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ABOUT
MATTERS ECCLESIASTICAL.

READER,

I HAVE something to say to thee of the number of these cases, somewhat of the order, and somewhat of the manner of handling and resolving them. I. That there are so many is because there are really so many difficulties which all men are not able to resolve. That they are no more, is partly because I could not remember then any more that were necessarily to be handled, and I was not willing to increase so great a book with things unnecessary.

II. As to the order, I have some reasons for the order of most of them, which would be too tedious to open to you. But some of them are placed out of order, because, 1. I could not remember them in due place. 2. And great haste allowed me not time to transpose them. If you say that in such a work I should take time, I answer, You are no competent judges, unless you knew me and the rest of my work, and the likelihood that my time will be but short. They that had rather take my writings with such defects which are the effects of haste, than have none of them, may use them, and the rest are free to despise them and neglect them. Two or three questions about the Scripture, I would have put nearer the beginning if I could have time; but seeing I cannot, it is easy for you to transpose them in the reading.
III. The resolution of these Cases so much avoideth all the extremes, that I look they should be displeasing to all that vast number of Christians, who involve themselves in the opinions and interests of their several sects as such; and that hold the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons. But there will be still a certain number of truly Catholic, impartial readers, whose favourable acceptance I confidently prognosticate; and who, being out of the dust, and noise, and passions of contending sides and parties, and their interests, will see a self-evidencing light in those solutions, which are put off here briefly, without the pomp of formal argumentation, or persuading oratory. The eternal Light reveal himself to us, by Christ who is the Light of the world, and by the illumination of the Spirit and Word of Light; that we may walk in the Light, as the children of Light, till we come to the world of glorious, everlasting Light. And what other defect soever our knowledge have, if any man hath knowledge enough to kindle in him the love of God, the same is known of Him, and therefore is beloved by Him, and shall be blessed with and in Him for ever.

Quest. 1. How to know which is the true church, among all pretenders, that a Christian's conscience may be quiet in his relation and communion.

I have written so much of this already in four books, (viz. one called, "The Safe Religion," another called, "A Key for Catholicks," another called, "The Visibility of the Church," another called, "A True Catholic, and the Catholic Church described," that I shall say now but a little, and yet enough to an impartial, considerate reader.

The terms must first be opened: 1. By a church is meant, a society of Christians as such. And it is sometimes taken narrowly, for the body or members as distinct from the head, as the word kingdom is taken for the subjects only as distinct from the king; and sometimes more fully and properly for the whole political society, as con-
stituted of its head and body, or the 'Pars imperans et pars subdita.'

2. The word church thus taken, signifieth sometimes the universal church called Catholic; which consisteth of Christ and his body politic, or mystical; and sometimes some part only of the universal church. And so it is taken either for a subordinate, political part, or for a community, or a part considered as consociate, but not political; or as many particular, political churches agreeing and holding concord and communion without any common head, save the universal Head.

3. Such political churches, are either of divine constitution and policy, or only of human.

2. By Christians, I mean such as profess the essentials of the Christian religion. For we speak of the church as visible.

3. By 'true,' may be meant, either reality of essence, opposite to that which is not really a church in this unequivocal acceptance; or else sound and orthodox, in the integrals, as opposite to erroneous and defiled with much enormity. And now I thus decide that question.

Prop. i. The true Catholic church consisteth of Christ the Head, and all Christians as his body, or the members. As the kingdom consisteth of the king and his subjects*

Prop. ii. As all the sincere heart-covenanters make up the church as regenerate, and mystical or invisible; so all that are christened, that is, baptized, and profess consent to all the essentials of the baptismal covenant, not having apostatized, nor being by lawful power excommunicated, are Christians, and make up the church as visible

Prop. iii. Therefore there is but one universal church, because it containeth all Christians; and so leaveth out none to be the matter of another.

Prop. iv. It is not ignorance or error about the mere integrals of Christianity, which maketh them no Christians who hold the essentials, that is, the baptismal covenant

Prop. v. That the baptismal covenant might be rightly

---

* 1 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Cor. xii. 12. Eph. i. 22, 23 1 Cor. vi. 15 1 Cor. xii. 27.
* Eph. iv. 4, 5. 1 Cor. xii. 13. Mark xvi 16.
* Rom. xiv. 1. 6, 7, xv. 1. 3, 4.
understood and professed, the churches have still used the creed as the explication of the covenant, in point of faith; and taken it for the symbol of the Christian belief. And no further profession of faith was or is to be required, as necessary to the being of Christianity.

Prop. vi. If proud usurpers or censurers take on them to excommunicate, or unchristian, or unchurch others, without authority and cause, this maketh them not to be no Christians, or no churches, that are so used.

Prop. vii. Therefore to know which is the true catholic or universal church is but to know who are baptized, professed Christians.

Prop. viii. The reformed churches, the Lutherans, the Abassines, the Coptics, the Syrians, the Armenians, the Jacobites, the Georgians, the Maronites, the Greeks, the Moscovites, and the Romanists, do all receive baptism in all its visible essentials, and profess all the essentials of the Christian religion, though not with the same integrity.

Prop. ix. He that denieth any one essential part, in itself, is so a heretic as to be no Christian, nor true member of the church, if it be justly proved or notorious; that is, none ought to take him for a visible Christian, who know the proof of his denying that essential part of Christianity, or to whom it is notorious.

Prop. x. He that holdeth the essentials primarily, and with them holdeth some error which by unseen consequence subverteth some essential point, but holdeth the essentials so much faster, that he would forsake his error if he saw the inconsistency, is a Christian notwithstanding: and if the name heretic be applicable to him, it is but in such a sense, as is consistent with Christianity.

Prop. x1. He that is judged a heretic and no Christian justly by others, must be lawfully cited, and heard plead his cause, and be judged upon sufficient, and not unheard, or upon rash presumption.

Prop. x11. Christianity and heresy being personal qualities, and nowhere found but in individuals, nor one man

---

* 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2, &c. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.
* Rom. vi. 1, 2, &c. Ephes. iv. 4, 5.
* James iii. 2. Phil. iii. 15, 16. Heb. v. 1, 2.
* Rom. xiv. 3, 4.
* Tit. iii. 10. 3 John.
* Tit. iii. 10.
guilty of another's errors, it followeth that it is single persons upon personal guilt that must be judged in.

**Prop. xiii.** Any man may judge another to be a Christian or heretic, by a private judgment of discerning, or the reason which guideth all human actions: but only church-rulers may judge him by that public judgment, which giveth or denieth him his public privileges and communion.

**Prop. xiv.** If by notorious injustice church-rulers condemn Christians as no Christians, though they may thereby deny them communion with those public assemblies which they govern, yet do they not oblige the people to take such injured persons for no Christians. Else they might oblige all to believe a lie, to consent to malicious injuries, and might disoblige the people from truth, righteousness, and charity.

**Prop. xv.** There is no one natural or collective head and governor of all the churches in the world (the universal church) but Jesus Christ; and therefore there is none that by such governing power, can excommunicate any man out of the universal church: and such usurpation would be treason against Christ, whose prerogative it is.

**Prop. xvi.** Yet he that deserveth to be excommunicated from one church, deserveth to be excommunicated by and from all, if it be upon a cause common to all; or that nullified his Christianity.

**Prop. xvii.** And where neighbour churches are consociate and live in order and concord, he that is orderly excommunicate from one church, and it be notified to the rest, should not be taken into the communion of any of the rest, till he be cleared, or become fit for their communion. But this obligation ariseth but from the consor of consociate churches, and not from the power of one over the rest: and it cannot reach all the world, where the person cometh not, nor was ever known; but only to those who through neigh-

---

* 1 Cor. x. 15. Acts i. 19. 1 Cor. v. 3—5. xi. 3.
* 1 Cor. xii. 27—29. Ephes. iv. 5—7. 1 Cor. i. 10, 13. iii. 22. 23.
* Ephes. v. 25. iv. 15. Col. i. 18. ii. 19.
* S. John. 1 Ephes. v. 11. 1 Cor. v. 11.
bourhood are capable of just notice, and of giving or denying communion to that person.

Prop. xviii. From all this it is clear, that it is not either Papists alone, or Greeks alone, or Protestants alone, or any party of Christians, who are the universal church, seeing that church containeth all Christians. And that reviling others (yea, whole nations) as heretics, schismatics, and no Christians or churches, will, no more prove the revilers to be the only church or Christians, than want of love will prove a man to be one of Christ's disciples, who by love are known to all men to be his.

Prop. xix. It is therefore the shameful language of distracted men, to cry out against other Christian nations; 'It is not you, but we that are the Catholic or universal church.' And our shameful controversy, which of them is the Catholic, is no wiser than to question, Whether it be this house or that which is the street? Or this street or that which is the city? Or whether it be the kitchen, or the hall, or the parlour which is the house? Or the hand, or foot, or eye which is the man? O when will God bring distracting teachers to repentance, and distracted people to their wits!

Prop. xx. There is a great difference in the purity or soundness of the several parts of the universal church; some being more orthodox and holy, and some defiled with so many errors and sins, as to make it difficult to discern whether they do not deny the very essentials.

Prop. xxi. The reformed churches are the soundest and purest that we know in the world, and therefore their privilege exceeding great, though they are not all the universal church.

Prop. xxii. Particular churches consisting of lawful pastors and Christian people, associated for personal communion in worship and holy living, are societies or true churches of Christ's institution, and the chief parts of the universal church: as cities and corporations are of the kingdom.

---

1 Cor. xii. 12. John xiii. 35. 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, &c.
1 Cor. xiii. 12. vi. 17. xi. 17. Ephes. iv. 3, &c.
Gal. iv. 11, 12.
Rev. iii. 8—12. ii. 10, 11. Acts xiv. 22. Tit. i. 5. Rom. xvi. 4. 16.
2 Cor. vii. 17. x. 16. xiv. 33, 34. 2 Thess. i. 4. Rev. ii. 23.
Prop. xxiii. There are thousands of these in the world, and a man may be saved in one, as well as in another; only the purest give him the best advantages for his salvation; and therefore should be preferred by all that are wise and love their souls, so far as they are free to choose their communion.

Prop. xxiv. The case then being easily resolved, (which is the true church?) viz. All Christians as Christians are the Catholic or universal church; and all congregations afore described, of true pastors and Christians being particular true churches, differing only in degrees of purity, he is to be suspected as a designing deceiver and trouble of the world, that pretending to be a learned man and a teacher, doth still perplex the consciences of the ignorant with this frivolous question, and would muddy and obscure this clear state of the case, lest the people should rest in the discerned truth.

Prop. xxv. The Papal church as such, being no true church of Christ’s institution (of which by itself anon) it followeth that a Papist as a Papist is no member of the church of Christ, that is, no Christian*. But yet, whether the same person may not be a Papist and a Christian, and so a member of the Catholic church, we shall anon inquire.

Prop. xxvi. There are many things which go to make up the fitness and desirableness of that particular church, which we should prefer or choose for our ordinary personal communion*: as, 1. That it be the church of that place where we dwell; if that place be so happy as to have no divided churches, that it be the sole church there; however that it be so near as to be fit for our communion. 2. That it be a church which holdeth communion with other neighbour churches, and is not singular or divided from them; or at least not from the generality of the churches of Christ; nor differeth in any great matters from those that are most pure. 3. That it be under the reputation of soundness with the other churches aforesaid, and not under the scandal of heresy, schism, or gross corruption among

* Acts ii. 44. 1 Cor. i. 10. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.
* Heb. x. 25. 1 Tim. iii. 7. 3 John 12.
those that live about. 4. That it be under the countenance and encouraging favour of the Christian magistrate.
5. That it be the same church of which the rest of the family which we are of, be members; that husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants be not of several churches.
6. That the pastors be able teachers, prudent guides, and of holy lives, and diligent in their office.
7. That the pastors be regularly called to their office.
8. That the members be intelligent, peaceable, and of holy, temperate, and righteous lives. But when all these cannot be had together, we must choose that church which hath those qualifications which are most needful, and bear with tolerable imperfections. The most needful are the first, second, and sixth of these qualifications.

Prop. xxvii. He that is free, should choose that church which is the fittest for his own edification; that is, the best pastors, people and administrations.

Prop. xxviii. A man’s freedom is many ways restrained herein. As, 1. When it will tend to a greater public hurt, by disorder, ill example, division, discouragement, &c. 2. When superiors forbid it; as husbands, parents, masters, magistrates. 3. By some scandal. 4. By the distance or inconvenience of our dwelling. 5. By differences of judgment, and other causes of contention in the said churches: and many other ways.

Prop. xxix. A free man who removeth from one church to another for his edification, is not therefore a separatist or schismatic; but it must not be done by one that is not free, but upon such necessity as freeth him.

