not be amiss to take into confederation, how Mr *Rutherford* *denies* the ground, how it comes about that a Presbytery can bind a Congregation by an Ecclesiastical tie of Obedience, how a Synod can tie a Presbytery. &c.

He answers they have warrant by

Positive Law by God,
The Law of Nature.

Concerning which I shall take leave to offer some few things to consideration, because I cannot so well reach his meaning, that so I may give him occasion more fully to explicate himself at his return.

Jus Naturale, and Poitivum, when their special and specific Nature comes to be attended, I have looked at them, as *carrying a kind of Opposition*, as *Membra dividientia* use to do; and as its ordinary to observe amongst all Interpreters in the Exposition of the Commands.

Jus Naturale is, *That which issues out of the reference and dependence, which the Nature of men hath unto God as a Creator*, so that if God be God, and man a Creature, made for him and his Glory, he must bestow himself and heart upon, him in the first Command, *This is a Natural Law.*

But that he should worship him by such means by the Word, such Sacraments and Censures so dispensed; this is a positive Law of God’s appointment, which had he not expressed, or should

be after, that which was positive Law before is no Law now; As in the *Sacraments of the Jews*, which are now out of date, may be easily discerned; those which *were means* of Worship then appointed, are no *means* now, because abrogated.

8

And how the Authority of Synods should bind by a *Positive Law*, and yet *also bind by Nature*, deserves some further Explication.

Nor doth the Explication and Distinction added, pag, 208.

“*A thing is natural two ways,*

simply

and

by consequent,

take away all the scruple, or clear all the doubt.

For if that may be counted a *Law of Nature*, which upon *some supposition* or condition stands by a rule of reason, I cannot see how natural and positive Laws will be distinguished.

Take we Mr R. *Examples* propounded into consideration.

“That *Thomas and John should dwell in such a Congregation, God in his providence might have otherwise disposed; and that is ergo Jus Positivum that they come there to be Members.*

“*But being Members, then its connatural, they should be subjected to the Eldership of this Congregation; and the ground of the bound is, the part must be in subjection to those who command the whole: John and Thomas are parts of this Congregation; such an Eldership commands the whole, ergo they must be subject to such an Eldership.* pag. 101.

I do not see how this distinction can clear the cause in hand; for by the same ground I see nor why any man may not say than all positive Laws are natural, nay cannot be but natural Laws; look we at the consequent and condition which may, nay certainly will attend all of them in their very constitution.

Take some instance for evidence; when any of the *Heathen* came to imbrace *the Jews Religion* and ceremonial Law, they did that by a positive Law, because they might have remained as *Job*, and never become Proselytes.

But *when* they are *once* turned Proselytes and become Members of the *Jewish* Congregation, then it is conatural that they should submit to all their Ceremonies; every Member of the Corporation must be under the Laws of the whole; so that by this ground they must be said to obey the Ceremonies by Nature's Law; but how harsh doth that found?

Besides, when a man is a Member of such a Congregation, where its ordinary and usual for such a man to depart at, his pleasure,

9

and become an Inhabitant in another Province, as it suits with his own will, or emergent occasions; and yet being there, he as a Member must submit to the rule of the whole; and upon that ground is bound to obey by Nature's Law; when there be no Laws that can be more merely positive, then these be; and their obedience comes from free choice, because it is in their choice to depart if they will.

To end this case, let this reason be attended.

That ground which is common to Nature's Lows and Positive Laws, that cannot make a distinction betwixt either of them. Communia non distinguunt.

But this rule of reason that the part should be ordered by the whole, is common to all the Laws, natural and positive. Ergo, by this the one cannot be distinguished from the other.

That which follows, needs a grain of salt to be added, otherwise it exceeds my apprehension to make work of it, pag. 202.

“The division of a Nation into Provinces, and of Provinces into so many Territories called Presbyteries, and the division of so many Presbyteries into so many Congregations, cannot be called a devise of mans, because it is not in the Word of God; for by the same reason that John and Thomas, and so many threes and fours of Believers should be Members of Independent Congregations seeing it is not in the Word, it shall be a devise of men.

Against which Assertion I should reason.

The division of a Nation into Provinces &c. is either a devise of men, or a Divine Inatitution, for non datur tertium.

But a Divine Institution it cannot be.

1. That which stands *by the rule of arbitrary Policy*, that is a device of man, and not a divine Institution.

But this stands by a rule of arbitrary Policy, as practice and experience evidence.

2. *That is a device of man, which proceeds from the free choice of rectified reason suiting his civil ends*, according to the several occasions and means he shall devise to that purpose.

But the division of a Nation into Presbyteries, &c. is of this nature; It issues from the free choice of rectified reason, suiting civil ends, according to the several means and occasions devised to that purpose.

10

3. *That device which it acted by one man, and may lawfully be altered by another*, keeping the end of *εὐπολιτευεως*,????? that is the device of man.

But this is so.

One King and Governor orders the combination of people and places *one way*, into so many hundreds, so many shires; some so large, other so much less: The successor alters all another way, and both of them without just blame.

4. Lastly I shall reason from his own grant; *That which is not in the Word, is a device of man*: For all lawful devices must either be from the wisdom of the Word, discovering, directing and approving such, when ever they shall be observed and followed.

Or else they must issue from the wisdom of man, following that light of reason, the reliques whereof are yet left in lost nature, or renewed by education, and the use of such means as may be helpful thereunto.

And that which I desire may be especially observed in this place is, That from this grant, I cannot see how (I do not say the authority of a Classis or Synod can be proved, but how) either of them can be maintained to be an Ordinance.

If Classes and Synods be *Ordinances of Christ*, and so parts of his *Worship*, then they are if not expressed, yet necessarily may they, nay they be collected out of the *Scripture*: For that only is a part of God's *Worship*, which God himself appoints.

But it's here *granted*, that *all these divisions of Nations into Provinces, of Provinces into Territories and Classes, are not to be found in the Word.*

Therefore, *They are no Ordinances of Christ, nor parts of his Worship.*

When it is added, that *John and Thomas* should be Members of a Congregation, is not found in the Word.

I answer, It is found, though not particularly expressed, as many other things are not, yet so, as may necessarily be collected therefrom.

All who are believers in Christ, should by duty attend upon Christ in all his Ordinances, and therefore in Church-fellowship, as the Apostle disputes and concludes; *Eph. 4:14, 16.*

But *John and Thomas are such. Ergo.*

“That which follows pag. 202. *That all our singular actions*

11

“are mixed; there is something moral in them, and that must be squared and ruled by the Word; and something it in them not moral but positive, and this not to be squared by the Word, but by nature's light.

In these expressions there be many doubtful things, which deserve to be discussed and cleared, but that they fall not in so pat with the purpose in hand.

1. It would be proved, *that all our singular actions are mixed,* and have something to be squared by the Word, something not; Ex. gr. Preaching, praying, receiving Sacraments, professing Faith at this time and season, and upon this express Command of God, how are these Angular actions mixed, what in these is to be squared by the Word, and what it not?

2. *How that which is positive in an act* (I suppose the meaning is, that its done by a positive Law) *is not yet moral,* when these are for the most part subordinate, and not contradictory.

3. *How some actions must be squared by Nature's light, and not by the Word,* when the Apostles injunction goes so far; *Whether we eat or drinks, or whatever we do, let all be done to the glory of God;* and the received tenet of the School maintains, that *Omnis actio in individuo est moraliter bona vel mala;*

and if such, its certain, they then come within the verge of the Word.

I propound *these qmres* to occasion Mr *Rutherford* his further explications: But I conceived it necessary to take notice of that *division of a Nation into Provinces, and those into several Territories*; because we have herein the *foundation* laid, and a way made *for Synods*, which must have their garb and garment cut after this compass; but it shall anon appear this Apostolical pattern will quit us of any such constraining inference.

We have now done with the explication and preface to the dispute: We now come to Mr *Rutherford* his argument, which he thus propounds out of the place.

“If the Churches of Antioch being troubled with a question which they could not determine, they had recourse to an Assembly of Churches, who gave a Decree, which the Churches

12

“were bound to keep; then, upon like occasion we must have recourse to like remedy.

“But the first part is plain; being in this trouble &c. they did resort to an Assembly, which gave out a Decree, which they were bound to keep.

“Therefore we also upon the like occasion, must seek for the like remedy, and stoop to the Authority thereof.

ANSWER.

The *whole conclusion* may be *granted* as true in a true sense according as we have formerly opened it in the foregoing conclusions; for its granted, we lawfully may, nay it's necessary we should repair in cases of difficulty and doubt to a Classis or Synod: It's certain they should shew their counsel and set down their sentence out of the Word, and lay it by virtue of the Word as a burden upon men's Confidences; and being to published, lo confirmed out of the Scriptures, we ought to receive it as the Word, so much as is gathered out of the Word and attend to it, as an authoritative advice, as Mr *Rutherford* speaks, and we have formerly declared in the foregoing Conclusions.

This is all the place enforceth, and all this we grant.

But that they did tie Ecclesiastically, by mtue of any Church-jurisdiction, which they had over other Churches, *non-dum constat*, as yet appeareth not.

Act. 15:28, We lay no greater burden. Act. 16:4 And as they went through the Cities, they delivered them the Decrees to keep, Act. 21:25. We have written and concluded, that they observe no such things, but that they keep themselves, &c.

All this I say, may well agree to a way of counsel.

For suppose a Christian man out of office (an *expectant* as Mr *Rutherford* speaks) *preach* and publish the commands of God, he may be said *to press them as a burden upon men's Consciences and charge them as necessary duties*, which their are bound upon the hazard of their souls carefully and conscientiously discharge, and not dare to neglect in the least measure.

13

The *whole frame of the proceeding*, and all the calling circumstances of the context shew *that Assembly acted by way of counsel*.

1. These Decrees are said to bind those to whom they are sent.

But they, were sent to all the Churches of the Gentiles. Act. 21:25.

As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded &c. who had no Commissioners nor Messengers delegated to the Synods; and therefore could not bind them by way of any authoritative jurisdiction; For it is a ruled case in all such proceedings synodical. Those who have warning and liberty to send to the Synod, those are subject to the Authority of the Synod; what Mr Parker expresseth as effectual to the constitution of a Synod, that is approved by all, and by Mr Rutherford; That which materially furnisheth Commissioners at on Assembly in their gifts and holiness, that which formally fits them to that work is their calling and sending. Park. l. 3. cap. 18. Rut. pag. 213, Where there is no delegation of

Messengers by mutual consent, there is no right of jurisdiction.

2. All these fundamental grounds which are laid for the orderly acting of any of their occasions, take this as confessed; for were it enough for several Churches to assemble and to set out Decrees which might bind all indifferently, whether they had Commissioners or no Commissioners in their meeting; then the Decrees of one Province or Nation might impose upon another Province or Nation, which is by all conceived and concluded to be unequally nay it may fall out, that they may impose contrary things, and so of necessity breed and bring confusion and vexation in stead of reformation.

The Decrees of a Synode bind only such by an Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, who delegate Messengers to the Synod.

But the Decrees of this Synod bind more then those who delegated Messenger to it; to wit, all the Churches of the Gentiles.

Therefore, Thy did not intend to bind by Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, but by way of Christian Council; Or more plainly thus,

They who fend the Decrees of the Synods to such Churches,

14

Who never sent their Messengers or Commissioners thither, they send only by way of Counsel.

But this Synod at Jerusalem sent their Decrees to all the Churches of the Gentiles, who never sent their Commissioners thither, ergò.

Ergò, They sent only by way of Counsel.

3. That Pattern which sends a Church 200. miles for a Synod and consociation, that doth not tie a Church either to a Provincial or National Synod.

But this doth so.

If it be replied; If I may go so far, therefore I may gather one nearer.

I answer; True, you may do so; but its as true by this pattern any delinquent may refuse to do so; but when his cause comes to be scanned, and he to be convented before *Provincial* or *National Synod*, he may plead that liberty, which

the practise of the Apostles propounded here as presidential will allow unto them: And so by this Samplar, National and Provincial Synods are wholly made frustrate, and may as well be rejected as received, notwithstanding any force of argument from the place or practise that might constrain to the contrary.

4. Its said Act. 15:2. When they appointed *Paul* and *Barnabas* to go to *Jerusalem* to inquire touching the opinion of the necessity of Circumcision, that created them no small business, that the Church of *Antioch* sent *other Messengers* with them, *Τίνας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν* with the same commission, and they concurred with the Apostles in the sentence determined: For the Church of *Antioch* which was a party, and contested with those of the Pharisees against their false conceit and opinion, to be judge in their own cause, is against rule; but that they may crave counsel and concurrence with others, and so be a means to settle themselves and others in the Faith of the Gospel, and to walk with a strait foot in the profession thereof, this fuits well with rule and reason.

15

CHAP. II.

Where Mr Rutherford his Arguments touching the Superiority of Classes and Synods above particular Congregations, are considered and answered; And they are in number 6. more, set down in the 15. ch. of his book.

THe 7. and 9. Arguments propounded in this 15. ch. seem to be of greatest weight, and therefore require more serious and studious search, and to that purpose we shall make way for our selves by some previous Explications in the *Conclusions* which follow. I. *Conclus.*

There is some first and most supreme Tribunal in the exercise of Church-power, unto which appeals juridicè are last made; and fromwhich no appeal can be granted or expected.

Otherwise the wisdom of Christ would be blemished, if there should be an endless maze and circle in seeking reformation, which could never be found nor attained.

Beside, the *peace of the wronged* and complaining party would be exceedingly prejudiced, if he should never come to a period in the pursuit of his case, and so never to a *remedy of his wrong*; and the seeking for a cure would prove far worse then the suffering of the trouble of the disease.

Standum in aliquo prima; God, and Reason, and Nature determine this: And *this* I suppose must be an *Œcumenical Council* in the apprehension and approbation of our *most learned and reverend Brethren*.

CONCLUSION. II

Hence this first and supreme Tribunal, which exerciseth power over all other, *there can be none to exercise power over it*. This follows *ex terminis*, and out of the *Nature* of the thing; *That which is above all, can have none above it*.

16

Higher there cannot be then the highest. I speak now only of a way of *Ministerial* proceeding. And this not only equity but necessity forceth upon all courses of judicature, whether *civil* in the Common-wealth, or *Ecclesiastic* in the Churches.

3. *Conclus.*

Hence, the highest and supreme Tribunal cannot be censured by any power of the same kind: nor yet is there any prejudice to the care and wisdom of our Saviour, *that the punishment of such is reserved only to the throne of his divine justice*.

1. *That such cannot be censured*, common sense will teach one.

Over whom there is no power, upon them can be exercised no censure. But the highest *Ministerial* power hath no power in that kind above it. (I mean *Ecclesiastical* power) only the supreme Magistrate in the Common-wealth, hath a civil co-active power to constrain the Churches in case of their exorbitations and Apostasies from the order of the Gospel to attend the rules of Christ, and to recover themselves by a just Reformation.

But if we look at the highest Tribunal of Church-power, in case they be faulty, whether can an appeal be made in an *Ecclesiastical* proceeding? To go higher we cannot, because we are at the highest: and to appeal to the *inferior* from whom the appeal hath been made, not only the rules of *prudence*,

but *common sense* will condemn a man of folly, in such a practise.

2. Nor yet doth *this* (in the second place) *derogate any thing from the depth of Christs wisdom and faithfulness in the government of his Church*: for it is no other, then that which infinite providence doth yield approbation unto. *When all flesh hath corrupted his way*, and erred in judgement, its but rational, that then the execution of judgement should come into his hand, *who is the righteous judge of all flesh*.

These things being premised, which cannot be denied, unless we will bid battle to common sense, we shall now address our selves to the examination of the seventh and ninth Arguments, because they arise out of one root, and one bottom serves to bear them both.

7. Argument of Master *Rutherford*.

“If when an obstinate Brother offend, we must tell the Church,

¹⁷

“then the same course is to be taken, when art obstinate Church offends, Pag. 217 for Christ’s remedy for removing of offences is hence argued to be imperfect, if excommunication doth not remove all offences, pag. 221. and prevent the Leavening of many lumps.

“He that careth for the part, must much more care for the whole Church, and ordain excommunication for the edifying of it.

“And he that takes care of a national Church, who can doubt, but he hath care of edifying and saving in the day of Christ, Churches of Nations and Provinces, pag. 221.

This is the *main and only* bottom that bears up *both the Arguments*, and if this prove brickle, the whole frame will *imis sedibus ruere*; and that this weakness may appear, I desire no better Armory to fetch weapons from, to wound this cause withal. For *from the ground of this Argument* I would reason *this*, not that I take the ground good, out *its good against him and his cause, because it is his own*.

If when an obstinate Brother offends I must tell the Church, then when an obstinate Church offends, I must take the same course:

then when an Oecumenical Synod or Council offends, I must take the same course: but that is exceeding irrational.

Christ's remedy of *excommunication* must remove all offences, else its imperfect. But *excommunication* cannot remove the offences of an Oecumenical Council; therefore Christ's remedy is imperfect.

And that it cannot remove the offence of a general Council, reason and common sense doth evidence at the first sight, besides the conclusions formerly proved; for to whom can the appeal be made, or who can excommunicate?

When Master *Rutherford* hath answered these Arguments, he will answer himself.

1. Reason against it.

That course of proceeding which hinders the removing and healing of offences, that is not Christ's course.

But this appeal from particular congregations to Classes and thence to Synods, hinders the cure of offences.

For suppose I am a Delinquent, the Classis will proceed a-

18

gainst me; I appeal to a Synod. If the Synod favour me not, I will appeal from it to a National, and from that to an Oecumenical counsel; and since there hath not been a general Synod near upon this two hundred years, nor when there will be any, who can tell, before that be gathered, censure cannot be executed upon these grounds.

2. Reason.

That which frustrates the power of Congregations, yea directly crosseth the rule which our Saviour hath given for the exercise of discipline, in each particular Church, that is not Christ's Way,

But this course of subordinating congregations to the jurisdiction of Classes, and then to Synods doth so.

The Assumption will appear by practical instance.

1. *It frustrates the power of a Congregation;* for if the Delinquent be complained of to the Congregation, and shall perceive an *admonition* ready to be dispensed, and the vote passed against him, he presently makes his appeal, and prevents the proceeding of the Church. For that is a received rule, *pendente appellatione reus debet pro non judicato haberi.*

2. Nay I cannot see, *but that the rule of our Saviour is directly crossed.* For when the *admonition* is given, and the judgement of the offender approves not of the Churches proceeding, he may then go further, and crave the judgement of the Classis and Synod, and so *keep off the blow of excommunication:* which is professedly to thwart the rule of our Saviour, and the words of the Text, *Whoever hears not the voice of the Church, is to be cast out and accounted as an Heathen. But he who appeals from the judgement of the Church after admonition, he hears not the judgement of the Church.*

Therefore he deserves to be cut off.

And yet by this *Law of Appeal*, the Law of Christ for the cutting off of a pertinacious sinner *it wholly crossed:* or else the Church may proceed against him for taking a course which according to this opinion is lawful and regular.

3

Let it yet be further considered, whether this provision made by a Synodical proceeding, keeping the pattern here propounded, will heal the wound and reform the sinner, though there be not an appeal made to an Oecumenical Council,

19

And that this *provision* according to the proposed grounds, may in a *lega way* be defeated, I thus shew.

The party that is to be censured in a Classis, *he appeals to a Synod* for his relief, as he hath an allowance by the judgement of our Brethren.

But the Synod of which he will make choice, *shall be so far remote,* that either it will *not* be *easily* gathered, or the *Messengers of the Churches cannot readily* be fitted to repair thereunto, as instance thus.

The party that broacheth false Doctrine in *Scotland*, is not convinced, cannot be reclaimed from his error by the Classis, but makes an appeal from them to an higher Court of jurisdiction, which may right his wrong; but that shall not be a *Provincial nor National Synod in Scotland, but one in Germany or Holland*, and from this pattern he pleads his lawful liberty in such a proceeding.

If they went to have their cause scanned 200. miles from *Antioch* to *Jerusalem*, why may not I upon the like occasion challenge the like liberty? and who can oppose, unless he will oppose the precedential practice of the Gospel.

Now when this Error will be suppressed, or this Heretic reformed by this way, let the Reader judge; For the *Error* it may be is such, that it is *not worth* the labour, and travel, and trouble that must thus be undertaken; or the cure is like to prove so *difficult*, that its unlikely ever to be attained, or at leastwise never in season: and thus human devices prejudice God's Ordinances, and their own comforts.