Prop. xxx. It is schism or sinful separation to separate from, 1. A true church as no true church. 2. From lawful worship and communion, as lawful; but of this more in its proper place.

b Acts xvi. 32. 34. x. 2. 22. xviii. 8. Col. iv. 15.

c Of these things I have said so much in my Cure of Church-divisions,” and in the Defence of it, and in the end of my “Reasons of Christian Religion,” that I pass them over here with the more brevity.
Quest. 11. Whether we must esteem the church of Rome a true church? And in what sense some divines affirm it, and some deny it?

Want of some easy distinguishing hath made that seem a controversy here, which is so plain, that it can hardly be any at all to Protestants, if the question had been but truly stated.

Remember therefore that by a church is meant, not a mere company of Christians, any how related to each other; but a society consisting of an ecclesiastical head and body, such as we call a political society. 2. And that we speak not of an accidental head (such as the king is, because he governeth them 'saev modo' by the sword); for that is not an essential constitutive part; but of a constitutive ecclesiastical head and body. 3. That the question is not, Whether the church of Rome be a part of the church, but whether it be a true church? And now I answer,

1. To affirm the church of Rome to be the Catholic or universal church, is more than to affirm it to be a true Catholic church, that is, a true part of the Catholic church; and is as much as to say that it is the whole and only church, and that there is no other; which is odious falsehood and usurpation, and slander against all other churches.

2. The church of Rome, is so called in the question, as it is a policy or church in a general sense; and the meaning of the question is, Whether it be a divine, or a human or diabolical policy; a lawful church.

3. The church of Rome is considered, 1. Formally, as a church or policy. 2. Materially, as the singular persons are qualified. It is the form that denominateth. Therefore the question must be taken of the Roman policy, or of the church of Rome as such; that is, as it is one ruler pretending to be the vicarious, constitutive, governing head of all Christ's visible church on earth, and the body which owneth him in this relation.

4. Therefore I conclude (and so do all Protestants) that this policy or church of Rome is no true church of Christ's instituting or approbation, but a human, sinful policy formed

4 See Mr. Barton's and Bp. Hall's contest hereabouts.
by the temptation of satan the prince of pride, deceit, and darkness. The proof of which is the matter of whole loads of Protestant writings. And indeed the proof of their policy being incumbent on themselves, they fail in it, and are still vain to fly to pretended, false tradition for proof, in which the sophisters know that either they must be judges themselves, and it must go for truth because they say it; or else that if they can carry the controversy into a thicket or wood of fathers and church history, at least they can confound the ignorant, and evade themselves. Of this see my "Disput. with Johnson," and my "Key for Catholicks," &c.

5. The bishop of the English Papists, Smith called bishop of Chalcedon, in his Survey, cap. v. saith, * To us it sufficeth that the bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor; and this all the fathers testify, and all the Catholic church believeth; but whether it be 'jure divine' or 'humano' is no point of faith." The like hath Davenport, called France, à Sancta Clarà more largely. By this let the reader judge whether we need more words to prove their church to be such as Christ never instituted, when the belief of their divine right, is no part of their own faith.

6. If the church of Rome in its formal policy be not of human institution, it is, 1. Unnecessary to salvation. 2. Unlawful; because they that first instituted it had no authority so to do, and were usurpers. For either the makers of it were themselves a church or no church. If no church, they could not lawfully make a church: infidels or heathens are not to be our church makers. If a church, then there was a church before the church of Rome, and that of another form. And if that former form were of Christ's institution, men might not change it; if not, who made that form? and so on.

7. Our divines therefore that say that the church of Rome is a true church, though corrupt, do not speak of it formally as to the Papal policy or headship, but materially. 1. That all Papists that are visible Christians are visible parts of the universal church. 2. That their particular congregations considered abstractedly from the Roman headship may be true particular churches, though corrupt;
which yet being the only difficulty shall be the matter of
our next inquiry.

Quest. 111. Whether we must take the Romish clergy for true
ministers of Christ? And whether their baptism and ordi-
nation be nullities.

I join these two distinct Questions together for brevity.
1. As true signifieth regularly called, so they are com-
monly irregular and not true ministers. But as true sig-
nifieth real opposed to a nullity, so it is now to be further
considered.

The doubt lieth either of the sufficiency of his call, or
of somewhat that is supposed to destroy it by contradiction
or redundancy. 1. Whether he want any thing of absolute
necessity to the office, who is called in the church of
Rome, or 2. Whether there be any thing in his office or en-
trance, which nullifieth or invalidateth that which else would
be sufficient.

For the first doubt, it is not agreed on among Papists or
Protestants what is of necessity to the being of the office.
Some think real godliness in the person is necessary; but
most think not. Some think that visible, that is, seeming,
professed godliness, not disproved by mortal sin is necessary;
and some think not. Some think the people’s election is
necessary, and that ordination is but ‘ad bene esse;’ and
some think ordination necessary ‘ad esse,’ and election ‘ad
bene esse,’ or not at all; and some think both necessary
‘ad esse,’ and some neither. Some think the election of
the people is necessary, and some think only their consent
is necessary, though after their election by others: some
think it must be the consent of all the flock or near all; and
some only of the major part; and some of the better part,
though the minor. Some think the ordination of a dioce-
san bishop necessary ‘ad esse,’ and some not. Some think
the truth of the ordainers calling, or power, to be necessary
to the validity of his ordination, and some not. Some think
the number of two, or three, or more ordainers to be neces-
sary, and some not. Some think it necessary to the validity
of the ministry that it come down from the apostles by an
uninterrupted succession of truly ordained bishops, and
some think not. Some few think that the magistrate's command or licence is necessary, and only it, and most deny both. Johnson, alias Terret, the Papist, in his Disputation against me, maintaineth that consecration is not necessary 'ad esse,' nor any one way of election, by these or those, but only the church's reception upon such an election as may give them notice, and which may be different, according to different times, places, and other circumstances.

In the midst of these confusions, what is to be held? I have opened the case as fully and plainly as I can, in my second "Disput. of Church Government," about ordination, to which I must refer the reader: only here briefly touching upon the sum.

1. There are some personal qualifications necessary to the being of the office (of which anon), and some only to the well-being.  

2. The efficient conveying cause of power or office, is God's will signified in his own established law; in which he determineth that such persons so called shall receive from him such power, and be obliged to such office-administrations.

3. Any providence of God which infallibly or satisfactorily notifieth to the church, who these persons are, that receive such power from God, doth oblige them to submit to them as so empowered.

4. God's ordinary established way of regular designation of the person, is by the church's consent, and the senior pastor's ordination.

5. By these actions they are not the proper donors or efficiencies of the power, or office given, but the consent of the people and the ordination do determine of the recipient, and so are regularly 'causa sine qua non' of his reception. And the ordination is moreover a solemn investiture in the office: as when a servant is sent by delivering a key to deliver possession of a house, by his master's consent, to him that had before the owner's grant; and so it ceremoniously entereth him into visible possession; like the solemnizing of marriage, or the listing of a soldier, &c.

1 Ephes. iv. 6—11.
3 Vol. V. S
6. The people's consent (before or after) is not only by institution, but naturally necessary, that a man become a pastor to those persons (for no man can learn, obey, &c. without consent): but it is not of necessity to the being of the ministry in general, or in the first instant: a man without it may be authorized as a minister to go preach the Gospel for conversion, and baptize and gather churches, though not to be their stated pastor.

7. When death, distance, corruption, heresy or malignity of pastors within reach, maketh it impossible to have ordination, God's choice of the person may be notified without it; as by 1. Eminent qualifications. 2. The people's real necessities. 3. And the removal of impediments, and a concurrence of inviting opportunities and advantages. 4. And sometimes the people's desire. 5. And sometimes the magistrate's commission or consent; which though not absolutely necessary in themselves; yet may serve to design the person and invest him, when the ordinary way faileth; which is all that is left to man to do, to the conveyance of the power.

The case being thus stated, as to what is necessary to give the power or office, we may next inquire whether any Papist priest have such power, by such means.

And, 1. We have sufficient reason to judge that many of them have all the personal qualifications which are essentially necessary. 2. Many among them have the consent of a sober Christian people (of which more anon). And Mr. Jacob who was against bishops and their ordination, proveth at large, that by election or consent of the people alone, a man may be a true pastor, either without such ordination, or notwithstanding both the vanity and error of it. 3. Many of them have ordination by able and sober bishops; if that also be necessary. 4. In that ordination, they are invested in all that is essential to the pastoral office.

So that I see not that their calling is a nullity through defect of any thing of absolute necessity to its being and validity; though it be many ways irregular and sinful.

II. We are next therefore to inquire whether any contradicting additions make null that which else would be no nullity. And this is the great difficulty. For as we accuse not their religion for being too little, but too much, so this is our chief doubt about their ministry.
And 1. It is doubted, as to the office itself, whether a mass-priest be a true minister, as having another work to do, even to make his maker, and to give Christ's real flesh with his hands to the people; and to preach the unsound doctrines of their church; and these seem to be essential parts of his function.

The case is very bad and sad; but that which I said about the heresies or errors which may consist with Christianity, when they overthrow it but by an undiscerned consequence, must be here also considered. The prime part of their office is that (as to the essentials) which Christ ordained: this they receive, and to this they sew a filthy rag of man's devising; but if they knew this to be inconsistent with Christianity or the essentials of the ministry, we may well presume (of many of them) they would not receive it. Therefore as an error which consequentially contradiceth some essential article of faith, nullifieth not his Christianity who first and fastest holdeth the faith, and would cast away the error if he saw the contradiction, (as Davenant, Morton, and Hall have shewed, Epist. Conciliat.). So it is to be said as to practical error in the present case. They are their grievous errors and sins, but for ought I see, do not nullify their office to the church. As a mass-priest, he is no minister of Christ, (as an anabaptist is not as a re-baptizer, nor a separatist as a separatist, nor an antinomian, or any erroneous person as a preacher of that error); but as a Christian pastor ordained to preach the Gospel, baptize, administer the Lord's supper, pray, praise God, guide the church, he may be.

The same answer serveth to the objection as it extendeth to the erroneous doctrines which they preach, which are but by consequence against the essentials of religion.

2. But it is a greater doubt, Whether any power of the ministry can be conveyed by antichrist, or from him? And whether God will own any of antichrist’s administrations? Therefore seeing they profess themselves to have no office but what they receive from the pope, and Christ disowning his usurpation, the same man cannot be the minister of Christ and antichrist; as the same man cannot be an officer in the king’s army and his enemies.

But this will have the same solution as the former. If
this antichrist were the open, professed enemy to Christ, then all this were true: because their corrupt additions would not by dark consequences, but so directly contain the denial of Christianity or the true ministry, that it were not possible to hold both. But (as our divines commonly note) antichrist is to sit in the temple of God, and the pope's treason is under pretence of the greatest service and friendship to Christ, making himself his vicar general without his commission. So that they that receive power from him, do think him to be Christ's vicar indeed, and so renounce not Christ, but profess their first and chief relation to be to him, and dependance on him, and that they would have nothing to do with the pope, if they knew him to be against Christ. And some of them write, that the power or office is immediately from Christ, and that the pope, ordinaries, and electors do but design the person that shall receive it; (because else they know not what to say of the election and consecration of the pope himself, who hath no superior). And the Spanish bishops in the council of Trent held so close to this, that the rest were fain to leave it undetermined; so that it is no part of their religion, but a doubtful opinion, whether the power of bishops be derived from the pope, though they be governed by him.

But as to the other, the case seemeth like this: if a subject in Ireland usurp the lieutenancy, and tell all the people that he hath the king's commission to be his lieutenant, and command all to submit to him, and receive their places from him, and obey him; and the king declareth him a traitor, (antecedently only by the description of his laws,) and maketh it the duty of the subjects to renounce him: those that now know the king's will, and yet adhere to the usurper, though they know that the king is against it, are traitors with him: but those from whom he keepeth the knowledge of the laws, and who for want of full information, believe him to be really the king's lieutenant, (and specially living where all believe it,) but yet would renounce him if they knew that he had not the king's commission; these are the king's subjects, though in ignorance they obey an usurper. And on this account it is that Archbishop Usher concluded, that 'an ignorant Papist might be saved, but the learned hardly.' But when the learned, through the disadvantages
of their education, are under the same ignorance, being learned but on one side to their greater seduction, the case may be the same.

The same man therefore may receive an office from Christ, who yet ignorantly submitteth to the pope, and receiveth corrupt additions from him.