The truth is, *A particular Congregation is the highest Tribunal, unto which the greived party may appeal in the third place*; if private Counsel, or the witness of two have seemed to proceed too much sharply and with too much rigour against him, before the Tribunal of the Church, the cause may easily be scanned and sentence executed according to Christ.

If *difficulties* arise in the proceeding, the *Counsel of other Churches* should be sought to deare the truth; but the *Tower of Censure* rests still in the Congregation where Christ plead it.

Let us now hear *what Mr Rutherford answers in this be-*

20

half pag. 218. *When it was said an offended Brother cannot have a Synod of Elders or a National Assembly to complain unto, 2. That Christ is setting down away, how an obstinate Brother may be cast out of the Church, where he was an offender.*

Mr Rutherford's 1. *Answer.*

"Excommunication must reach as far as offences; but offences are betwixt Church and Church &c.

Reply.

The contrary to this hath been proved, and I suppose upon cold blood and second thoughts it will be confessed, that a *general Council cannot be excommunicated*, though it do offend.

If the *Council of Nice* had determined against *Paphnuttius* in the marriage of Ministers, he must have sat down in silence, and swallowed his offence, but could not have

gained satisfaction; Neither is Christ's remedy upon this ground insufficient; *for excommunication is sufficient to attain its end, which is to cut off particular persons, one, or many, but not whole Churches, as anon shall appear, Christ willing.*

2. He would seem to *retort the Argument*, and turn the edge of it against it self, thus;

"Those who are consociated and neighboured together in the acts of visible Church-communion, by rebuking one the other, Levit. 19:17. comforting one another. 1 Thess. 5:11. pleading one with another, Hos. 2:2. and so occasionally communicating one with another: these makeup one visible Politic Church, that is under a common Government.

"But so it is, that sundry particular Sister Churches are consociated in the foresaid acts, pag. 219.

"Coloss. 4:16. Macedonia, Galatia, in the same acts of charity, 1 Cor. 16:2, 3, 4. 2 Cor. 8:1.

"Also if any person be excommunicate in one Congregation, he is also in the neighbouring Congregations; and hence these visible acts of Church-communion require a common Law and Discipline,

"But one common Law and Discipline they cannot have, un-

21

"less they may by authority convene in one Synods in their principal Members.

ANSWER.

These acts are of a *double Nature*, as issuing from a *double ground*; to wit,

They are either

Christian

or

Ecclesiastical and Authoritative.

Several Churches communicate in the *first*, but not in the *second*; and I confess, it seems somewhat strange to me, that a respect so obvious and ordinary should not be observed and acknowledged; but that which is most strange of all, that *such actions*, which reach not only to *Christians*, but to *Excommunicates*, yea to *Infidels*, should be put as *proofs of Church-communion*.

A man may *rebuke an Excommunicate*, and in case, by way of parity, he may *counsel and exhort* him, as Mr *Rutherford* grants; doth it therefore follow that a man exerciseth acts of *visible Church-communion*?

One may, nay should *distribute* to the necessities of other, when extremities pinch and press. He that sees a *Brother want, and shuts up his bowels, how dwells the Love of God in him? Do good to all, but especially to the Household of Faith. If thine Enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him, drink;* let him be an *infidel*, let him be *Excommunicate* of other Churches. Will any man, can any man, therefore rationally conclude, *that these are visible acts of Church Communion*, and so require a *common Law of Discipline*?

When *Paul* rebuked *Elymas* the sorcerer *Act. 1:3*. Checked the superstition of the *Athenians Act. 17*. When he shook his garment with indignation against such as opposed and blasphemed, threatened, and condemned them for their sin, *Act. 18: 6, 7*. and professed to renounce communion with them. And so *Paul and Barnabus* with the pertinacious *Jews, Act. 13:46*. when they had sharply rebuked them for their base opposition against the evidence of the doctrine of the Gospel, and therefore openly professed they, would turn to the Gentiles:

22

Are these *atis of Church-communion* and require a *common Law of discipline*?

To this head belongs that which he adds in the 221. pag. as arising from the like mistake.

For when *it was said, that God hath provided other means for whole Churches, then to excommunicate them:* we must plead with them, and rebuke them, but it wants precept, promise and practise to excommunicate a whole Church.

He Answers, "*It is a begging of the question; for we desire (saith he) a warrant from God's word why Sister Churches may use some power of the Keys against Sister Churches, such as to rebuke them, and plead with them, and yet we may not use all the power of the Keys, even excommunication, pag. 222.*"

Reply.

To which I reply, 1. From that which hath been said it is apparent, that *all rebuking is not an act of the power* of the Keys: and therefore that may be used, when excommunication cannot.

Beside it hath not only been affirmed but proved, there can be no act of excommunication pass upon *some Churches*, as I suppose will be granted by them; and it shall Christ helping be made evident, that it can pass upon none in propriety of speech, or according to the order of the Gospel.

Lastly, *this rebuking out of Christian charity* is diverse from an act of *authority* and *excommunication*: I suppose there need no better proof then his own principles will yield.

1. One Classis may admonish another.

2. One Provincial Synod may counsel, may rebuke another, upon just occasion offered.

3. One or all of these may plead with *a general Council*: And yet he grants: *One Church cannot excommunicate another*: one Provincial Synod hath *no power* over another, none of all these can excommunicate a general Council, nor have they any authority over it.

2. He adds, “The power *did justly excommunicate the Church of the Samaritans, and Christ alloweth thereof*, Joh. 4:22. *Ye wor-*

23

“*ship, ye know not what, but salvation is of the Jews, in which words* (saith he) *Christ pronounceth the Jews to be the true Church, and the Samaritans not to be true.*

Reply.

1. *I reply.* From these words how to fetch or force an excommunication of a Church, I am yet to learn. For by his own confession, *excommunication is to deny all Church communion with those who were of one Church and communion*; but so the *Samaritans* were *never* of the *Jews*.

2. Besides, there is not any *act of power* expressed by the Church of the Jews upon the *Samaritans*: nay not a word, syllable or sentence founding that way, discovering any *judicial proceeding* of the Jews in that behalf.

3. It's true, our Saviour doth plainly and peremptorily pronounce that their estate was *Idolatrous*, and corrupt and perfectly heathenish. But thence to infer the power of the Church to excommunicate another, would be a far fetched and in truth a feeble inference. Should a man reason thus, If our Saviour condemn the *Samaritans worship for heathenish and Idolatrous*, in that they *worship they know not what*: then one Sister Church may excommunicate another: I suppose the repeating of such consequence were reply enough: as he, *Recitare est confutare*.

Lastly, when he desires to know *what excommunication is*, if it be not to deny all Church communion with such who were once in one Church.

I reply: Something is here craved, which hath been proved to be far from truth, *to wit*, that the *consociating of Churches is to make a Presbyterial or Synodical Church*: and to make the particular congregations *members of the Church, as an integrum* which is not so, but a mere *concurrence and combining of their counsels together*, without any *authoritative and Church jurisdiction* over the particulars.

And this he perceived to follow by undeniable Argument, that the *renouncing the right hand of fellowship*, which other Churches may do, and should do as occasion requires, is *another rhing from excommunication*.

24

1. Because *one congregation may do this to another*.

One Provincial Synod to another, which yet have no power given them by Christ over each other. The like may be said of the rejection of a particular Church by a Synod; and that is all that can be said.

2. *That which every Christian man or woman may do to one, or many*, that is not excommunication,

But any Christian man or woman may, upon just grounds, reject the right hand of fellowship with others, whom they cannot excommunicate.

In a word, there may be a *total separation*, where there is *no excommunication*, Because *excommunication is a sentence judicial*, presupposing ever a *solemn and superior power* over the part-

ly sentenced; but no such thing in separation, or rejection, *Separation* is and may be, *from those that are without the Church*; but *excommunication* is only of them, *who are within*.

A man never so mean, may *separate from the Assemblies of Turks, Pagans, and Papists*: yet for the same person to *excommunicate* such an Assembly, would be a sinful *profanation of God's Ordinance*.

8. *Argument of Mr. Rutherford.*

His eighth Argument is taken from the common concurrence of the Apostles in their counsels and carriages of businesses.

"If all weighty affairs, that concerns equally many particular congregations, were managed, not by one single congregation, but by the joint voices and suffrages of Apostles, Pastors, and selected brethren of many congregations in the Apostolic Church: Then were Synods the practice of the Apostles, and not Independent congregations.

"But the first is true.

"The Assumption is proved by induction.

"The select Pastors of the Christian World, and select brethren chose Matthias, Act 1. The treasury of the Churches was commated to the Apostles, because that concerned all, Act. 4:33, 34. The common Synod of the Apostles ordained Deacons, Act. 6:3, 4, 5.

"There is a Synod of Pastors at Ephesus, Act. 23:28. whom Paul warned to take heed to the flock.

"Peter giveth an account of his going to the Gentiles, before a Synod of Apostles and brethren, Act. 11:2.

An Assembly of Elders appoint Paul to purity himself, Act. 21: "18.

25

A Synod of Elders ordained Timothy, 1 Tim. 4:14.

Reply.

I Reply. *These several places* have commonly and frequently been propounded and alleged many times, in many passages of the book, *they have met us, as it were, at every turn*, and stopped us in our way: In all which we have referred the full debate and disquisition about them, *unto this, as the proper place.*

And therefore we shall take leave a little more seriously, *to examine the particulars* once for all: that so it may appear, what vigour and validity is in all these instances to conclude the cause in hand, and whether there is a sufficient cause to place so great considence in the several practices here expressed.

Only before we can apply our selves to the particulars, that must here be remembered and taken along with us, which will easily be yielded and confessed on all hands.

1. *The office of the Apostles, being extraordinary, as* having the care of all the Churches under their care and watch, they did, as extraordinary persons, interpose their power in all the particular Churches, where ever they came: as also express their judgements by vote and counsel, as occasion did require.

And therefore what they did in this case, it must not, it *should not be drawn into example; extraordinary practices, are no* suitable ingredients to make up *ordinary precedents, as certain* and standing copies to succeeding generations. But we must take only that which is ordinary, when we would make ordinary patterns to regulate our proceedings by.

This being *once mentioned and remembered*, it will ease us of needless repetitions in the succeeding discourse.

I reply then, First *generally*. Secondly we shall *examine* shortly the *particulars*.

1. *Generally*. That there *can be no warrant or proof of a Synod in these several instances*, It will appear by apparant evidences from Master *Rutherford his own principles*; who pag. 204. lays this down as a confessed truth, which admits no dispute,

1. *“That the members of a Synod, must be Elders and brethren, sent as Commissioners from several Churches, which are not here to be found in any of these places.*

26

2. *“The ground of thus gathering members from many Churches, it must be matter of weight, and that which it attended with much difficulty and danger also.*

3. *“The manner of their proceeding, it by way of disquisition and agitation of all or many of the members, who are willing to speak.*

4. “*The decisions and determinations are by common consent, and joint approbation of all, in whose name such sentences are decreed and published.*

And *none of all* these are to be found *in any of these instances*: so that to my shallow conceiving, there is not the least semblance of a Synod.

But secondly, let us come some what nearer, and take the *particulars* into special consideration.

In Act 1. There be these three things to be attended, which take up the substance of the whole proceeding.

1. Peter leads the action, lays forth the ground of their meeting, and the mind of God, how the action should be managed, ver. 15. to 23.

2. The whole Assembly, by mutual consent, present two to choice.

3. And commend the determination of the business to God by prayer, and so cast lots.

What is here done, that carries the face or appearance of a Synod.

True: the eleven Apostles were here together, because they were enjoined by our Saviour, to abide in Jerusalem, until they were indued with the spirit from above. But there is nothing here done, but any one might have done it; nor was there need to crave the concurrence of other Churches which they had not. The whole Church concurred, by mutual consent to appoint two to lot: and accepted him, upon whom the lot fell. Here was no joint voices and suffrages of Pastors and select Brethren of many Congregations, which was the thing to be proved. Nor can I imagine where the force of the dispute lies, or whence it will be fetched.

If Peter directed the particular Assembly, how far they should go, and after what manner they should proceed in making way for the choice of Matthias; then Synods have Ecclesiastic Authority over particular Congregations.

How crazy is such a conference.

27

And yet the second instance carries a further distance from the cause in hand, and is marvellous wide from the mark: For all that is expressed, or can be gathered from Act. 4:35.

That the Apostles had the *disposing of the common treasury and provision*, which men raised by the selling of their goods, and laid it at their feet, to dispense as seemed fitted to their wisdom: All which it's certain they did as *extraordinary persons*, and that in an extraordinary manner; the Officers which were to take care of such occasions, *not being yet appointed in the Church*.

Where are the joint voices and suffrages of Apostles, Pastors, and select Brethren of many Congregations, which were to be demonstrated by promise to be in this Example? Beside, *how Deacons* are to order the treasury of the Church, needs *no Synod* at all, if we would consider the matter without the extraordinary managing of it, to reason then from this place.

If the Apostles by the extraordinary power of their places did manage the treasury of the Church, because the Office, of Deacons was not yet instituted; Then a Synod hath Authoritative Ecclesiastic Power over a Congregation.

Such an inference hath little cement of reason.

Neither *doth the third instance* comes near the Conclusion to be proved, *Act. 6:3, 4, 5.* touching the *ordination of Deacons*; For *where are the joint voices and suffrages of Apostles, Elders, and select Brethren of many Congregations*, which was the proposition to be confirmed? Its true the people are directed to make choice of able men, and that *any Congregation* in particular may do, nay it hath right to do, without a Synod. The *Apostles as extraordinary men, they laid an their hands* for the establishment of them in their places, being extraordinary persons, and having a plenitude of power in them: But to infer hence,

If the Apostles laid on their hands upon the Deacons elected by the people, therefore a Synod hath authoritative power over a Congregation; such an inference will appear feeble at the first sight.

The 11. of the *Acts* and 3. vers. comes next to considera-

28

tion, and that hath *as little, if not less evidence* of proof, then any of the former.

For there be no joint voices and suffrages of Pastors and select Brethren of many Congregations, which was the thing to be proved, but it is not so much as remembred, but laid aside wholly.

2. There is *no evidence* given in, of *many Churches here present*, nay no certainty of any; but its most certain they met not (if they met at all) in way of a Synod, or for that end, nor acted, nor intended any thing that way: Only some of *the Jews*, who were not so thoroughly informed and convinced of the liberty and lawfulness to converse with the *Gentiles* in holy communion as *Peter* had done with *Cornelius*, they questioned his course, and demanded a reason and warrant of his practice: To whom he gave an account, that he might remove all doubts out of their minds and stumbling stones out of the way of the profession, as any Christian man would, and any Apostle ought to remove any appearance of offence that any might take in their way.

But hence to reason, If *Peter* give an account and warrant of his communion with *Cornelius* to those Jews that questioned it, and was not sufficiently informed therein, be it done before them, or never so many beside them:

Then a Synod hath an authoritative Power over a Congregation, there is no conclusive force, nay in truth, nor a colour, in such a consequence.

That of Act. 21. carries some *small appearance* at the first view: but when we shall come to nearer search, it will be found to *have little pith in it.*

Its true *Paul* went to visit *James* with whom all the Elders were as it might seem by some intimation and appointment of *Paul's coming*, that they might entertain him; but *the joint suffrages* of many Elders and select Brethren, of *many Congregations*, to determine any businesses, as being called thereunto; there is not *vola, ne vestigium quidem.*

Only the text says, *Paul saluted* them, as it may seem, meeting on purpose to that end, and he reported to them the

passages of God's providence towards him, & the good hand of God's blessing upon his labour: They also acquainted him, how

29

occasions stood with them, what rumors were spread abroad of him, and what a jealous eye the Jews had touching his disregard of *Moses* Law, and suggested such advice as might seem most advantageous to promote the work of the Lord.

There is nothing here done or recorded, but *what the Elders of a Congregation might do* to some faithful Minister that was arrived at their coast.

There is nothing like calling or carrying on of a Synodical work; and without all question, *Synod there was none*, because it must be *either Provincial or National*; and touching either of these, there is not so much as any syllable that sounds this way, in the text: And to reason hence,

If *James* and the Elders met to entertain *Paul* at his coming, and he saluted them, and they suggested to him, how he might so carry himself in wisdom and wariness, that he might crush the false rumours that were spread of him; Then a Synod hath Ecclesiastical Authority over a Congregation: There is no containing, force in such a kind of reasoning.

That of Acts 20:28. hath *least of all*, that looks this way: For the scope of the place, and purpose of the Spirit, is only this; *Paul now* resolved for *Rome*, and by the Spirit of Prophecy knowing that he should never see those coasts, nor their faces, amongst whom he had preached the Gospel; knowing also, that false Teachers as ravening wolves would endeavour to make a prey of them: He therefore desires to take his leave, and solemn farewell of them, and to leave a favourable caution and heart-breaking exhortation, as his last farewell with them, and to that purpose fends for the *Elders of Ephesus*, and pours out his passionate and affectionate expressions into their bosom.

Where is there any the least shew of the joint voices and suffrages of Apostles, Elders, and select Brethren, of many Congregations?

Here were none but the *Elders of Ephesus*, and *all* things in the text *argue they were Rulers of one Congregation*: They are only *Elders of the Church*, not *Churches*, vers. 17. He chargeth them to attend *to the flock*. τῷ ποιμνιῷ v. 28.

But had they been the *Elders of never so many Churches*,

30

sent for by the *Holy Apostle*, to take *his farewell of them*, and to leave some spiritual Counsel with them: Alack a day, what is this to a *Synod*, or to the *Ecclesiastic Authority of a Synod* over particular Congregations? Here there is neither joint voices, nor dispiriting, nor decreeing, but only hearing and attending the last words of a dying and departing Apostle.

To reason thus; If the *Elders of Ephesus* met at *Miletum*, were sent for by *Paul*, to come to visit him, as he parted by in his travel, and to take their farewell of him, and to receive some holy counsel from him;

Then Synods have an *Ecclesiastical Power* over Congregations.

How unreasonable would such a reason seem?

The last place alleged of 1 Tim. 4:14. (The laying on of the hand of the Eldership upon Timothy) is I confess accompanied with much difficulty and obscurity, and deserves through examination; but this place hath been opened and handled in the head of Ordination, whether we refer for the while: we shall only now attend so much as concerns the present Argument.

Whatever then is the meaning of the text, its certain, it falls short of that, for which it is alleged here by Master *Rutherford*, nor doth it *prove* the Proposition for which it is brought; nay if his allegation may be attended, it wholly *crosseth a main Conclusion, for the maintenance whereof he contends.*

1. That *it proves not* that for which it's brought is evident by the letter of the text; for the Proposition underhand to be made good, is this;

That the weighty affairs were managed by the voices and suffrages of *Apostles, Pastors, and select Brethren* of many Congregations.

But in the place of *Timothy* we have only the hand of the Eldership; but not a word of any select Brethren, that were interested in this work.

2. Nay it will appear upon search, if this Argument be good to prove this cause, for which it is brought, its certain it will *confute another cause strongly maintained by Master Rutherford*; for I reason thus:

If the laying on the hands upon *Timothy* was, by the concur-

31

rence of the Elders and select Brethren of many Congregations; then Ordination is not an act proper to the Eldership, but issues from the power of the select Brethren also, and so the Church of Believers have a hand in it.

But the first is true by Master *Rutherford's* assertion; The laying the hand in *Timothy* his Ordination, was by concurrence of Elders and select Brethren of many Congregations.

Let Master *Rutherford* now take his choice; If he deny the Assumption, then he doth confess by that denial, that the place was wholly misalleged by him, and that he missed his purpose and the proof of that it was brought for.

The *conference* of the Proposition upon his own grounds cannot be gainsayed; if the select Brethren have a joint hand and suffrage in the work of Ordination with the Eldership, then is not the work proper to the Elders, for which he hath so frequently, so constantly contended through his whole book. We have stayed the longer, because we desired to clear this coast, that when these places come in our way, we may look over them without any trouble, or once making a stand or stumble at them.

10. *Argument of Master Rutherford.*

“*That government it not from Christ, that is deficient in the means of the propagation of the Gospel, to Nations and Congregations that want the Gospel.*

“*But the government by Independent Congregations is such.*

The Assumption he approves by the doctrine of Independency.

Pastors and Doctors may not preach the Gospel without the bounds of their own Congregation, nor can they exercise any Pastoral acts elsewhere.

“And so Pastors and Doctors now, since the apostles times, have no authority Pastoral to preach the Gospel to those who sit in darkness.