But suppose I be mistaken in all this, yet to come to the second question,

III. Whether baptism and ordination given by them be nullities? I answer, no; on a further account, 1. Because that the ministry which is a nullity to the receiver, (that is, God will punish him as an usurper,) may yet perform those ministerial acts which are no nullities to the church. Else how confused a case would all churches be in? For it is hard ever to know whether ministers have all things essential to their office. Suppose a man be ignorant, or an heretic against some essential article of faith; or suppose that he feigned orders of ordination when he had none; or that he was ordained by such as really had no power to do it; or suppose he pretended the consent of the majority of the people, when really the greater part were for another: if all this be unknown, his baptizing and other administrations are not thereby made nullities to the church, though they be sins in him. The reason is, because that the church shall not suffer, nor lose her right for another man's sin! When the fault is not theirs, the loss and punishment shall not be theirs. He that is found in possession of the place, performeth valid administration to them that know not his usurpation, and are not guilty of it. Otherwise we should never have done re-baptizing, nor know easily when we receive any valid administrations, while we are so disagreed about the necessaries of the office and call; and when it is so hard in all things to judge of the call of all other men.

2. And as the Papists say, that a private man or woman may baptize in extremity, so many learned Protestants think, that though a private man's baptism be a sin, yet it is no nullity, though he were known to be no minister.

And what is said of baptism, to avoid tediousness, you may suppose said of ordination, which will carry the first case.

far, as to the validity of the ministry received by Papist's ordination, as well as of baptism and visible Christianity received by them. For my part, God used Parson's "Book of Resolution Corrected," so much to my good, and I have known so many eminent Christians, and some ministers converted by it, that I am glad that I hear none make a controversy of it, whether the conversion, faith, or love to God be valid, which we receive by the books or means of any Papist!

Quest. iv. Whether it be necessary to believe that the pope is the antichrist?

It is one question, whether he be antichrist, and another, whether it be necessary to believe it? To the first I say; I. There are many antichrists: and we must remove the ambiguity of the name, before we can resolve the question. If by antichrist be meant, 'One that usurps the office of a universal vicar of Christ, and constitutive and governing head of the whole visible church, and hereby layeth the ground of schisms, and contentions, and bloodshed in the world, and would rob Christ of all his members, who are not of the pope's kingdom, and that form a multifarious ministry for this service, and corrupteth much of the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the church;' in this sense no doubt but the pope is antichrist.

But if by antichrist be meant him particularly described in the Apocalypse and Thessalonians, then the controversy 'de re,' is about the exposition of those dark prophecies. Of which I can say no more but this, 1. That if the pope be not he; he had ill luck to be so like him. 2. That Dr. More's moral arguments, and Bishop Downham's and many others' expository arguments, are such as I cannot answer. 3. But yet my skill is not so great in interpreting those obscure prophecies, as that I can say I am sure that it is the pope they speak of, and that Lyra, learned Zanchy, and others that think it is Mahomet, or others that otherwise interpret them, were mistaken.

II. But to the second question, I more boldly say, 1. That every one that indeed knoweth this to be the sense of those texts, is bound to believe it.
2. But that God who hath not made it of necessity to salvation to understand many hundred plainer texts, nor absolutely to understand more than the articles and fundamentals of our religion, hath much less made it necessary to salvation to understand the darkest prophecies.

3. And that as the suspicion should make all Christians cautious, what they receive from Rome, so the obscurity should make all Christians take heed, that they draw from it no consequences destructive to love, or order, or any truth, or Christian duty. And this is the advice I give to all.

Quest. v. Whether we must hold that a Papist may be saved?

This question may be resolved easily from what is said before.

1. A Papist as a Papist, that is, by popery, will never be saved, no more than a man's life by a leprosy.

2. If a Papist be saved, he must be saved against, and from popery, either by turning from the opinion, and then he is no Papist, or by preserving his heart from the power of his own opinions¹. And the same we may say of every error and sin. He that is saved, must be saved from it, at least from the power of it on the heart, and from the guilt of it by forgiveness.

3. Every one that is a true, sincere Christian in faith, love, and true obedience shall be saved, what error soever he hold that doth consist with these.

4. As many Antinomians and other erroneous persons, do hold things which by consequence subvert Christianity; and yet not seeing the inconsistence, do hold Christianity first and fastest, in heart and sincere practice, and would renounce their error if they saw the inconsistence, so is it with many Papists. And that which they hold first, and fastest, and practically, doth save them from the power, operations, and poison of their own opinions: as an antidote or the strength of nature may save a man from a small quantity of poison.

5. Moreover we have cause to judge that there are mil-

lions among the Papists, corrupted with many of their lesser errors, who yet hold not their greater; that believe not that none are Christians but the pope's subjects, and that Christ's kingdom and the pope's are of the same extent, or that he can remit men's pains in another world, or that the bread and wine are no bread and wine, or that men merit of God in point of commutative justice, or that we must adore or worship the bread, or yet the cross or image itself, &c., or that consent to abundance of the clergy's tyrannical usurpations and abuses: and so being not properly Papists, may be saved, if a Papist might not. And we the less know how many or few among them are really of the clergy's religion and mind, because by terror they restrain men from manifesting their judgment, and compel them to comply in outward things.

6. But as fewer that have leprosies, or plagues, or that take poison escape, than of other men, so we have great cause to believe, that much fewer Papists are saved, than such as escape their errors. And therefore all that love their souls should avoid them.

7. And the trick of the priests who persuade people that theirs is the safest religion, because we say that a Papist may be saved, and they say that a Protestant cannot, is so palpable a cheat, that it should rather deter men from their way. For God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God: and all men must know us to be Christ's disciples, by loving one another: and he that saith he loveth God, and loveth not his brother, is a liar: and charity believeth all things credible. That religion is likest to be of God which is most charitable, and not that which is most uncharitable, and malicious, and like to satan.

To conclude, no man shall be saved for being no Papist, much less for being a Papist. And all that are truly holy, heavenly, humble lovers of God, and of those that are his servants, shall be saved. But how many such are among the Papists, God only knoweth who is their Judge.

The questions whether the Greeks, Abassines, Nestorians, Eutychians, Antinomians, Anabaptists, &c. may be saved, must be all resolved as this of the Papists, allowing for the different degrees of their corruption. And therefore
I must desire the reader to take up with this answer for all, and excuse me from unnecessary repetition.

As for such disputers as my antagonist Mr. Johnson, who insisteth on that of Tit. iii. 10. "A man that is an heretic—is condemned of himself;" when he hath proved that the word heretic hath but one signification, I will say as he doth. Till then, if he will try who shall be damned by bare equivocal words, without the definition, let him take his course, for I will be none of his imitators.

Quest. vi. Whether those that are in the church of Rome, are bound to separate from it? And whether it be lawful to go to their mass or other worship.

These two also for brevity I join together.

1. To the first, we must distinguish of separation: 1. It is one thing to judge that evil which is evil, and separate from it in judgment. 2. It is another thing to express this by forbearing to subscribe, swear, or otherwise approve that evil. 3. And another thing to forbear communion with them in the mass and image-worship, and gross or known sins. 4. And another thing to forbear all communion with them, even as to baptism and other lawful things. 5. And another thing to use some open detestations or protestations against them.

2. And we must distinguish much of persons, whether they be ministers or people, free or bound, as wives, children, &c. And now I answer.

1. There is no question but it is a duty to judge all that evil which is evil among the Papists or any other.

2. It is the duty of all to forbear subscribing, swearing to, or otherwise approving evil.

3. It is the duty of all mass-priests to renounce that part of their calling, and not to administer their mass, or any other unlawful thing.

4. It is the duty of all private Christians to forbear communion in the mass, because it is a kind of idolatry, while they worship a piece of bread as God: as also image-worship, and all other parts of their religion, in which they are put upon sin themselves, or that which is notorious scandal
and symbolizing with them in their bread-worship, or other corruptions of the substance of God's ordinances.

5. It is their duty who have fit opportunity, (when it is like to do more good than harm,) to protest against the papal corruptions where they are, and to declare their detestation of them.

6. It is the duty of those that have children to be baptized or catechized, to make use of more lawful and sound ministers, when they may be had, rather than of a Papist priest.

7. But in case they cannot remove, or enjoy better, I think it is lawful, 1. To let such baptize their children, rather than leave them unbaptized. 2. To let their children be taught by them to read, or in arts and sciences, or the catechism, and common principles of religion, so they will mix no dangerous errors. 3. And to hear those of them preach, who preach soundly and piously, (such as were Gerrhard, Zutphaniensis, Thaulerus, Feras, and many more). 4. And to read such good books as these now mentioned have written. 5. And to join with them in such prayers as are sound and pious, so they go no further.

8. And wives, children, and such other as are bound, and cannot lawfully remove, may stay among them, and take up with these helps, dealing faithfully in abstaining from the rest.

II. The second question is answered in this. Only I add, that it is one thing to be present as Elias was, in a way of opposition to them; or as disputants are, that open their errors; or as a wise man may go to hear or see what they do, without compliance, as we read their books; and it is another thing to join with them in their sinful worship, or scandalously to encourage them in it by seeming so to do. See Calv. contr. Nicod. &c.

Quest. vii. Whether the true calling of the minister by ordination or election, &c., be necessary to the essence of the church?

By a church here we mean a political society of Christians, and not any assembly or community. And no doubt pastor and flock are the constitutive parts of such a church; and where either of them are notoriously wanting, it is noto-
rious that there is no true church. Therefore all the doubt is, whether such parts of his call be necessary to the being of the ministry, or not? And here we must conclude, that the word 'ministry' and 'church' are ambiguous. By a minister or pastor is meant either one that God so far owneth as to accept and justify his administrations as for himself, even his own good and salvation; or one whose administrations God will own, accept, and bless to the people.

I. In the former sense, 1. He is no true minister that wanteth the essential qualifications of a minister, viz. that hath not (1.) The understanding and belief of all the articles of faith, without heresy. (2.) Tolerable ability to teach these to the people, and perform the other essentials of his office. (3) Sincere godliness, to do all this in love and obedience to God as his servant, in order to life eternal.

2. And he is thus no true pastor as to God's acceptance of himself; who hath not a lawful calling; that is, (1.) Ordination, when it may be had. (2.) The consent or reception of that church of which he pretendeth to be pastor, which is still necessary, and must be had, if ordination cannot.

II. But in the second sense, he is a pastor so far as that God will own his administrations as to the people's good, who, 1. Hath possession. 2. And seemeth to them to have necessary qualifications, and a lawful call, though it prove otherwise, so be it, it be not through their wilful fault, that he is culpable, or they mistaken in him. If he be not a true believer, but an infidel, or heretic, he is no minister as to himself; that is, God will use him as an usurper that hath no title: but if he profess to be a believer when he is not, he is a true pastor visibly to the people; otherwise they could never know when they have a pastor: even as real faith makes a real Christian, and professed faith makes a visible Christian, so is it as to the ministry. If he seem to understand the articles of faith, and do not, or if he seem to have due ordination when he hath not, if he be upon this mistake accepted by the people, he is a true visible pastor as to them, that is, as to their duty and benefit, though not as to himself. Yea, the people's consent to his entrance is not necessary 'ad esse,' nor to his relation neither, so far as to justify himself, but to his administrations and to his rela-
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tion, so far as their own right and benefit are interested in it. So that two things are necessary to such a visible pastor as shall perform valid administrations to the church, 1. Seeming necessary qualifications and calling to it. 2. Possession, by the people's reception or consent to his administrations and relation so far as to their benefit.

And III. Thus also we must distinguish of the word 'church.' It is, 1. Such an entire Christian society as hath a minister or pastor whose office is valid as to himself and them; or it is such a society only as hath a pastor whose office is valid to them but not to himself. Let us not confound the question 'de re' and 'de nomine.' These societies differ as is said. Both may fitly be called true churches.

As it is with a kingdom which hath a rightful prince, and one that hath an usurper, so it is here. 1. If it have a rightful king accepted, it is a kingdom in the fullest sense. 2. If it have an usurper accepted, it is a kingdom, but faulty. 3. If the usurper be only so far accepted as that the people consent not to his entrance, no, nor his relation so as to justify his title, but wish him cast out if they could procure it; but yet consent to receive that protection and justice which is their own due from the possessor, and consent to his relation only thus far, this is a kingdom truly, but more defective or maimed than the first. 4. But if the people do not so much as receive him, nor submit to his administrations, he is but a conqueror, and not a king, and it is (in respect to him) no kingdom, (though in respect to some other that hath title and consent, without actual possession of the administration, it may be a kingdom). And this is the true and plain solution of this question, which want of distinction doth obscure.

Quest. viii. Whether sincere faith and godliness be necessary to the being of the ministry? And whether it be lawful to hear a wicked man, or take the sacrament from him, or take him for a minister?

This question receiveth the very same solution with the last foregoing, and therefore I need not say much more to it.