“And if they do preach they do it as private men not as Pastors, they have no pastoral authority from Jesus Christ and his Church pag. 224.

Reply.

For *Reply*, I shall by way of prevention, desire to settle that which is our tenet: *That Doctors and Pastors may preach, to all-*

32

sorts, upon all occasions, whin opportunity and liberty it offered, nay they ought so to do. But this they do not as Pastors, but as gifted and enabled Christians, who use their talents given them by God and Christ, to the best advantage of God’s glory and the good of others, as any opportunity is presented and put into their hands.

But they neither do, nor in truth have right to exercise any authority and jurisdiction over them, and this I shall prove in several cases from his own grant. For pag. 216. speaking against the opinion and expressions of Mr Davenport & M. Beast, “That will have Pastors so far strangers to all Congregations, save only their own, that they say, other Churches are without, and that they have nothing to do to judge them, and allege for this, 1 Cor. 5:12. but by those who are without, Paul meaneth not those who were not of the congregation of Corinth but he meaneth Infidels and heathens, as in other Scriptures: for Paul judged and excommunicated Hymeneus and Alexander, 1 Tim. 1:20. Who were without the Church of Corinth.

It is granted then by Master Rutherford, that Pagans and Infidels are without, in the Apostles judgement, and that the Pastor of Corinth could not judge them.

Those whom Pastors of Churches cannot Ecclesiastically judge, over them they have no pastor-like power, nor can be said in propriety of speech to be Pastors to such.

But Pagans and Infidels, Pastors of Churches cannot judge, therefore over them they have no pastor like power, nor can in truth be called their Pastors.

The *Assumption* is Master Rutherford his own grant and confession.

The *proposition* cannot be gainsaid: for the *power of order and jurisdiction*, ever go together. The *being of a Pastor* to a people, doth, in the very nature and constitution of the Call and Office *give power of judgement*, over that people to whom he stands in that relation, as being *one special act of feeding*.

And in truth, how comes any man to take a Pastoral power over any Pagans? *By nature* no man hath any: For it is not conveyed by way of Propagation. *By intitution* he cannot challenge it; for an extraordinary Commission of that Latitude Christ never gave to any, *but the Apostles, go preach and teach all Nations*. If then any man receives it, it must be by their vo-

33

luntary election and choice, which because they nor have, nor can shew, they have no right of Ecclesiastic and Office-rule over them; here that question is seasonable, and will not receive an answer, *Who gave you this authority?*

Nay its certain, a Pastor of one Congregation (elected and settled according to Christ) cannot receive a Pastoral power over Pagans, but he must relinquish the place and power in which he is: unless we shall bring in an allowance of *pluralities and tot quots*, a conceit so loathsome, that the most ingenious amongst the Papists have abhorred the Patronage of.

Lastly, let any man put his power to proof in the exercise of it, and his experience will make it more then plains, its a thing, merely imagined and arrogated without rule, there is no reality in such presumed rights. For the Pagan offends, he rebukes him, he will not hear; he then takes one or two, he rejects them also: he reports it to the Church, he casts away the advise of any Church. What will the Pastor or his Church do? Excommunicate him, how will they? how can they? To cast a man out of Church communion, that never was in Church-communion, how irrational? how impossibler? The issue therefore evidenceth, it was a presumption, no power in truth; for when it comes to proof its powerless.

Before we leave this place, let me *leave two things upon record* with the Reader, which may lead him to a right conceiving of what he hath met withal, or shall meet with touching the *power of a Church-Ruler*. For from the premises its plain.

1. That *bare preaching* to a people, though it was ordinary and often, is *not an act of pastoral power* and so *jurisdiction*, but his Commission is mainly to be attended, which gives vigour and validity in that work. And therefore,

2. A man *may preach by Pastoral power*, in some place, to some people, and the same person may preach *without pastoral jurisdiction* to others, but only as an able gifted Christian.

2. Again out of Master Rutherford his grant in another place, I shall *dispute* against his *opinion* expressed in this.

Its a *conclusion* which he sets down, pag. 72.

“*We deny that Christ hath given power of jurisdiction to one*

34

“*particular congregation over another particular congregation,* pag. 199. *We grant that one Presbytery hath no jurisdiction over another Presbytery.*

Suppose now that one, or many, or all, of one Presbytery, should be destitute of Elders: The Pastors of another Presbytery cannot exercise any pastorlike acts there: nor yet in another Province and Nation; by the same proportion *over whom they have no jurisdiction, over them they can exercise no pastorlike power; but the first is granted, and therefore the second is yeilded.*

Let us now listen to the reasons which Master Rutherford alledged, *whereby he endeavours to prove; because the government by Independent Congregations doth not authorise persons to be Pastors and Teachers to Pagans, and by Pastoral authority, to make them the Churches of Christ, therefore that government is deficient in the means of the propagation of the Gospel.*

Master *Rutherford's* first Reason.

1. *Because it is unbeseeming the care of Christ, that pastoral authority should be so confined at home, and imprisoned within the lists of every particular Congregation, that the care spoken of 2 Cor. 11:28. should be now in no Pastors upon the earth, but be dead with the Apostles.*

Reply.

Reply. That each Congregation should have their own Pastors and teachers, and that out of their calling and commission, as they have pastoral power, so they should have care of them, over whom they have taken charge, is granted.

That *as Christians in love to Christ*, his Gospel and the souls of fellow Christians, as far as liberty, opportunity, and ability will reach, they should *occasionally* put forth their care and pains to promote their spiritual good, is confessed.

But that one, or many, or all of them, should have Pastoral authority, and out of that ground exercise pastoral *care over all Churches*, as the place alleged would, 2 Cor. 11:18. or indeed over many: its *cross to the institution of our Saviour*, and there-

35

fore it should not, nay in truth it cannot be exercised by any ordinary man.

The Apostles indeed because their calling was extraordinary their gifts extraordinary, and assistance extraordinary they had a larger task, even the whole world, as Christ's field to Till: *All Nations*. Every creature reasonable.

But Pastors and Teachers, who have but ordinary gifts, they have but, as it were, *an Acre of ground, a particular Congregation to till and teach: and he that knows his duty, and doth his duty, will find enough of that, τῷ ποιμνίῳ* Act. 20:28.

So that we should be very careful to cast any disparagement upon the wisdom and care of our Saviour, because he hath now put an end to the *extraordinary callings of Apostles and Evangelists*, when the end of them is attained: or weakly and

sinfully make our selves more merciful and mindful of the good of the Church, then he, who is the God of mercy, is.

When he therefore cares most for his Church, because he doth confine the Pastoral power and pains of one man to one Congregation, as sense it self will teach. He that keeps the stream in one channel, he best provides for the strength of it.

2. Reason,

He adds; "*As if these places, 1 Cor. 10:32. 1 Cor. 9:19. 20, 21. Rom. 1:14, 15. Rom. 9:2, 3. did not press upon all Ministers of Christ, the extending of their pastoral vigilancy to the seeding and governing of all the Churches in their bounds, that make up one visible body, pag. 225.*

Reply.

Reply is. If all this were granted, yet that is not proved, which was propounded, and should be concluded: that because they had not pastorlike authority to make Pagans' Churches, therefore they are deficient; all that is here said, falls short of that.

But the reason is not only wide of the mark, but wide of the truth. For besides that of Rom. 1:14 Which is peculiar to the calling of an Apostle, and therefore presseth no particular mi-

36

nister at this day, unless any man would vainly conceit he hath a commission to preach to all Nations and all conditions of men, the calling and the date of the Apostles commission being now, out this concernes no particular Officer.

The rest of the places respect only a double Christian duty, unto which all men are bound; namely, That we should walk inoffensive towards all. 1 Cor. 10:33. and secondly, we should use our liberty to comply with all men's occasions, that as much as in us lies, we may edify all, which each must do that is not a Pastor, and each Pastor should do as a Christian amongst them, over whom he can exercise no Pastoral Au-

thority, as to those of another Presbytery, and of a general Council.

Thirdly, He would infer some *seeming absurdities*, which would follow from this kind of Government. As first, *Hence* (he says) “*It must follow, that when the Grecian Church shall be wronged by the Hebrew, that the Pastors may not Synodically meet, and by joint authority, remove offences,* pag. 225. Act. 6.

I *reply*, There is no colour for such an inference, nor doth it once touch the thing to be proved; For let it be *granted*, that the *Pastors may meet Synodically, and by authority also remove offences*; yet they shall not have power to give Pastoral Authority to men *to make Churches of Pagans*: Nay from his own grant, though they do thus meet, yet he denies they can give *Power over the Churches under other Presbyteries*.

The second inference is of the same stamp; comes not near the mark.

“*If followeth that all the meetings of the Apostles and Pastors to take care authoritatively for the Churches, as Act. 1. Act. 4:35. Act. 6:2, 3, 4. Act. 11:1. Act. 21:18. Act. 20:28. Act. 8:14. Act. 14:1, 2, 3. Act. 15:6. were all meetings extraordinary and temporary.*

I *reply*; Let all be granted for the present, that he would desire; let these meetings be ordinary, and let them care authoritatively for the Churches in what they did; yet this gives in no evidence, that they can give Pastoral Power and Jurisdiction to men out of the Churches; for we have heard, that the Apostle affirmd it, and he granted it in this sense; that

37

no ordinary Pastors can judge those who are without, and those are Infidels by his grant.

So that though they have Power to meet, and these meetings be ordinary, yet neither of these grounds will evince that they do, or can give Pastoral Jurisdiction to *judge such as be without*: therefore none of these inferences come near the thing to be proved; For if therefore Government by Independent Congregations be insufficient, because *it authoriseth not persons to be Pastors over Pagans, and by pastoral Authority to make them the Churches of Christ; then this government by Synodical*

meeting, will be inefficient; for we see it labours of the same fault.

The third Inference fails in the same manner as the former.

Thus are these Inferences altogether impertinent; but the places themselves are misunderstood, as hath at large been disputed in the Reply to the former Answer.

Since it hath appeared in all the places formerly handled (for these witnesses have been brought to speak, but their evidence proves nothing in issue) there is no Synodical meeting, nor any Ecclesiastical Power authoritatively to impose upon particular Churches; only in *Act. 15.* there is a true Synod truly gathered, and they did that, which the Churches of Christ should do; consociate with one another, and by mutual concurrence, lay all their cares and counsels together, to promote the good of Christ's Kingdom.

Whether the Apostle *had any thing or nothing extraordinary* in their meeting, upon which Mr *Rutherford* lays so much weight and conceives so much mistake, let it be considered?

1. Whether the acting of the Deacons work, (*Act. 4:35.*) be ordinary for any?
2. That they had their votes, and ruled the action in every Assembly, whether that was ordinary?
3. Whether the care of all, and their Commission reaching all, be ordinary and perpetual?

Master *Rutherford's* 11th *Argument* is taken from the light of sanctified reason.

“For sanctified reason teacheth, that the stronger Authority of the greater Politic Body of Christ should help the parts of

38

“the Body, that are weaker, as 1 Cor. 12:23, 26. The whole Body helpeth the weaker and less honourable Member.

“Therefore the greater Body and National Church is to communicate its Authority, for the good of a particular Church, which is a part thereof.

ANSWER.

The *Proposition* is true; but the *Assumption* takes that for granted, which is the very question to be proved, and hath been so often denied: For there be *no National Churches*, which are the *integrum* to particular Congregations *as the parts* thereof: Nor doth the pattern *Act. 15.* give any evidence of *Æcclesiastic Jurisdiction*, as hath been declared before; and if it did, surely there would come very slow help, if we should send *200. miles to Synods always*, as that place sets a precedent before us.

As their Members are the greater, they may and should con-sociate, and lay their Counsels together, and in the multitude of Councillors there is safety.

OBJ. “*But suppose the greater part of the Church of Corinth err?*”

ANSW. Suppose the greater part of the National and Ecumenical Council err; the same difficulty urgeth upon the same supposition, and *we profit not at all, when we seek authoritative relief beyond a particular Church.*

OBJ. “*But the Lord says, Take us the little Foxes.*”
ANSW. True, therefore *much more the greater Foxes.*

OBJ. *But that is an act of Authority and disciplinary taking, enjoined to the Church.*

ANSW. Be it therefore those that have the Authority in their hands, they should do it; and if they be followers of Christ, they will do it.

OBJ. What if the Congregation be corrupt and will not?

I reply; What if the Synod National, Ecumenical, be corrupt and heretical, and refuse to do it? There is no more help in the one, then in the other upon supposals.

When its lastly added, “*That the Argument is drawn from the greater Authority in the Politic Body, to the les-*

ser, but Brotherly Counsel is no Authority.

It's true, the Argument is taken from that Authority in the resemblance and similitude; but that similitude is not made good in the case in hand, and in the reddition, which was the thing to be proved: For it is the thing questioned, and by us

denied; That a Classis hath any Power, according to Christ, over particular Congregations.

Master Rutherford's 12th and last Argument taken from the practice of the Jews.

"If Christ left the Churches of a whole Nation in no worse case then the National Church of the Jews was in, &c. for the turning away of wrath. Then hath Christ ordained to Churches, in the New Testament, National Assemblies, which authoritatively &c. But Christ hath left the Churches of a whole Nation in no worse case then the National Church of the Jews was in, for the reaching of the foresaid ends.

Reply.

For reply. *The proposition is denied, because there is a marvelous difference betwixt the National Church of the Jews, and all other Churches, that ever were or shall be since that unto the end of the world. For that was a National Church truly and properly so called and so appointed by God, had National Ordinances, and offices peculiar to it self, and so also authoritative power, which was appropriate to them in a special manner, none of which ever did, nor can belong to any other Nation in the world beside.*

Nor yet doth it follow from hence, that the Churches of the Gentiles in times of the New Testament, be without these, that therefore they are lest in a worse case, because they had the Types, we the truth; they the shadow, wethbody. Every Congregation visible, rightly gathered, hath right unto, and use of all Ordinances, all the Officers, both the Scales of the Covenant: so that we need not go to Jerusalem, either to Passover, or Sacrifice.

If any man reason thus. If Christ hath left the Church of a Nation in the New Testament in no worse case then the Church of the Jews, then he hath left , them an High Priest , then he

40

hath appointed them to meet three times in the yeare, to the exercise and performance of solemn services and sacrifices. The feebleness of the dispute would discover it self at the first view. The same fault is in this reason.

But the Jews had these solemn Assemblies for ends before mentioned.

Obj. 1. *“But these were moral and concern us. 2. Without them these public ends cannot be attained.*

We shall way the severals shortly in the balance of the Sanctuary.

Its *granted* then, 1. That the whole Nation of the Jews was an elected and adopted Nation by God, and the whole Land taken into Covenant with him.

And hence its granted also, that in cases of Apostasies and departures from God and his worship, the godly Kings might and did recall this backsliding people to recover and renew the Covenant formerly made by God with them: and therefore, *Deut. 29:10, 11. Their Elders, Officers, all the men of Israel, their little ones. Wives, and the stranger within their gates, they all stand before the Lord.* (Here is more then Elders and select Brethren, sent as Commissioners to a National Synod) Here's *Captaines, Hewers of wood*, all the men of Israel, women, children, which evidenceth it was a *National covenant*, into which God entered with them. And therefore the godly Kings, they might recall them back to this, when just occasion did require.

But no King nor Emperor did the *like to this*, in *calling their Synods*: nor indeed have they, either *moral Law*, or *ceremonial Law*, nor in truth *any Law* to deal with a Nation on this manner, to call them to renew a *National Church covenant*, after the manner of the Jews.

God's people, who enter into Church covenant and fellowship of the faith, are and should be free in so doing. Church fellowship is to be ordered and acted by Ecclesiastical policy, not civil. If a Prince on earth should by covenant and Oath; make his whole Kingdom a National Church, he should do more then he hath any word or Christ to warrant his work.

So that it is one thing for Emperors or Kings to call counsels of Elders and select Brethren: Another thing for the King of Israel to call all Israel together, men, women, and children; to renew Church covenant which God had made with them, and with no other people on earth.

41

But let us attend *Mr. Rutherford's proof* of this, that these Assemblies were moral.

1. "*An Oath to keep Gods Commandments, is a part of the third Commandement, Psal. 119:106. We are enjoined to contend for the Faith, Jude 3, and to profess God before men, and that which binds one man morally, binds a Nation.*

I reply. The reason is weak, and the ground of it is worse.

1. *That it it weak* put it but *into form*, and it will discover its own feebleness at the first appearance.

David swore that he would keep God's righteous Statutes, then its lawful to swear to a National Church, as that of the Jews was.

Ans. The *consequence* is unfound, because *David's* taking an Oath was upon lawful grounds, to do a lawful thing: but to do the second, is now unlawful, because all such National Churches, and such a manner of covenanting, as they did, is now abrogated and antiquated.

Beside were the thing lawful, yet the taking of the Oath might be unwarrantable in the one, and not in the other, because in Oaths and promises, that is one special ingredient to make them warrantable, that they suit with our strength: and hence that which is useful and helpful to one, because strong and able to go through the performance of his Oath, to another it is hurtful because not sufficient to accomplish what he swears. The same answer will satisfy that of *Jude*, and the 10 of *Math*.

2. As the reason is weak, *so the ground is worse*; For its said, what binds one man morally, binds a Nation; which rule applied to the former practice of *David's* Oath, fails many ways.

For 1. Though when a man hath sworn, he is bound by a moral Command to keep his Oath, and so his promise; yet this *manner of swearing*, seeming to be *private*, its but a *fee-will offering* as the Nature of vowing or promising is, and therefore if I vow, I may; and if I will not, I may choose: And I do believe a man may live all his life, and never take a *private Oath*; I say private *betwixt God and himself*, to keep his Laws, and yet *not be guilty of sin* in so doing: so that a man is not morally and necessarily tied to swear or vow, though

having vowed, he is necessarily bound to perform it: If thou dost not vow, thou dost not sin.

42

But 2. Be it granted, that it is moral, yet the rule seems exceeding uneven. *That which binds one man morally binds a whole Nation*, take it generally, as here propounded in the Argument, when as there be some special duties, that in a peculiar manner belong to his particular, which a Nation need not do, nay should not, nay cannot do.

A man finds by constant proof that drinking of wine is exceeding prejudicial to his health, and hurtful also to his soul, being *given*, as the Wise-man says, *to his appetite*, and so apt to sin: He finds it possible for him to abstaine; He therefore swears he will drink no wine in such Company for such a space.

Another hath found himself somewhat too abstemious, and hath prejudiced his health out of neglect of the lawful use of the Creature; He swears he will use such means provided for his health: These men are morally bound, both to take the Oath and keep their Oath: *Do these Oaths bind the whole Nation?*

The Scholar swears he will study conscionably: The Plowman that he will plow so painfully; These are moral bonds to those men, but *is a whole Nation bound thus to swear?*

The truth is, the contrary rule for the most part is most true; that which morally binds one man in things special appertaining to his moral course, doth not bind a whole Nation.

Lastly, The ends of general Reformation may be attained by Power of the Civil Magistrate, who may authoritatively require all the Churches in all their several Assemblies, to attend the mind of Christ, and solemnly humble themselves by falling and prayer, and see Reformation wrought according to God, in their several places; and if they see Churches be holy, they will willingly listen thereunto; and if corrupt, they may be compelled by the Civil Power to attend the rules of Christ, which through the corruption that is now crept in amongst them, they would be content to cast off.

AN
APPENDIX

To the former Treatise concerning Synods.

*An Epistle of them that sent the Book over
to be Printed.*

Courteous Reader you may be pleased to take notice, that *the Treatise concerning Synods is not so complete,* as was intended by this Reverend Author; but the Lord having taken him from us, before the Book was transcribed for the Press, we cannot find amongst his writings any other Copy, but this: only these few questions here annexed came to our hands, being found in his study, which because they may be somewhat useful to the further clearing of the same subject, we have thought good to communicate them together with the other: Only this we should add, that whereas there is a seeming denial of a Synod, to have at all any footing in the Scriptures, and yet an allowance of it from *Act. 15.* This is known to be the Authors mind, which the whole discourse doth manifest, that he denies a Synod that hath juridical power, which he takes for a Synod properly, as used in the present controversy, and he grants a Synod that hath power of counsel, which is a Synod more largely taken, and for such a Synod the 15 of the *Acts* is alleged as a pattern by way of proportion.

CHAP. III.

Qu. I. *What is a Synod?*

A Synod is an Ecclesiastical meeting, consisting of fit persons, called by the Churches, and sent as their messengers, to discover, and determine of doubtful cases, either in Doctrine or practise, according to the truth.