I. The first part is too oft resolved mistakingly on both
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extremes. Some absolutely saying that godliness or faith is not necessary to the being of the ministry; and some that it is necessary. Whereas the true solution is as aforesaid; sincere faith and godliness are necessary to make a man a minister so far as that God will own and justify him as sent by himself, as to his own duty and benefit: for he cannot be internally and heartily a Christian pastor that is no Christian, nor a minister of God, who is not godly, that is, Is not truly resigned to God, obeyeth him not and loveth him not as God. But yet the reality of these are not necessary to make him a visible pastor, as to the people’s duty and benefit.

2. But the profession of true faith and godliness is necessary so far, as that without it the people ought not to take him for a visible minister, (as the profession of Christianity is to a visible Christian.)

3. And in their choice they ought to prefer him ‘caeteris paribus,’ whose profession is most credible.

Obj. ‘That which maketh a minister is gifts and a calling, which are distinct from grace and real Christianity.’

Answ. Every minister is a Christian, though every Christian be not a minister or pastor: therefore he that is a visible pastor must visibly or in profession have both.

Obj. ‘But a man may be a Christian, without saving grace or godliness.’

Answ. As much as he may be godly without godliness. That is, he may be visibly a Christian and godly, without sincere faith and godliness, but not without the profession of both. It is not possible that the profession of Christianity in the essentials, can be without the profession of godliness; for it includeth it.

II. To the other question I answer, 1. A man that professeth infidelity or impiety, yea, that professeth not faith and godliness, is not to be taken for a minister, or heard as such.

2. Every one that professeth to stand to his baptismal covenant professeth faith and godliness.

3. He that by a vicious life or bad application of doctrine contradicteth his profession, is to be lawfully accused of it, and heard speak for himself, and to be cast out by true church-justice, and not by the private censure of a private person.
4. Till this be done, though a particular private member of the church be not bound to think that the minister is worthy, nor that the church which suffereth and receiveth him doth well, yet they are bound to judge him one who by the church's reception is in possession; and therefore a visible pastor, and to submit to his public administrations; because it is not in a private man's power, but the church's, to determine who shall be the pastor.

5. But if the case be past controversy and notorious, that the man is not only scandalous, but weak, and dull, and negligent, but also either, 1. Intolerably unable; 2. Or an infidel, or gross heretic; 3. Or certainly ungodly, a private man should admonish the church and him, and in case that they proceed in impenitency, should remove himself to a better church and ministry. And the church itself should disown such a man, and commit their souls to one that is fitter for the trust.

6. And that church or person who needlessly owneth such a pastor, or preferreth him before a fitter, doth thereby harden him in his usurpation, and is guilty of the hurt of the people's souls, and of his own, and of the dishonour done to God.

Quest. ix. Whether the people are bound to receive or consent to an ungodly, intolerable, heretical pastor, yea, or one far less fit and worthy than a competitor, if the magistrate command it, or the bishop impose him?

For the deciding of this, take these propositions.

1. The magistrate is authorized by God to govern ministers and churches, according to the orders and laws of Christ, (and not against them:) but not to ordain or degrade, nor to make ministers or unmake them, nor to deprive the church of the liberty settled on it by the laws of Christ.

2. The bishops or ordainers are authorized by Christ, to judge of the fitness of the person to the office in general, and solemnly to invest him in it, but not to deprive the people of their freedom, and exercise of the natural care of their own salvation, or of any liberty given them by Christ.

3. The people's liberty in choosing or consenting to
their own pastors, to whom they must commit the care of their souls, is partly founded in nature, (it being they that must have the benefit or loss, and no man being authorized to damn or hazard men's souls, at least against their wills;) and partly settled by Scripture, and continued in the church above a thousand years after Christ, at least in very many parts of it. See Blondel's "Full Proof de jure plebis in regim. Eccles. Hildebertus Canoman. (alias Turonensis)" even in his time sheweth, that though the clergy were to lead, and the people to follow, yet no man was to be made a bishop, or put upon the people without their own consent: Epist. 12. Bibl. Pet. To. iii. p. 179. Filesacus will direct you to more such testimonies. But the thing is past controversy. I need not cite to the learned the commonly cited testimony of Cyprian, 'Plebs maximam habet potestatem indignos recusandi, &c.' And indeed in the nature of the thing it cannot be: for though you may drench a mad man's body by force, when you give him physic, you cannot so drench men's souls, nor cure them against their wills.

4. Not that the people's consent is necessary to the general office of a Gospel minister, to preach and baptize; but only to the appropriation or relation of a minister to themselves; that is, to the being of a pastor of a particular church as such, but not of a minister of Christ as such.

5. A man's soul is of so great value above all the favour of man, or treasures of this world, that no man should be indifferent, to what man's care he doth commit it; nor should he hazard it upon the danger of everlasting misery, for fear of displeasing man, or being accused of schism or disorder.

6. There is as great difference between an able, learned, judicious, orthodox, godly, diligent, lively teacher, and an ignorant, heretical, ungodly, dull, and slothful man, as there is between a skilful and an ignorant pilot at sea; or between an able, experienced, faithful physician, and an ignorant, rash, and treacherous one, as to the saving men's lives. And he that would not take a sot or empiric for his physician, who were like to kill him, and refuse the counsel

1 In the time of the Arian emperors the churches refused the bishops whom the emperors imposed on them, and stuck to their own orthodox bishops; especially at Alexandrias and Cesarea, after the greatest urgency for their obedience.

both will fall into the ditch?” And Paul, “Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; for in so doing, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.”

The second is our second (and first English) historian Beda, and in him the famous Johannes Episc. Hagulstaden-sis Eccles., who, as he reporteth, wrought many very great miracles, as Eccles. Hist. lib. v. cap. 2—5. is to be read. This man had one Herebaldus in his clergy, afterwards an abbot; who himself told Beda as followeth:—‘That this Johannes Ep. cured him miraculously of a perilous hurt, taken by disobedient horsemanship; and when he recovered, he asked him, whether he were sure that he was baptized? who answered, That he knew it past doubt, and named the presbyter that baptized him. The bishop answered, If thou wast baptized by that priest, thou art not rightly baptized: for I know him, and that when he was ordained presbyter, he was so dull of wit, that he could not learn the ministry of catechizing and baptizing. Wherefore I commanded him altogether to give over the presumption of this ministry, which he could not regularly fulfil. And having thus said, he himself took care to catechize me the same hour: and—being cured—‘vitali etiam unda perfusus sum,’ I was baptized.’

I commend not this example of re-baptizing, the rather because it seems the priest was not deposed till after he had baptized Herebaldus; but if he went so far as to rebaptize, and account the baptism a nullity, which was done by an unable, insufficient presbyter, though rightly ordained, judge but as favourably of men that avoid such presbyters in our age.

The third instance shall be that of Cyprian and all the worthy bishops in the councils of Carthage in his time, who re-baptized those baptized by heretics. And consider withal that in those times many were called heretics whom we call but schismatics, that drew disciples after them into separated bodies and parties, speaking perverse things, though not contrary to the very essentials of religion a. I justify not their opinion: but if so many holy bishops counted the
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very baptism of such a nullity, be not too severe and censo-
rious against those that go not also far from an insufficien-
or ungodly, or grossly scandalous man, for the mere preser-
vation of their own souls.

To these I will add the saying of one of the honester
sort of Jesuits, Acoets; and in him of a more ancient than
he: lib. iv. c. 1. p. 354. de reb. Indic. He extolleth the
words of Dionysius Epist. viii. ad Demoph. which are 'Si
igitur quae illuminat sacerdotum est sancta distinctio, pro-
culubio ille à sacerdotali ordine et virtute omnino prolap-
sus est, qui illuminans non est, multoque sane magis qui
neque illuminatus est. Atque mihi quidem videtur audax
nimium hujusmodi est, si sacerdotalia munia sibi assumit;
neque metuit, neque veretur ea quae sunt Divina praeter me-
ritum persequi; putatque ea latere Deum, quorum sibi ipse
consicius sit; et se Deum fallere existimat, quem fals o no-
mine appellat patrem; audetque scelestas blasphemias suas
(neque enim preces dixerim) sacris aries inferre; esseque
super signa illa Divina, ad Christi similitudinem dicere. Non
est iste sacerdos; non est; sed infestus, atrox, dolosus, il-
lusor sui, et lupus in dominicam gregem ovina pelle arma-
tus. His plura aut majora de evangelici ministerii et cul-
mine et præcipitio qui expectat, cuique ad resipiscendum
non ista sufficiunt, infatuatum se juxta Domini sententiam,
et nihil unquam sale saliri posse demonstrat.' I will not
English it, lest those take encouragement by it who are bent
to the other extreme.

7. Yet it will be a great offence, if any censorious, self-
conceited person, shall on this pretence set up his judgment
of men's parts, to the contempt of authority, or to the vi-
lifying of worthy men; and especially if he thereby make
a stir and schism in the church, instead of seeking his own
edification.

8. Yea, if a minister be weaker, yea, and colder and
worse than another, yet if his ministry be competently fitted
to edification, he that cannot leave him and go to a better,
without apparent hurt to the church, and the souls of others,
by division, or exasperating rulers, or breaking family order,
or violating relative duties, must take himself to be at pre-
sent denied the greater helps that others have, and may trust
God in the use of those weaker means, to accept and bless
him; because he is in the station where he hath set him. This case therefore must be resolved by a prudent comparing of the good or hurt which is like to follow, and of the accidents or circumstances whence that must be discerned.

Qest. x. What if the magistrate command the people to receive one pastor, and the bishops or ordainers another, which of them must be obeyed?

1. The magistrate, and not the bishop or people, (unless under him) hath the power and disposal of the circumstancials or accidents of the church; I mean of the temple, the pulpit, the tithes, &c. And he is to determine what ministers are fit either for his own countenance or toleration, and what not. In these therefore he is to be obeyed before the bishops or others.

2. If a pope or prelate of a foreign church, or any that hath no lawful jurisdiction or government over the church that wanteth a pastor, shall command them to receive one, their command is null, and to be contemned.

3. Neither magistrate or bishop, as is said, may deny the church or people any liberty which God in nature, or Christ in the Gospel hath settled on them, as to the reception of their proper pastors.

4. No bishop, but only the magistrates can compel by the sword, the obedience of his commands.

5. If one of them command the reception of a worthy person, and the other of an intolerable one, the former must prevail, because of obedience to Christ, and care of our souls.

6. But if the persons be equal, or both fit, the magistrate is to be obeyed, if he be peremptory in his commands, and decide the case in order to the peace or protection of the church; both because it is a lawful thing, and because else he will permit no other.

7. And the rather because the magistrate's power is more past controversy, than, whether any bishop, pastor, or synod, can any further than by counsel and persuasion, oblige the people to receive a pastor.
Quest. xi. Whether an uninterrupted succession either of right ordination or of conveyance by jurisdiction, be necessary to the being of the ministry, or of a true church?

The Papists have hitherto insisted on the necessity of successive right ordination; but Voetius 'de desperata Causa Papatus' hath in this so handled them, and confuted Jansenius, as hath indeed shewed the desperateness of that cause: and they perceive that the papacy itself cannot be upheld by that way; and therefore Johnson, alias Terret, in his rejoinder against me, now concludeth, that it is not for want of a successive consecration that they condemn the church of England, but for want of true jurisdiction, because other bishops had title to the places whilst they were put in: and that successive consecration (which we take to include ordination) is not necessary to the being of ministry or church. And it is most certain to any man acquainted in church history, that their popes have had a succession of neither. Their way of election hath been frequently changed, sometimes being by the people, sometimes by the clergy, sometimes by the emperors, and lastly by the cardinals alone. Ordination they have sometimes wanted, and a layman been chosen; and oft the ordination hath been by such as had no power according to their own laws. And frequent intercisions have been made, sometimes by many years' vacancy, when they had no church, (and so there was none on earth, if the pope be the constitutive head) for want of a pope; sometimes by long schisms, when of two or three popes, no one could be known to have more right than another, nor did they otherwise carry it, than by power at last; sometimes by the utter incapacity of the possessors, some being laymen, some heretics and infidels, so judged by councils at Rome, Constance, Basil; and Eugenius the fourth continued after he was so censured, and condemned, and deposed by the general council. I have proved all this at large elsewhere.

And he that will not be cheated with a bare sound of words, but will ask them, whether by a succession of jurisdiction, they mean efficient, conveying jurisdiction in the causers of his call, or received jurisdiction in the office re-
ceived, will find that they do but hide their desperate cause in confusion and an insignificant noise. For they maintain that none on earth have an efficient jurisdiction in making popes. For the former pope doth not make his successor; and both electors, ordinaires, and consecrators, yea, and the people receiving, they hold to be subjects of the pope when made, and therefore make him not by jurisdiction giving him the power. Therefore Johnson tells me, that Christ only, and not man, doth give the power, and they must needs hold that men have nothing to do but design the person recipient by election and reception, and to invest him ceremoniously in the possession. So that no efficient jurisdiction is here used at all by man. And for received jurisdiction, 1. No one questioneth but when that office is received which is essentially governing, he that receiveth it receiveth a governing power, or else he did not receive the office. If the question be only, whether the office of a bishop be an office of jurisdiction, or contain essentially a governing power, they make no question of this themselves. So that the noise of successive jurisdiction is vanished into nothing. 2. And with them that deny any jurisdiction to belong to presbyters, this will be nothing as to their case, who have nothing but orders to receive.