Three things are maine.

1. *It's a meeting Ecclesiastical.*

Meeting] When it is taken in a large sense, includes all that Ecclesiastical intercourse, that is betwixt Church and Church, and this may be refered to two heads.

Its done by

Communication,

or

Combination.

1. *Communication*, when, by letter or messengers, one Church seeks and craves for some common help by *counsel* and *advise*, what may be most suitable to the truth, and acting and ordering of their present difficulties, which concern the peaceable managing of occasions presented.

Thus we find one Church sends to another; or to many, as the weight of the busines may require, so in *Coloss. Philippi, &c.*

This sense is some what too large for our present confederation, as it appears by stating of the question by all, who on purpose have set themselves to search into the nature of Synods.

2. There is a *meeting* by way of *combination*, when Churches, *consociating* together by mutual consent, enter upon a *common engagement to administer help* each to other, as any apparant oc-

casione shall appear to call for confutation for a common good.

And in this sense it is here taken.

Ecclesiastical,] it's so termed, not only because of the persons who are there assembled nor yet because of the occasion there to be agitated, which may be merely and only Ecclesiastical at least Ecclesiastically handled, but especially (for now we speak according to the opinions and apprehensions of those, with whom the question is controverted) because such meetings are peculiar to Churches, and the actings are appropriated there unto, as any other Church administrations, and if we may conclude their opinion by their practise, it cannot be otherwise.

For they, who allow Synods to censure by way of excommunication (which is a judicature only appertaining to the Church) they must needs make the constitution properly Ecclesiastical. For the *Operation* discovers, and certainly determines what the *Constitution* must be.

2. *The parties who constitute* this meeting must be,

1. Fitting men, able for the work, and that gives the material to the messenger.
2. Chosen and sent by the Church, and that is the *formalis ratio* of a member of the Assembly.

This *Parker* expresseth, *Polit. Eccles. lib. 9.*

And all the Presbyterians I meet withal, do constantly receive and approve.

Hence upon these grounds and the true stating of the question according to their intent;

1. A Magistrate *qua talis*, is no member, nor can act in this meeting, as such.

2. Here is no act of an Office or Officer, because *the formalis ratio* to make one a member, is the choosing and sending; and therefore, they who are no Officers, if so elected and appointed, they *jus suffragii*. They who are Officers, if yet not called, nor sent, they have *no jus suffragii*.

3. Hence, all have equal power, because equally sent and chosen, which are the substantial ingredients to make up Synodical members.

4. Any member, though not an Officer, if he be elected as moderator of the Synod, may as legally and regularly and as

As suppose some learned Reader in a University chosen to the Synod, though he be no Pastor, he may be elected to that place, and act in it regularly.

5. Hence, none have this power, unless they be sent, because that gives the formal to this action.

6. Hence, these cannot censure by way of excommunication, according to Presbyterian principles; because none by their rules can censure so, but Officers; But here none act as Officers, *id est*, though they be Officers in their own Congregations, yet they act not so here, but *as called*.

7. Hence this Power is not intrinsical to their Office, but wholly superadded; and if Authors, who call it *Potestatem accumulativam, non privativam*, intend this sense, they say true, namely, it is a special Power, beside an official Power.

But if that be their meaning, That it is an Office-power only with additament, its a total mistake; For many Officers have not this Power, and many not Officers, being called, have it.

The third thing in the Description, is the end, which is to
discover and determine of doubtful questions, *touch-
ing Opinion and Practice*.

They are to debate and set down their judgements clearly and definitively, not to leave the Churches, whence they are sent, in doubts and demurrs; For that was to miss the end of their sending and meeting; But they dogmatise their sentences, and set down their determinations, as sure truths to their judgements and apprehensions, and so return them to the particular Churches whence they came; and their determinations take place, not because they concluded so, but because the Churches approved of what they have determined.

For the Churches sent them, and therefore are above them: And therefore may send other if they see fit, who may vary in their judgements, and alter their sentences if they see fit.

How far this Judgement goes, it comes after to be considered.

The Power of Synods ariseth from a double root, according to which the proofs will proceed.

Potestas est

Authoritativa,

Consultativa.

1. *Potestas Authoritativa* or *Juridica*, whereby they execute censures, and impose their sentences to be received and subjected unto under that penalty.

And this Power is not so seated in any Church, as that it can challenge it of it self: For by all Presbyterian principles it is confessed, That one Congregation hath no Power over another, one Classis over another, &c.

Hence this Power issues from their Combination of one with another, and subjection of one to another.

But whether they should give this Power unto any, or thus be subject unto any, &c. when the Authority of Synods comes to be scanned, we shall speak to it.

2. Again, The Power of Synods is by others conceived to be only consultative, when Churches by way of Combination, for their mutual support in truth and peace, do with mutual consent appoint times of meeting for their mutual help, that they may lend common relief by their Common Counsel, and have the benefit of each others gifts & abilities; or though they be not in any set consociation, if there be any emergent occasions of more danger or difficulty, they send for help of Counsel, to such as are most able to lend and administer it, though furthest removed from their society and fellowship: As the practice of the Church of *Antioch* is most pregnant to this purpose.

2. Quest.

How are Synods proved? or what Scriptures or reasons to prove the necessity *of Synods*?

ANSW. That there should be Synods, which have *Pote-*

49

statem juridicam, is no where proved in Scripture, because it is not a truth: such a Power will appear after to be unlawful, and therefore never appointed by God, nor approved by his Word.

The Examples given out of *Act. 15.* and *Gal. 2.* carry no full and satisfying evidence with them.

That of *Act. 15.* is deficient many ways.

1. If they had Power juridical, it must arise by way of Combination; But that they were not in, being 200 miles distant at the least one from another.

2. If that was a Synod, it must be referred to some of the species of a Synod.

But it can be referred to none of the species; Its neither Classis, Provincial, nor National Synod, as the distance from Jerusalem gives in evidence.

And an Œcumenical Council it was not, because that is gathered out of all Nations; here were but two Churches.

OBJ. If it be here said, because the Apostles were here present, who had Power over all Churches; therefore it may in that regard be called a General or Œcumenical Council.

ANSW. It is easy to reply, That there can be no just warrant taken from thence for such an Assertion: For if the Apostles did act here as particular persons, not by any Apostolical Power, then their presence, look at them as private persons, cannot make a General Council.

But their acting in this Synod was not as Apostles by way of revelation or peculiar assistance; *Ergo.*

That cannot make a General Council.

They disputed as others, consented, concluded, subscribed, and sent as others.

3. One Church hath no power over another:

But here is but one Church advising with another, *Antioch* with *Jerusalem.*

The minor is in the text; the Proposition is a confessed principle, and reason gives force of confirmation; For it carries some appearance with it, that one should yield to many; but that one should submit to the Power of another, and haply

the stronger, and more able and judicious to that which is more weak and ignorant, &c.

50

4. All juridical Power issues from Combination. Therefore those only are bound, that are so combined and sent.

But this Synod sent their *dogmata* and sentences to the Churches of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, who never sent any Messengers thither, and *ergo*.

All that they intended and acted was by a way of Counsel.

5. The controversy arising from the Church of *Antioch*, they repairing for judgement, cannot be judges in their own cause, now controverted by an opposite party.

Hence there was but one Church that gave in the sentence, and that cannot make a Synod.

6. Each Practice or Example is so far warrantable and binding, as it hath either some particular precept to enjoin it, or some general rule that may confirm it by way of collection.

But here is no particular precept to enjoin it; let them shew any general rule appropriate to Church discipline or Church government to bottom it.

Dr Whitaker confessth, there is no precept for Synods.

The reason alleged for proof, hath no convicting evidence in it.

For when it is said,

An ordinary Assembly of Church-members, Elders and Brethren of many Churches meeting by occasion of controversy, to dispute and clear truth from Scripture, is founded on *Act. 15*.

But this is a Synod.

ANSW. To the major, such an Assembly met of many Messengers of many Churches, is not found, nor can be proved out of the *Act*.

2. They met not to dispute and determine *juridicè*.

The same fault is in that proof of *Gal. 2*.

If *Paul* went up to the Apostles to gain mutual consent and approbation, not to submit his office or doctrine *juridicè* to them at all, for this he professedly gainsays, that he had not his

office from man, or by man; and that his doctrine was from God by revelation, as well as theirs,

If he come to advantage his proceeding by mutual consent and approbation, then other Churches may meet together by

51

way of jurisdiction; there is no soundness in such a conference.

The reasons also reach not this Power.

For errors may be prevented, truth cleared, union of Churches in judgment preserved, and they kept from running in vain, and all neighbouring Churches may be consulted with in more weighty transactions, without this meeting in this judicial manner.

But if Synods and such meetings be attended only in way of confutation, as having no other power, nor meeting for any other end:

Then as they are lawful, so the root of them lies in a common principle which God in providence hath appointed for human proceeding, and that is,

He that hearkens to counsel shall be safe.

In the multitude of Councillors there is safety.

Hence all conditions and callings, as they need, so they use a Combination of counsel, for the carrying on of their occasions tunder their hand.

Hence arise the Companies of Merchants, and all men of all Crafts.

Hence Common Counsels in all Kingdoms and States.

And therefore in the Course of Christianity also the Churches of Christ should use the means which God hath appointed for their more comfortable and succesful proceeding in a Church-way.

And hence one Church may send to another, or to many and that severally or jointly meeting.

Hence send to the most able: As *Antioch* sent to *Jerusalem*, because though it was far remote, yet in reason they might expect more relief, because of the joint being of the Apostles together.

Beside, they were concerned in some manner therein, as it appears, some came as from them, and pretended the judg-

ment of the Apostles touching the necessity of Circumcision, to whom say the Apostles, we gave no such allowance.

OBJ. If it be said, this course of Counsel is common to all sorts, and therefore they may as well conlult with any, as with Churches.

ANSW. True, they may, and in some cases should consult with

52

the Chief learned men and Readers of Divinity in several Universities, or such who have the chiefest skill in the occasions which are in doubt.

But because the occasion of one Church may deeply concerne others. 2. Because Churches are in reason most fit and best able, and will be most affected with the conditions of other Churches, Therefore its most suitable to right reason, and the rules of confutation to advise with such.

3. Quest.

What is the Power of a Synod?