They have nothing of sense left them to say but this, 'That though the efficient jurisdiction which maketh popes be only in Christ, because no men are their superiors, yet bishops and presbyters who have superiors, cannot receive their power but by an efficient power of man, which must come down by uninterrupted succession.'

Answ. 1. And so if ever the Papal office have an intercession, (as I have proved it hath had as to lawful popes) the whole Catholic church is nullified; and it is impossible to give it a new being, but by a new pope.

But the best is, that by their doctrine indeed they need not to plead for an uninterrupted succession either of popes, bishops, or presbyters, but that they think it a useful cheat to perplex all that are not their subjects. For if the Papacy were extinct a hundred years, Christ is still alive; and seeing it is no matter 'ad esse' who be the electors or consecrators, so it be but made known conveniently to the people, and men only elect and receive the person, and Christ
only giveth the power (by his stated law) what hindereth after the longest extinction or intercision, but that somebody, or some sort of person may choose a pope again, and so Christ make him pope? And thus the Catholic church may die and live again by a new creation, many times over.

And when the pope hath a resurrection after the longest intercision, so may all the bishops and priests in the world, because a new pope can make new bishops, and new bishops can make new priests. And where then is there any shew of necessity of an interrupted succession of any of them? All that will follow is, that the particular churches die till a resurrection; and so doth the whole church on earth every time the pope dieth, till another be made, if he be the constitutive head.

2. But as they say that Christ only efficiently giveth the power to the pope, so say we to the bishops or pastors of the church. For there is no act of Christ's collation to be proved, but the Scripture law or grant: and if that standing law give power to the pope, when men have but designed the person, the same law will do the same to bishops and pastors; for it establisheth their office in the same sort. Or rather in truth there is no word, that giveth power to any such officer as an universal head or pope, but the law for the pastoral office is uncontrovertible.

And what the Spanish bishops at Trent thought of the Divine right of the bishop's office, I need not mention.

I shall therefore thus truly resolve the question.

1. In all ordinations and elections, man doth but first choose the recipient person. 2. And ceremoniously and ministerially invest him in the possession when God hath given him the power; but the efficient collation or grant of the power is done only by Christ, by the instrumentality of his law or institution. As when the king by a charter saith, 'Whoever the city shall choose, shall be their mayor, and have such and such power, and be invested in it by the recorder or steward': here the person elected receiveth all his power from the king by his charter, (which is a standing efficient, conveying it to the capable chosen person,) and not from the choosers or recorder; only the last is as a servant to deliver possession. So is it in this case.

2. The regular way of entrance appointed by Christ to
make a person capable, is the said election and ordination. And for order sake where that may be had, the unordained are not to be received as pastors.

3. If any get possession, by false, pretended ordination or mission, and be received by the church, I have before told you that he is a pastor as to the church's use and benefit, though not to his own. And so the church is not extinct by every fraudulent usurpation or mistake, and so not by want of a true ordination or mission.

4. If the way of regular ordination fail, God may otherwise (by the church's necessity, and the notorious aptitude of the person) notify his will to the church, what person they shall receive: (as if a layman were cast on the Indian shore and converted thousands, who could have no ordination:) and upon the people's reception or consent, that man will be a true pastor.

And seeing the Papists in the conclusion (as Johnson 'ubi supra') are fain to cast all their cause on the church's reception of the pope, they cannot deny reasonably but 'ad esse' the church's reception may serve also for another officer; and indeed much better than for a pope. For 1. The universal church is so great, that no man can know when the greater part receiveth him, and when not, except in some notorious declarations. 2. And it is now known, that the far greater part of the universal church (the Greeks, Armenians, Abassines, Coptics, Protestants, &c.) do not receive the Roman head. 3. And when one part of Europe received one pope, and another part another pope for above forty years together, who could tell which of the parties was to be accounted the church? It was not then known, and is not known yet to this day; and no Papist can prove it, who affirmeth it.

As a church e.g. Constantinople may be gathered, or 'oriri de novo' where there is none before, so may it be restored where it is extinct. And possibly a layman (as Frumentius and Edesius in the Indies) may be the instrument of mens' conversion. And if so, they may by consent become their pastors, when regular ordination cannot be had.

I have said more of this in my "Disputations of Church-government," Disput. ii. The truth is, this pretence of a necessity of uninterrupted, successive ordination, mission,
or jurisdictional collation 'ad esse,' to the being of ministry or church, is but a cheat of men that have an interest of their own which requireth such a plea, when they may easily know, that it would overthrow themselves.

Quest. xii. Whether there be, or ever was such a thing in the world, as one Catholic church, constituted by any head besides or under Christ?

The greatest and first controversy between us and the Papists, is not what man or politic person, is the head of the whole visible church; but, whether there be any such head at all, either personal, or collective, monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical under Christ, of his appointment or allowance? Or any such thing as a Catholic church so headed or constituted? Which they affirm and we deny. That neither pope nor general council is such a head, I have proved so fully in my "Key for Catholics" and other books, that I will not here stay to make repetition of it. That the pope is no such head, we may take for granted, 1. Because they bring no proof of it, whatever they vainly pretend. 2. Because our divines have copiously disproved it, to whom I refer you. 3. Because the universal church never received such a head, as I have proved against Johnson. 4. And whether it be the pope, their bishop of Calcedon, 'ubi supra,' et Sancta Clara "System. fid." say is not 'de fide.'

That a council is no such head I have largely proved as aforesaid, Part ii. "Key for Catholics." And 1. The use of it being but for concord proveth it. 2. Most Papists confess it. 3. Else there should be seldom any church in the world for want of a head, yea, never any.

For I have proved there and to Johnson, that there never was a true general council of the universal church; but only imperial councils of the churches under one emperor's power, and those that having been under it, had been used to such councils: and that it is not a thing ever to be attempted or expected, as being unlawful and morally impossible.  

* See also in my "Reasons of Christian Religion," Cons. ii. of the interest of the church.
Quest. xiii. Whether there be such a thing as a visible Catholic church? And what it is?

The ancients differently used the terms 'A Catholic church' and 'The Catholic church.' By the first they mean any particular church which was part of the universal; by the second they meant the universal church itself. And this is it that we now mean. And I answer affirmatively, 'There is a visible universal church, not only as a community, or as a kingdom distinct from the king, but as a political society.

2. This church is the universality of baptized visible Christians headed by Jesus Christ himself.

There is this, and there is no other upon earth. The Papists say, that this is no visible church because the head is not visible.

I answer, 1. It is not necessary that he be seen, but visible: and is not Christ a visible person?

2. This church consisteth of two parts, the triumphant part in glory, and the militant part; and Christ is not only visible but seen by the triumphant part. As the king is not seen by the ten thousandth part of his kingdoms, but by his courtiers and those about him, and yet he is king of all.

3. Christ was seen on earth for above thirty years; and the kingdom may be called visible, in that the king was once visible on earth, and is now visible in heaven. As if the king would shew himself to his people but one year together in all his life.

4. It ill becometh the Papists of any men, to say that Christ is not visible, who make him, see him, taste him, handle him, eat him, drink him, digest him in every church, in every mass throughout the year, and throughout the world: and this is not as divided, but as whole Christ.

Object. But this is not 'quatenus' regent.

Assw. If you see him that is regent, and see his laws and Gospel which are his governing instruments, together with his ministers who are his officers, it is enough to denominate his kingdom visible.

5. The church might be fitly denominated visible 'se-
cundum quid,' if Christ himself were invisible; because the
politic body is visible, the dispersed officers, assemblies, and
laws are visible. But sure all these together may well serve
for the denomination.

Quest. xiv. What is it that maketh a visible member of the
universal church? And who are to be accounted such?

1. Baptism maketh a visible member of the universal
church; and the baptized, (as to entrance, unless they go
out again) are to be accounted such.

2. By baptism we mean, open devotion or dedication to
God by the baptismal covenant, in which the adult for them-
selves, and parents for their infants, do profess consent to
the covenant of grace; which includeth a belief of all the
essential articles of the faith, and a resolution for sincere
obedience; and a consent to the relations between God and
us, viz. that he be our reconciled Father, our Saviour, and
our Sanctifier.

3. The continuance of this consent is necessary to the
continuance of our visible membership.

4. He that through ignorance, or incapacity for want of
water, or a minister, is not baptized, and yet is solemnly or
notoriously dedicated and devoted to God the Father, Son,
and Holy Ghost, in the same covenant, though without the
outward sign, and professeth openly the same religion, is a
visible Christian, though not by a complete and regular vi-
sibility; as a soldier not listed nor taking his colours, or a
marriage not regularly solemnized, &c.

5. He that forsaketh his covenant by apostacy, or is to-
tally and duly excommunicated, ceaseth to be a visible mem-
ber of the church.

Quest. xv. Whether besides the profession of Christianity,
either testimony or evidence of conversion or practical godli-
ness be necessary to prove a man a member of the universal
visible church?

1. As the Mediator is the way to the Father, sent to re-
cover us to God, so Christianity includeth godliness;

Matt. xxi. 19. Mark xvi. 16.
and he professeth not Christianity, who professeth not godliness.

2. He that professeth the baptismal covenant, professeth Christianity, and godliness, and true conversion. And therefore cannot be rejected for want of a profession of conversion or godliness.

3. But he that is justly suspected not to understand his own profession, but to speak general words, without the sense, may and ought to be examined by him that is to baptize him; and therefore though the apostles among the Jews who had been bred up among the oracles of God, did justly presume of so much understanding, as that they baptized men the same day that they professed to believe in Christ; but when they baptized converted Gentiles, we have reason to think, that they first received a particular account of their converts, that they understood the three essential articles of the covenant. 1. Because the creed is fitted to that use, and hath been ever used thereunto by the churches, as by tradition from the apostles' practice. 2. Because the church in all ages, as far as church history leadeth us upward, hath used catechising before baptizing; yea, and to keep men as catechumens some time for preparation. 3. Because common experience telleth us, that multitudes can say the creed that understand it not.

If any yet urge the apostles' example, I will grant that it obligeth us when the case is the like: (and I will not fly to any conceit of their heart-searching, or discerning men's sincerity). When you bring us to a people that before were the visible church of God, and were all their lifetime trained up in the knowledge of God, of sin, of duty, of the promised Messiah, according to all the law and prophets, and want nothing, but to know the Son and the Holy Ghost, that this Jesus is the Christ, who will reconcile us to God, and give us the sanctifying Spirit, then we will also baptize men the same day that they profess to believe in Jesus Christ, and in the Father as reconciled by him, and the Holy Ghost as given by him. But if we have those to deal with who know not God, or sin, or misery, or Scripture prophecies, no nor natural verities, we know no proof that the apostles so hastily baptized such.

* John xiv. 6. 1 Tim. iii. 16. vi. 3. 11. 2 Pet. i. 3. Acts ii. 38, 39.
Of this I have largely spoken in my "Treatise of Confirmation."

4. It is not necessary to a man's baptism and first church-membership, that he give any testimony of an antecedent godly life; because it is repentance and future obedience professed that is his title; and we must not keep men from covenanting, till we first see whether they will keep the covenant which they are to make. For covenanting goeth before covenant-keeping; and it is any, the most impious sinner, who repenteth, that is to be washed and justified as soon as he becometh a believer.

5. Yet if any that professeth faith and repentance, should commit whoredom, drunkenness, murder, blasphemy, or any mortal sin, before he is baptized, we have reason to make a stop of that man's baptism, because he contradicteth his own profession, and giveth us cause to take it for hypocritical, till he give us better evidence that he is penitent indeed.

6. Heart-covenanting maketh an invisible church-member, and verbal-covenanting and baptism make a visible church-member. And he that maketh a profession of Christianity, so far as to declare that he believeth all the articles of the creed particularly and understandingly (with some tolerable understanding, though not distinct enough and full) and that he openly devoteth himself to God the Father, Son, and Spirit, in the vow and covenant of baptism, doth produce a sufficient title to the relation of a Christian and church-member; and no minister may reject him, for want of telling when, and by what arguments, means, order, or degrees he was converted.