ANSW. Power, ἐξουσία is either

Juridica,

Prætoria, to bind consciences to Christ

Æquatoria

Consultativa.

Juridica Æquatoria

Either in inflicting censures,

Or

Imposing their conclusions and determinations upon others under pain of censure, & this is that they call legislative Power, *Potestas consciendi Canones.*

Again this Power looks two ways,

Either in respect of other Churches.

Or of the Magistrate.

Hence the answer will issue in three heads.

I. They have not Power *infligendi censuras, utpote excommunicationis:* The reason is taken from Presbyterian principles.

All censures are administred by men in office.

But here the actions ifliie not from such.

Those acts which proceed in common from men without, as well as in office, those cannot be acts of men in office.

But all acts of the Synod are performed by all the Members of the Synod.

It seems good to the Spirit and unto us, that was, all the

53

Brethren, as well, as the Church.

2. They grant, that all the Power the Synod hath, is accumulative, not privative; it takes nothing from the Power of the Churches.

But thus to censure, would take Power from the Churches.

That which crosseth the Power given by Christ, that diminisheth their lawful and rightful Power.

But this doth so; For Christ saith, *He that will not hear the Church, let him be as a heathen*: But this Power gives them leave to refuse the admonition of the Church, and to appeal, and so nullifies the proceeding of the Church.

3. That which gives power over a Church without the attending the judgement of the Rulers, nay happily, against their judgement, that diminisheth the power of the Church.

But this doth so: As in case all the Elders of a particular Congregation shall gainsay the censure, and the rest of the Synod pass a censure against the Elders.

4. Excommunication is proper to the Congregation.

Therefore they take that which is their propriety.

That it is proper, it thus appears.

It's either proper to the Congregation, or else common to both.

Therefore it falls firstly and properly somewhere else, namely, it belongs to the Church in general first, and then to both the species.

But this cannot be.

That which is firstly in the genus, doth belong indifferently to both species from thence.

But all the power the Classis hath, they have it from the Congregation.

Therefore it was firstly there not in a Church in the general, as belonging to Synods and to Congregations.

5. All jurisdiction belongs to, and issues from the power of order.

But this jurisdiction issues from no power of order; for here is new jurisdiction, but no new order or officer.

6. Where there is a superior power, thither belongs supreme honour.

But the greatest honour belongs to them, who preach, not who rule,

54

2. *They have no power to impose their Canons or Conclusions upon them.*

1. Because the Churches power is above them, in that they sent them.

2. Because the Churches have power to call another Synod, and send other Messengers, and passes entence against them.

3. Because in many cases it may enjoin a man to believe contradictions.

As suppose a man under one Province, which hath determined a case one way, and therefore he must believe that.

He removes himself the next month or week into another Province, and they have determined a contrary Conclusion, and he must believe that.

4. In all Synods, but an Œcumenical, its lawful to make an appeal; and therefore to refuse.

3. *In point of Counsel.*

They have *dogmaticum decisivum judicium*, i.e. they may dogmatise and set down their judgements definitively, and by way of determination.

Therefore *Junias* calls them

διάταξεις ἐκ ἐντολας

Non præcepta sed Ordinationes.

4. QUEST.

To whom the power of calling *Synods doth appertain.*

1. The state of the question must be first inquired.

2. The reasons brought for the truth, that it may be settled. This controversy comes to be agitated betwixt us and the Papists: and also betwixt many of the Protestants, in some particular branches, or some peculiar explications of it.

We shall indeavour to lay out the full breadth, and then to point out the severals wherein the very nick and hinge of the question stands. Therefore inquire,

1. What Synod is here meant.
 2. What it is to call.
 3. To whom the power appertaines.
-

55

1. A Synod, in this question, is usually restrained to a general counsel, or an Oecumenic Synod, as it may appear in Doctor *Whitaker*. For as touching Provincial or National counsels, he grants they were commonly convocated by the Bishops, Metropolitan, or Patriach, who had an inspection into such places, by human appointment.

Though I confess, in a safe and fair sense, I would extend it further.

2. *Convocare*, The greatest weight lies in the explication of this word, *what it is to call*, and if we may look at it, in the full bounds and limits, as its often considered by such as inquire into all the ingredients of this action,

Then it implies two things.

1. By way of appointment and injunction to require the solemn and public concurrence and assembly of some persons of severall Churches, for such ends, as hath above been specified.

I say a public and solemn Assembly and concurrence of Churches.

For, if it be but private and clandestine by some privy intimation one from another, to meet in a secret manner, as under the colour, and by the rule of Christian society, We look not at such meeting as Synodical.

2. This public concurrence, it must be appointed and intreated, not attained by way of intreaty;

As persons dissenting, and being in difference one with another, are said, in one usual phrase, to call in Arbitrators, or by entreaty to desire the help of such persons, to consider and end their controversy.

Such a kind of calling which is by occasionall intreaty, reacheth not the freile arid state of this question.

3. I find some also, who make this as one branch, which growes to the body of this question.

Whether they who call, may name and specify the particular persons who must be sent, or may refuse such as be sent, in case they same to their judgement, upon reasons which appcare just to them, that they are unfit.

And here men's apprehensions vary.

Some will allow the Magistrate to enjoin and require the Churches to fend: But the Churches must make choice of those whom they will end.

56

Others conceive it is in the Magistrates hand to appoint both.

Again,

This power of appointing they look at it in a double consideration.

Either as a Commission, which they give, whereby they are inabled unto this action.

Or only a permission, that the Churches having power of themselves, the Magistrate suffers them, or will not hinder them from putting it forth.

And the issue then returns to this,

It belongs to the supreme Magistrate, and the power of his place, to enjoin the solemn and public concurrence of the several persons of the Churches, and to appoint and nominate whom of those he will have to consider of such weighty and doubtful cases, which concern the public profession and practising of the worship of God, within his Dominions.

When I say, It belongs to his power and place, I mean to him it is peculiar, and doth not belong to the Church,

2. I say, The public and solemn concurrence is appointed by him.

They may, as Christians, maintain private communion, one with another, seek, and by entreaty call for the counsel and help one of another, and as they be Churches, use that Christian privilege of *auxilium & consilium*, to further their own good, and promote the work under their hand: And that act requires no allowance of Magistrate at all.

For what I do, *quà Ethicus, quà Oeconomicus*, and so *quà Christianus* in private, it appertains not to him to inquire, provided it entrench not upon his *ὀπολιτευσθαι*.

But when any proceed to public and solemn Assemblings, this comes properly under the Cognizance of the Magistrate, as falling professedly in his way, and requires his *allowance*.

I say allowance; for in such acts, which issue from the common abilities or dexterities of men *Commissio & just a permissio* are all one, at least make no great difference.

The Magistrate allows a scholar, a sencer, to set up Schools of their Art, there needs no more Commission, but such a permission to such actions in a state.

Before I descend to the Arguments, there be two *postulata*.

I shall premise.

57

1. That a right opinion and worship of God should be openly professed within the territories and jurisdiction of a State, appertains to them, as that which comes within the verge and object of the state and policy to attend.

For how could they provide for their subjects, to live in godliness and honesty without this?

How should they be nursing Fathers and Mothers to the Church and Religion, if they should suffer open Blasphemy and Idolatry to be maintained and professed?

Nay in that such crimes were punished with death in Israel, its plain, the Kings did it, not as Types of Christ, but by a civil power.

For no spiritual power useth the weapons of this world.

2. Hence the supreme Magistrate hath liberty and power both to inquire and judge of professions and Religions, which is true, and ought to be maintained, which is false, and ought to be rejected.

For were he bound to follow the judgement of the Churches, or Ministers, if they should judge a Toleration of all Religions lawful, or judge the false to be true, he then were bound to nurse the false Religion, and false Churches.

Now we shall proceed to the Reasons for the settling of the truth, which was the second thing to be attended,

Argument 1.

If it be in the Magistrates power lawfully to forbid and hinder, then it is not in the power of the Churches lawfully to do.

For then the same thing should, in the same regard be lawful and unlawful: and the rules of providence should be opposite one to another.

But the supreme Magistrate may lawfully hinder any people of another Kingdom to come into his: or his own subjects to go out of his territories without his leave.

Otherwise, he should want lawful power to oppose such, as would come in to undermine or lay waste the State, and to defend himself.

And should also not have authority to require homage of his own people.

Now without the coming in of many; from all Nations, or

58

the going out of his own subjects to other Nations, there will be no general concurrence, nor counsel.

And the same power he hath to confine his own people from such general Assemblings, within his own precincts. For there may be the like just reasons.

Argument 2.

That which is an act merely civil, that belongs properly to the civil Magistrate.

But this is an act merely civil to appoint such solemn and public Assemblings.

The first Proportion is evident from the diversity of the Rules, by which actions are put forth.

A civil act belongs not to an Ecclesiastic power, because that which they do, is only done by the Ecclesiastical policy.

Minor.

The *πραττόμενον* of a role of policy is an act merely civil.

But this is such, for it is contained under that rule of *rectus de Deo sensus, de Deo cultus*.

Argument 3.

It's lawful for a Prince to require the help of faculties and abilities of his subjects, to consider, to advise for the good of the public.

This his Royal place, and their homage evidenceth.

But to call what persons of the Churches, he conceives most fit to meet and concur for counsel, is to improve the faculties and abilities of his subjects for the common good, *ergo*.

And if it was lawful for them to refuse, there must needs follow, not only rebellion on their part, but certain ruin to the whole.

Argument 4.

If the Magistrate is bound to maintain the peace of his subjects in godliness, and to know and judge of the ways of godliness, then he must have power to use such means, that he may both know and maintain it.

For providence doth not require the end, but always al-

59

lowes ways withal, for the attainment of it, which are requisite and lawful.

But unless he may require the concurrence of the Counsels and considerations, and so the determinations of Churches touching what they hold and maintain in their profession, to be according to the rule of godliness, there is not a means lest, to know what profession they be of, and how far they either agree or difagre.

Argument. 5.

If the Churches need and desire the protection of the Magistrate in their way of worship; then they must be ready to give him an account of their way, when he requires it, and therefore to concur and assemble upon his appointment, that so he may know, and lend his patronage and protection.

This Conclusion in all the particulars of it, is made good by all the Examples in the Old and New Testament.

As that of *Asa*, *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*.

Herod Math. 2. calls all the Scribes, Pharisees, and the Elders of the people.

FINIS.