7. They that forsake these terms of church-entrance, left us by Christ and his apostles, and used by all the churches in the world, and reject those that shew the title of such a profession, for want of something more, and set up other, stricter terms of their own, as necessary to discover men's conversion and sincerity, are guilty of church-tyranny against men, and usurpation against Christ; and of making engines to divide the churches, seeing there will never be agreement on any human devised terms, but some

---

* 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Tit. iii. 3—5. Ephes. ii. 1—3. Acts ii. 37, 38.
will be of one side, and some of another, when they forsake the terms of Christ.

8. Yet if the pastor shall see cause upon suspicion of hypocrisy, 'ad melius esse,' to put divers questions to one man more than to another, and to desire further satisfaction, the catechumens ought in conscience to answer him, and endeavour his satisfaction. For a minister is not tied up to speak only such or such words to the penitent; and he that should say, 'I will answer you no further than to repeat the Creed,' doth give a man reason to suppose him either ignorant or proud, and to suspend the reception of him, though not to deny it. But still 'ad esse' no terms must be imposed as necessary on the church, but what the Holy Ghost by the apostles hath established.

Quest. xvi. What is necessary to a man's reception into membership in a particular church, over and above his aforesaid title? Whether any other trials, or covenant, or what?

1. A particular church is a regular part of the universal, as a city of a kingdom, or a troop of an army.

2. Every man that is a member of the particular church, is a member of the universal; but every one that is a member of the universal church, is not a member of a particular.

3. Every particular church hath its own particular pastor (one or more), and its own particular place or bounds of habitation or residence; therefore he that will be a member of a particular church, 1. Must co-habit, or live in a proximity capable of communion. 2. And must consent to be a member of that particular church, and to be under the guidance of its particular pastor, in their office work. For he cannot be made a member without his own consent and will; nor can he be a member, that subjecteth not himself to the governor or guide.

4. He therefore that will intrude into their communion and privileges without expressing his consent beforehand to be a member, and to submit to the pastoral oversight, is to be taken for an invader.

5. But no other personal qualification is to be exacted from him as necessary, but that he be a member of the church universal. As he is not to be baptized again, so
neither to give again all that account of his faith and repentance particularly which he gave at baptism; much less any higher proofs of his sincerity; but if he continue in the covenant and church-state which he was baptized into, he is capable thereby of reception into any particular church upon particular consent. Nor is there any Scripture proof of any new examinations about their conversion or sincerity, at their removals or entrance into a particular church.

6. But yet because he is not now looked on only as a covenant-maker, as he was at baptism, but also as a covenant-keeper or performer, therefore if any can prove that he is false to his baptismal covenant, by apostacy, heresy, or a wicked life, he is to be refused till he be absolved upon his renewed repentance.

7. He that oft professeth to repent, and by oft revolting into mortal sin, (that is, sin which sheweth a state of death,) doth shew that he was not sincere, must afterward shew his repentance by actual amendment, before he can say, it is his due to be believed.

8. Whether you will call this consent to particular church relation and duty, by the name of a covenant or not, is but ‘lis de nomine;’ it is more than mutual consent that is necessary to be expressed: and mutual consent expressed may be called a covenant.

9. ‘Ad melius esse,’ the more express the consent or covenant is, the better: for in so great matters men should know what they do, and deal above board: especially when experience telleth us, that ignorance and imagery is ready to eat out the heart of religion in almost all the churches in the world. But yet ‘ad esse’ churches must see that they feign or make no more covenants necessary than God hath made; because human, unnecessary inventions have so long distracted and laid waste the churches of Christ.

10. The pastor’s consent must concur with the persons to be received: for it must be mutual consent: and as none can be a member, so none may be a pastor against his will *. And though he be under Christ’s laws what persons to receive, and is not arbitrary to do what he list, yet he is the guide of the church, and the discerner of his own duty. And a pastor may have reasons to refuse to take a man into

his particular charge, without rejecting him as unworthy. Perhaps he may already have more in number than he can well take care of. And other such reasons may fall out.

11. In those countries where the magistrate’s laws and common consent, do take every unqualified person for a member of that church where his habitation is, (called a parish,) and to which he ordinarily resorteth, the pastor that undertaketh that charge, doth thereby seem to consent to be pastor to all such persons in that parish. And there cohabitation and ordinary conjunction with the church, may go for a signification of consent, and instead of more particular contract or covenant, by virtue of the exposition of the said laws and customs. Yet so, that a man is not therefore to be taken for a member of the church, merely because he liveth in the parish; for so atheists, infidels, heretics and papists may do: but because he is, 1. A parishioner, 2. Qualified, 3. Joining with the church, and actually submitting to the ministry.

12. Where there is this much only, it is a sinful slander to say that such a parish is no true church of Christ; however there may be many desirable orders wanting to its better being. Who hath the power of trying and receiving we shall shew anon.

Quest. xvii. Wherein doth the ministerial office essentially consist?

The office of the sacred ministry is a mixed relation, (not a simple). 1. As the minister is related to Christ he is his servant or minister by office: that is, one commissioned by him for that sacred work: where there is, 1. The commission itself, (which is not particular, but general, in a general law, applicable to each singular person when qualified). 2. The determination of the individual person who is to receive it: which consisteth in the call, which I have opened before and therefore repeat not. Only note again, 1. That by virtue of the general commission or institution of the office in specie, the power is conveyed from Christ to the individual person, and that the church (electors or ordainers) are not the donors, authorizers, or obligers, but only instru-

ments of designing an apt recipient, and delivering him possession. 2. That by virtue of this institution, charter, or law commission, it is that the acts of a man seemingly or visibly called, are valid to the church, though really he were not ordained or truly called, but deceived them by hypocritical intrusion*.

2. The causation or efficiency of Christ in the making any one a minister, is, 1. Dispositive, making him a qualified, fit recipient; 2. Then applying the general commission to him, or giving him the function itself*.

1. The dispositive acts of Christ are, 1. Giving him competent knowledge for a minister. 2. Giving him competent goodness; that is, love to God, truth, and souls, and willingness for the work. 3. Giving him competent power and abilities for execution, which is principally in utterance; and so qualifying his intellect, will, and executive powerb.

2. The immediate conveyance or act of collation, is, 1. An obligation laid on the person to do the work. 2. Authority given him to warrant him, and to oblige others: that is, a 'jus docendi, gubernandi,' &c.

3. The form of the relation is denominated, 1. From the reception of these efficiencies in general. 2. From the subordination which hereby they are placed in to Christ, as their relation is denominated 'à termino.'

1. Formally the office consisteth in, 1. An obligation to do the work of the office. 2. Authority to do it, and to oblige others to submit to it.

2. These make up an office which being denominated also from the 'terminus,' is considered, 1. As to the nearest term, which is the work to be done. 2. The remote, which is the object of that work.

The work is 1. Teaching: 2. Ruling: 3. Worshippingc. And so it is essentially 'An obligation and power of ministerial teaching, ruling, and worshipping God.'

2. As to the object it is, 1. The world to be converted.

* Eph. iv. 7, 8. 2 Tim. ii. 1. i. 5. 7. Eph. vi. 19. Col. iv. 3. 2 Cor. i. 4, 5.
* Tit. i. 2. 2 Cor. iii. 6. 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. Tit. i. 7.
* 2 Tim. ii. 2. iii. 2. iv. 11. vi. 2, 3. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.
2. The converted to be baptized, and congregated or ordered into particular societies, (so far as may be). 3. The baptized and congregate to be, (1.) Taught; (2.) Ruled; (3.) Guided in worship.

From all which resulteth an office which is ministerially subordinate to Christ, 1. The prophet or teacher; 2. The Ruler; 3. The Highpriest and Lover of his church: and it may be aptly called both a teaching ministry, a ruling ministry, (not by the sword, but by the Word,) and a priesthood or priestly ministry.

II. As the pastor is related to the church, he is, 1. A constitutive part of particular political churches. 2. He is Christ’s minister for the church and for Christ; that is, to teach, rule, and worship with the church. He is above the church, and greater than it, as to order and power, and not the minister of the church as the efficient of the ministry: but he is less and worse than the church finally and materially; and is finally the church’s minister, as the physician is the patient’s physician; not made a physician by him, but chosen and used as his physician for his cure: so that to speak properly, he is not from them, but for them. He is Christ’s minister for their good; as the shepherd is his master’s servant, for his flock, and so finally only the servant of the sheep.

The whole uncontroversible work of the office is laid down in my small book called “Universal Concord,” to which I must refer you.

Quest. xvi. Whether the people’s choice or consent is necessary to the office of a minister in his first work, as he is to convert infidels, and baptize them? And whether this be a work of office? And what call is necessary to it?

I conjoin these three distinct questions for expedition.

1. That it is part of the minister’s office-work to teach, convert, and baptize men, to bring them out of the world into the church, is undeniable; 1. In Christ’s express commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. “Go disciple me all nations, baptizing them—” 2. In the execution of this commission.

---

5 Rev. i. 6. v. 10. xx. 6. 1 Pet. ii. 6.
6 Rom. i. 1. Col. iv. 12. 2 Pet. xi. 1. 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. iii. 5. 2 Cor. iii. 6. vi. 4. xl. 23. Matt. xxiv. 45, 46, 48. 1 Cor. ix. 19.
2. That this was not peculiar to the apostles or their age is proved. 1. Because not an extraordinary work, like miracles, &c. but the first great business of the Gospel and ministry in the world. 2. Because others as well as the apostles did it in that age, and ever since. 3. Because the promise is annexed to the office thus described "I am with you alway to the end of the world." Or if you translate it "age," it is the age of the church of the Messiah incarnate, which is all one. 4. Because it was a small part of the world comparatively that heard the Gospel in the apostles' days. And the far greatest part of the world is without it at this day, when yet God our Saviour would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. 5. Even where the Gospel hath long continued, for the most part there are many still that are in infidelity. And so great a work is not left without an appointed, suitable means for its performance. And if an office was necessary for it in the first age, it is not credible that it is left to private men's charity ever since. 6. Especially considering that private men are to be supposed insufficient; (1.) Because they are not educated purposely for it, but usually for something else. (2.) Because that they have other callings to take them up. (3.) Because they have no special obligation. And that which is no man's peculiar work, is usually left undone by all.

II. The people's call or consent is not necessary to a minister's reception of his office in general, nor for this part of his work in special: but only to his pastoral relation to themselves.

1. It is so in other functions that are exercised by skill. The patients or people make not a man a physician or lawyer, but only choose what physician shall be their physician, and what lawyer shall be their counsellor.

2. If the people's call or consent be necessary, it is either the infidels or the churches. Not the infidels to whom he is to preach: for 1. He is authorized to preach to them (as the apostles were) before he goeth to them. 2. Their consent is but a natural consequent requisite for the reception and success of their teaching, but not to the authority which is prerequisite. 3. Infidels cannot do so much towards the making of a minister of Christ. 4. Else Christ would have few such ministers. 5. If it be infidels, either all or some? If some, why those rather than others? Or
is a man made a minister by every infidel auditory that heareth him?

2. Nor is it Christian people that must do this much to the making of a general minister; for, 1. They have no such power given for it, in nature or the Word of God. 2. They are generally unqualified and unable for such a work. 3. They are no where obliged to it, nor can fitly leave their callings for it; much less to get the abilities necessary to judge. 4. Which of the people have this power? Is it any of them, or any church of private men? Or some one more than the rest? Neither one nor all can lay any claim to it. There is some reason why this congregation rather than another should choose their own pastors: but there is no reason (nor Scripture) that this congregation choose a minister to convert the world.

III. I conclude therefore that the call of a minister in general doth consist, 1. Dispositively in the due qualifications and enablement of the person. 2. And the necessity of the people, with opportunity, is a providential part of the call. 3. And the ordainers are the orderly electors and determiners of the person that shall receive the power from Christ.

1. For this is part of the power of the keys or church-government. 2. And Paul giveth this direction for exercising of this power to Timothy, which sheweth the ordinary way of calling, 2 Tim. ii. 2. "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." "There were in the church at Antioch certain prophets——As they ministered to the Lord, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them; and when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. And they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed." In this (whether it be to be called an ordination, or rather a mission) there is somewhat ordinary, (that it be by men in office,) and somewhat extraordinary, (that it be by a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost).

And Timothy received his gifts and office by the imposition of the hands of Paul and of the presbytery. 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6. 1 Tim. v. 22. "Lay hands suddenly on no man."
These instances make the case the clearer, 1. Because it is certain, that all that governing power which is given by Christ to the church, under the name of the keys, is given to the pastors. 2. Because there are no other competitors to lay a reasonable claim to it.

Quest. xix. Wherein consisteth the power and nature of ordination? And to whom doth it belong? And is it an act of jurisdiction? And is imposition of hands necessary in it?

I. This is resolved on the by before. 1. Ordination performeth two things: (1.) The designation, election, or determination of the person who shall receive the office. (2.) The ministerial investiture of him in that office: which is a ceremonial delivery of possession; as a servant doth deliver possession of a house, by delivering him the key who hath before received the power or right from the owner.

2. The office delivered by this election and investiture, is the sacred ministerial office in general, to be after exercised according to particular calls and opportunities: as Christ called the apostles, and the Spirit called the ordinary general teachers of those times, such as Barnabas, Silas, Silvanus, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Apollos, &c. And as is before cited, 2 Tim. ii. 2. As a man is made in general a licensed physician, lawyer, &c.

3. This ordination is ‘ordinis gratiâ,’ necessary to order; and therefore so far necessary as order is necessary: which is ordinarily, when the greater interest of the substantial duty, or of the thing ordered, is not against it. As Christ determined the case of sabbath keeping, and not eating the shew-bread. As “the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath;” and the end is to be preferred before the separable means: so ordination was instituted for order, and order for the thing ordered and for the work of the Gospel, and the good of souls, and not the Gospel and men’s souls for that order. Therefore when 1. The death; 2. Distance; 3. Or the malignity of the ordainers depriveth a man of ordination, these three substitutes may notify to him the will of God that he is by him a person called to that office: 1. Fitness for the works; in understanding, willingness, and ability; 2. The necessity of souls; 3. Opportunity.
II. The power of ordaining belongeth not, 1. To magistrates; 2. Or to private men, either single, or as the body of a church; but, 3. To the senior pastors of the church (whether bishops or presbyters of a distinct order, the reader must not expect that I here determine).

For, 1. The power is by Christ given to them, as is before proved; and in Tit. i. 5.

2. None else are ordinarily able to discern aright the abilities of a man for the sacred ministry. The people may discern a profitable, moving preacher, but whether he understand the Scripture, or the substance of religion, or be sound in the faith and not heretical, and delude them not with a form of well-uttered words, they are not ordinarily able to judge.

3. None else are fit to attend this work, but pastors who are separated to the sacred office. It requireth more time to get fitness for it, and then to perform it faithfully, than either magistrates or people can ordinarily bestow.

4. The power is no where given by Christ to magistrates or people.

5. It hath been exercised by pastors or church-officers only, both in and ever since the apostles' days, in all the churches of the world. And we have no reason to think that the church hath been gathered from the beginning till now, by so great an error, as a wrong conveyance of the ministerial power.

III. The word jurisdiction as applied to the church officers, is no Scripture word, and in the common sense soundeth too big, as signifying more power than the servants of all must claim; for there is "one lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy." But in a moderate sense it may be tolerated; as jurisdiction signifieth in particular, 1. Legislation; 2. Or judicial process or sentence; 3. Or the execution of such a sentence, strictly taken, so ordination is no part of jurisdiction. But as jurisdiction signifieth the same with the power of government, 'jus regendi' in general, so ordination is an act of jurisdiction: as the placing or choosing of inferior officers may belong to the steward of a family, or as the calling or authorizing of physicians belongeth to the college of physicians, and the authorizing of lawyers to

Acts xiii. 2. Rom. i. 1. 1 Tim. iv. 15.
the judges' society, or the authorizing of doctors in philosophy, to the society of philosophers or to particular rulers. Where note that in the three last instances, the learning or fitness of the said persons or societies, is but their 'dispositio vel aptitudo ad potestatem exercendam;' but the actual power of conveying authority to others, or designing the recipient person, is received from the supreme power of the land, and so is properly an act of authority, here called jurisdiction.

So that the common distinguishing of ordination from jurisdiction or government, as if they were 'totâ specie' different, is unsound.

IV. Imposition of hands was a sign (like the kiss of peace, and the anointing of persons, and like our kneeling in prayer, &c.) which having first somewhat in their nature, to invite men to the use, was become a common, significant sign of a superior's benediction of an inferior, in those times and countries. And so was here applied ordinarily for its antecedent significance and aptitude to this use; and was not purposely instituted, nor had its significance newly given it by institution; and so was not like a sacrament necessarily and perpetually affixed to ordination.

Therefore we must conclude, 1. That imposition of hands in ordination is a decent, apt, significant sign, not to be scrupled by any, nor to be omitted without necessity, as being of Scripture, ancient, and common use.

2. But yet that it is not essential to ordination; which may be valid by any fit designation and separation of the person. And therefore if it be omitted, it nullifieth not the action. And if the ordainers did it by letters to a man a thousand miles off, it would be valid: and some persons of old were ordained when they were absent.

V. I add as to the need of ordination, 1. That without this key, the office and church doors would be cast open, and every heretic or self-conceited person intrude.

2. It is a sign of a proud, unworthy person, that will judge himself fit for so great a work, and intrude upon such a conceit, when he may have the judgment of the pastors, and avoideth it.

3. Those that so do, should no more be taken for minis-
Quest. xx. Is ordination necessary to make a man a pastor of a particular church as such? And is he to be made a general minister and a particular church-elder or pastor at once, and by one ordination?

I have proved that a man may be made a minister in general, yea, and sent to exercise it in converting infidels, and baptizing them, before ever he is the pastor of any particular church. To which I add, that in this general ministry, he is a pastor in the universal church, as a licensed physician that hath no hospital or charge, is a physician in the kingdom.

And, 1. As baptism is as such our entrance into the universal church, and not into a particular; so is ordination to a minister an entrance only on the ministry as such.

2. Yet a man may at once be made a minister in general, and the pastor of this or that church in particular: and in kingdoms wholly inchurched and Christian, it is usually fittest so to do: lest many being ordained 'sine titulo,' idleness and poverty of supernumeraries, should corrupt and dishonour the ministry: which was the cause of the old canons in this case.

3. But when a man is thus called to both at once, it is not all done by ordination as such; but his complicate relation, proceedeth from a complication of causes. As he is a minister, it is by ordination. And as he is the pastor of this people, it is by the conjunct causes of appropriation: which are, 1. Necessarily the people's consent. 2. Regularly, the pastor's approbation and recommendation, and reception of the person into their communion. 3. And sometimes the magistrate may do much to oblige the people to consent.

4. But when a man is made a minister in general before, he needeth no proper ordination to fix him in a particular charge; but only an approbation, recommendation, particular investiture, and reception. For else a man must be oft ordained, even as oft as he moveth. But yet imposition
of hands may fitly be used in this particular investiture, though it be no proper ordination, that is, no collation of the office of a minister in general, but the fixing of one that was a minister before.

Quest. xxi. May a man be oft or twice ordained?

It is supposed, that we play not with an ambiguous word, that we remember what ordination is. And then you will see cause to distinguish, 1. Between entire, true ordination, and the external act, or words, or ceremony only. 2. Between one that was truly ordained before, and one that was not. And so I answer,

1. He that seemed ordained, and indeed was not, is not re-ordained when he is after ordained.

2. It is needful therefore to know the essentials of ordination, from the integrals and accidentals.

3. He that was truly ordained before, may in some cases receive again the repetition of the bare words and outward ceremonies of ordination (as imposition of hands). Where I will, I. Tell you in what cases. II. Why.

I. 1. In case there wanted sufficient witnesses of his ordination; and so the church hath not sufficient means of notice or satisfaction, that ever he was ordained indeed: or if the witnesses die before the notification. Whether the church should take his word or not, in such a case, is none of my question, but, Whether he should submit to the repetition if they will not.

2. Especially in a time and place (which I have known) when written and sealed orders are often counterfeited, and so the church called to extraordinary care.

3. Or if the church or magistrate be guilty of some causeless, culpable incredulity, and will not believe it was done till they see it done again.

4. Or in case that some real or supposed integral (though not essential) part was omitted, or is by the church or magistrate supposed to be omitted; and they will not permit or receive the minister to exercise his office, unless he repeat the whole action again, and make up that defect.

5. Or if the person himself do think that his ordination was insufficient, and cannot exercise his ministry to the
satisfaction of his own conscience, till the defect be repaired.

In these cases (and perhaps such others) the outward action may be repeated.

II. The reasons are, 1. Because this is not a being twice ordained. For the word 'ordination,' signifieth a moral action, and not a physical only: as the word 'marriage' doth, &c. And it essentially includeth the new dedication and designation to the sacred office, by a kind of covenant between the dedicated person and Christ to whom he is consecrated and devoted. And the external words are but a part, and a part only as significant of the action of the mind. Now the oft expressing of the same mental dedication doth not make it to be as many distinct dedications. For 1. If the liturgy or the person's words were tautological, or at the ordination should say the same thing often over and over, or for confirmation should say often, that which else might be said but once, this doth not make it an often or multiplied ordination: it was but one love which Peter expressed, when Christ made him say thrice, that he loved him; nor was it a threefold ordination which Christ used, when he said thrice to him, "Feed my lambs and sheep."

2. And if thrice saying it that hour make it not three ordinations, neither will thrice saying it, at more hours, days, or months, or years distance, in some cases; for the time maketh not the ordinations to be many; it is but one moral action. But the common error ariseth from the custom of calling the outward action alone by the name of the whole moral action (which is ordinarily done to the like deceit in the case of the baptismal covenant, and the Lord's supper).

3. The common judgment and custom of the world confirmeth what I say. If persons that are married should for want of witness or due solemnity be forced to say and do the outward action all over again; it is by no wise man taken in the proper, moral, full sense, for a second marriage, but for one marriage twice uttered.

And if you should in witness bearing be put to your oath, and the magistrate that was absent should say, 'Reach him the book again, I did not hear him swear,' the doing it
twice is not morally two witnessings or oaths, but one only twice physically uttered.

If you bind your son apprentice, or if you make any indentures or contract, and the writings being lost or faulty, you write and sign, and seal them all again, this is not morally another contract, but the same done better, or again recorded. And so it is plainly in this case.

4. But re-ordination morally and properly so called, is unlawful: for, (1.) It is (or implieth) a lie, viz. that we were not truly dedicated and separated to this office before.

(2.) It is a sacrilegious renunciation of our former dedication to God: whereas the ministerial dedication and covenant is for life, and not for a trial; which is the meaning of the indelible character, which is a perpetual relation and obligation.

(3.) It is a taking the name of God in vain, thus to do and undo, and do again: and to promise and renounce, and promise again, and to pretend to receive a power which we had before.

(4.) It tendeth to great confusions in the church; as to make the people doubt of their baptism, or all the ministerial administrations of such as are re-ordained, while they acted by the first ordination.

(5.) It hath ever been condemned in the churches of Christ, as the canons called the apostles; and the church's constant practice, testify.

5. Though the bare repetition of the outward action and words be not re-ordination, yet he that on any of the forementioned occasions is put to repeat the said words and actions, is obliged so to do it, as that it may not seem to be a re-ordination, and so be a scandal to the church. Or if it outwardly seem so by the action, he is bound to declare that it is no such thing, for the counterpoising that appearance of evil.

6. When the ordainers or the common estimation of the church, do take the repetition of the words and action of a re-ordination, though the receiver so intend it not, yet it may become unlawful to him by this accident, because he scandalizeth and hardeneth the erroneous, by doing or receiving that which is interpretative re-ordination.

7. Especially when the ordinaries shall require this re-
petition on notoriously wicked grounds, and so put that sense on the action by their own doctrines and demands: as for instance,

(1.) If heretics should (as the Arians,) say that we are no ministers, because we are not of their heresy, or ordained by such as they.

(2.) If the pope or any proud papal usurpers shall say, 'You are no ministers of Christ, except we ordain you;' and so do it to establish a traitorous, usurped regiment in the church; it is not lawful to serve such an usurpation. As if cardinals or archbishops should say, 'None are true ministers but those that we ordain:' or councils or synods of bishops or presbyters should say, 'None are true ministers but those that we ordain:' or if one presbyter or one bishop without authority would thus make himself master of the rest, or of other churches, and say, 'You are no ministers unless I ordain you;' we may not promote such tyranny and usurpation.

(3.) If magistrates would usurp the power of the keys, in ecclesiastical ordination, and say that none but they have power to ordain, we may not encourage such pretences by repetition of the words and action.

(4.) If they would make something necessary to ordination which is not, as if it were a false oath, or false subscription or profession, or some unlawful ceremony (as if it were anointing, wearing horns, or any the like) and say, 'You are no ministers without these, and therefore you must be re-ordained to receive them.

(5.) Yea, if they declare our former ministry causelessly to be null, and say, 'You are no ministers till you are ordained again,' and so publicly put this sense upon our action, that we may take it as re-ordination; all these accidents make the repetition of the words and actions to be unlawful, unless when greater accidents notoriously preponderate.

Quest. But if such church tyrants should have so great power, as that without their repetition of ordination on those terms, the ministry might not be exercised, is it lawful so to take it in a case of such necessity?

Answ. 1. Every seeming necessity to you is not a necessity to the church. 2. Either you may publicly declare a contrary sense in your receiving their new orders or not.
1. If you may not as publicly declare that you renounce not your former ministry and dedication to God in that office, as the ordainers declare their sense of the nullity of it, so that your open declaration may free you from the guilt of seeming consent, I conceive it is a sinful compliance with their sin. 2. Yea, if you may so declare it, yet if there be no necessity of your ministerial liberty in that place, I think you may not take it on such terms. As, (1.) If there be worthy men enough to supply the church’s wants there without you. (2.) And if you may serve God successfully in a persecuted state, though to the suffering of your flesh. (3.) Or if your imprisonment for preaching be like to be as serviceable to the church and Gospel as your continued preaching on those scandalous terms. (4.) Or if you may remove and preach in another country.

9. When any such case doth fall out, in which the repetition of the outward action and words is lawful, it is not lawful to mix any false or scandalous expressions: as if we were required to say falsely, ‘I accept this ordination as confessing myself no minister of Christ till now:’ or any such like.

10. In a word, a peaceable Christian may do much as to the mere outward action and submission, for obedience, peace, order, or satisfaction to his own or other men’s consciences. But, (1.) He may do nothing for good ends which is false and injurious to the church. (2.) And he may not do that which otherwise were lawful, when it is for evil ends, or tendeth to more hurt than good; as to promote hereby, or church tyranny and usurpation, whether in pope, prelates, presbyters or people.

Quest. xxii. How many ordainers are necessary to the validity of ordination by God’s institution? whether one or more?

My question is not of the ancient canons, or any human laws or customs, for those are easily known; but of Divine right. Now either God hath determined the case as to the number of ordainers necessary, or not. If not, either he hath given the church some general rule to determine it by, or not. If not, then the number is not any part of the Divine
order or law, and then, if we suppose that he hath determined the case as to the ordaining office and not to the number, then it will follow that one may serve. The truth I think may be thus explained.

1. There is 'Ordo officialis primarius,' and 'Ordo ordinis, vel exercitii, vel secundarius;' an order of office primary, and an order of exercise secondary, in the church. As to the first, the order of office, God hath determined that the ordaining officers and no others, shall ordain officers, or give orders. And having not determined whether one or more, it followeth that the ordination of one sole lawful ordainer is no nullity on that account because it is but one, unless somewhat else nullify it.

2. God hath given general rules to the ordainers for the due exercise of their office, though he have not determined of any set number. Such as are these: that all things be done in judgment, truth, love, concord, to the church's edification, unity and peace, &c.

3. According to these general laws, sometimes the ordination of one sole ordainer, may not only be valid but regular: as when there are no other to concur, or none whose concurrence is needful to any of the aforesaid ends. And sometimes the concurrence of many is needful, (1.) To the receiver's satisfaction. (2.) To the church's or people's satisfaction. (3.) To the concord of pastors, and of neighbour churches, &c. And in such cases such consent or concourse is the regular way.

4. Where there are many neighbour pastors and churches so near, as that he that is ordained in one of them, is like oft to pass and preach, and officiate 'obiter' in others, and so other churches must have some communion with him, it is meetest that there be a concurrence in the ordination.

5. The ordainer is certainly a superior to the person that cometh to be ordained while he is a private man; and therefore so far his ordination is (as is said) an act of jurisdiction in the large sense, that is, of government: but whether he be necessarily his superior after he is ordained, hath too long been a controversy. It is certain that the Papists confess, that the pope is ordained such by no superior: and it is not necessary that a bishop be ordained by one or more of any superior order (or jurisdiction either). And though
the Italian Papists hold that a superior papal jurisdiction must needs be the secondary fountain of the ordaining power, though the ordainer himself be but of the same order; yet Protestants hold no such thing. And all acknowledge that as imposition of hands on a layman to make him a minister of Christ or an officer, is a kind of official generation, so the ordained as a junior in office, is as it were a son to the ordainer, as the convert is said to be peculiarly to his converter; and that a proportionable honour is still to be given him. But whether he that ordaineth a presbyter, and not he that ordaineth or consecrateth a bishop, must needs be of a superior order or office, is a question which the reader must not expect me here to meddle with.

Quest. xxiii. What if one bishop ordain a minister, and three, or many, or all the rest protest against it, and declare him no minister, or degrade him; is he to be received as a true minister or not?

Supposing that the person want no necessary personal qualification for the office, there are two things more in question; 1. His office, whether he be a minister. 2. His regularity, whether he came regularly to it; and also his comparative relation, whether this man or another is to be preferred. I answer therefore,

1. If the person be utterly incapable, the one bishop, or the many whosoever taketh him for incapable, is for the truth sake to be believed and obeyed.

2. If the man be excellently qualified, and his ministry greatly necessary to the church, whoever would deprive the church of him be it the one or the many, is to be disobeyed, and the ordainers preferred.

Object. But who shall judge? Answ. The 'esse' is before the 'scire:' the thing is first true or false before I judge it to be so; and therefore whoever judgeth falsely in a case so notorious and weighty, as that the welfare of the church and souls is ('consideratibus considerandis') injured and hazarded by his error, is not to be believed nor obeyed on pretence of order: because all Christians have 'judicium discretionis,' 'a discerning judgment.'

\* Eiusdem speciei vel inferiores: How then is the pope ordained or made?
3. But if the case be not thus to be determined by the person's notorious qualifications, then either it is, 1. The man ordained. 2. Or the people that the case is debated by, whether they should take him for a minister. 3. Or the neighbour ministers.

1. The person himself is 'cæteris paribus' more to regard the judgment of many concordant bishops, than of one singular bishop; and therefore is not to take orders from a singular bishop, when the generality of the wise and faithful are against it; unless he be sure that it is some notorious faction or error that perverteth them, and that there be notorious necessity of his labour.

2. The auditors are either infidels to be converted, (and these will take no man upon any of their authorities,) or else Christians converted. These are either of the particular charge of the singular bishop who ordaineth, or not; if they be, then 'pro tempore' for orders sake, they owe him a peculiar obedience, till some further process or discovery disoblige them, (though the most be on the other side). But yet they may be still bound in reason most to suspect the judgment of their singular bishop, while for order's sake they submit to it. But if they are not of his flock, then, I suppose the judgment and act of many is to prevail so much against the act of a single and singular person, as that both neighbour ministers and people are to disown such an ordained person as unfit for their communion under the notion of a minister, (because communion of churches is maintained by the concord of pastors). But whether the ordained man's ministry, be by their contradictory declaration or degradation, made an absolute nullity, to himself and those that submit to him, neither I will determine, nor should any other strangers to the particular case; for if he be rejected or degraded without such cause and proof as may satisfy other sober persons, he hath wrong; but if he be so degraded, on proved sufficient cause, to them that it is known to, it giveth the degraders the advantage 1.

And as 1. All particular members are to be obedient to their proper pastor.

2. And all particular churches are to hold correspon-

1 Ephes. iv. 3. 1 Cor. xii. Rom. iv. 17, 19. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. Phil. ii. 1—8. Ephes. iv. 15, 16. 1 Cor. i. 10.
dency and communion according to their capacity. So must men act in this and such like cases respectively according to the laws of obedience to their pastor, and of con-
cord of the churches.

Quest. xxiv. Hath one bishop power by Divine right to or-
dain, degrade, or govern, or excommunicate, or absolve, in
another's diocese or church, either by his consent, or against
it? And doth a minister that officiateth in another's church,
act as a pastor, and their pastor, or as a private man? And
doeth the ministerial office cease when a man removeth from
his flock?

I thrust these questions all together for their affinity, and
for brevity.

1. Every true minister of Christ, bishop or pastor, is re-
lated to the universal church by stronger obligations than
to his particular charge; as the whole is better than the
parts, and its welfare to be preferred.

2. He that is no pastor of a particular church, may be a
pastor in the universal, obliged as a consecrated person to
deavour its good, by the works of his office, as he hath
particular opportunity and call.

3. Yet he that hath a particular charge is especially and
more nearly related and obliged to that charge or church,
than to any other part of the universal (though not than to
the whole); and consequently hath a peculiar authority,
where he hath a peculiar obligation and work.

4. He that is (without degrading) removed from a par-
ticular church doth not cease to be a general minister and
pastor related to the universal church; as a physician put
out of a hospital charge, is a physician still. And therefore
he needeth no new ordination, but only a special designa-
tion to his next particular charge.

5. No man is the bishop of a diocese as to the measure
of ground, or the place, by Divine right, that is, by any par-
ticular law or determination of God; but only a bishop of
the church or people: for your office essentially containeth
a relation to the people, but accidentally only to the place.

6. Yet natural convenience, and God’s general laws of
order and edification do make it usually (but not always)
best, and therefore a duty, to distinguish churches by the people's habitation: not taking a man for a member 'eo nomine,' because he liveth on that ground; but for order's sake taking none for members that live not on that ground, and not intruding causelessly into each other's bounds.

7. He that by the call or consent of a neighbour pastor and people doth officiate (by preaching, sacraments, excommunication, or absolution) in another's special charge for a day, or week, or month, or more, without a fixed relation to that flock, doth neither officiate as a layman, nor yet unlawfully or irregularly; but, 1. As a minister of Christ in the church universal. 2. And as the pastor of that church for the present time only, though not stately; even as a physician called to help another in his hospital, or to supply his place for the time, doth perform his work, 1. As a licensed physician. 2. And as the physician of that patient or hospital for that time, though not stately.

8. No man is to intrude into another's charge without a call; much less to claim a particular stated oversight and authority. For though he be not an usurper as to the office in general, he is an usurper as to that particular flock. It is no error in ordination to say, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and administer the holy sacraments when thou shalt be thereto lawfully called;' that is, when thou hast a particular call to the exercise, and to a fixed charge, as thou hast now a call to the office in general.

9. Yet every bishop or pastor by his relation to the church universal, and to mankind, and the interest of Christ, is bound not only as a Christian, but as a pastor, to do his best for the common good; and not to cast wholly out of his care, a particular church, because another hath the oversight of it. Therefore if an heretic get in, or the church fall to heresy, or any pernicious error or sin, the neighbour pastors are bound both by the law of nature and their office, to interpose their counsel as ministers of Christ, and to prefer the substance before pretended order, and to seek to recover the people's souls, though it be against their proper pastor's will. And in such a case of necessity, they may ordain, degrade, excommunicate, and absolve in another's charge, as if it were a vacuity.

10. Moreover it is one thing to excommunicate a man
out of a particular church, and another thing for many associated churches or neighbours to renounce communion with him. The special pastors of particular churches, having the government of those churches, are the special governing judges, who shall or shall not have communion as a member in their churches; but the neighbour pastors of other churches have the power of judging with whom they and their own flocks will or will not hold communion. As e. g. Athanasius may as governor of his flock declare any Arian member excommunicate, and require his flock to have no communion with him. And all the neighbour pastors (though they excommunicate not the same man as his special governors, yet) may declare to all their flocks, that if that man come among them, they will have no communion with him, and that at distance they renounce that distant communion which is proper to Christians one with another, and take him for none of the church of Christ.

Quest. xxv. Whether canons be laws? And pastors have a legislative power?

All men are not agreed what a law is, that is, what is to be taken for the proper sense of that word. Some will have the name confined to such common laws as are stated, durable rules for the subject's actions: and some will extend it also to personal, temporary, verbal precepts and mandates, such as parents and masters use daily to the children and servants of their families. And of the first sort, some will confine the name 'laws' to those acts of sovereignty which are about the common matters of the kingdom, or which no inferior officer may make: and others will extend it to those orders which by the sovereign's charter, a corporation, or college, or school may make for the subregulation of their particular societies and affairs.

I have declared my own opinion 'de nomine' fully elsewhere. 1. That the definition of a law in the proper general sense, is to be a sign or signification of the reason and will of the rector as such, to his subjects as such, instituting or antecedently determining what shall be due from them, and to them; 'Jus efficiendo,' 'regularly making right.'

1 Cor. v. Tit. iii. 10. 2 Thess. iii. 14. 2 John 10. Rev. ii. 14, 15. 20.
2. That these laws are many more ways diversified and distinguished (from the efficient, sign, subjects, matter, end, &c.) than is meet for us here to enumerate. It is sufficient now to say, 1. That stated regulating laws, as distinct from temporary mandates and proclamations. 2. And laws for kingdoms and other commonwealths, in regard of laws for persons, schools, families, &c. 3. And laws made by the supreme power, as distinct from those made by the derived authority of colleges, corporations, &c. called bye-laws or orders, (for I will here say nothing of parents and pastors, whose authority is directly or immediately from the efficiency of nature in one, and Divine institution in the other, and not derived efficiently from the magistrate or any man). 4. That laws about great, substantial matters, distinct from those about little and mutable circumstances, &c. I say the first sort as distinct from the second, are laws so called by excellency above other laws. But that the rest are unequivocally to be called laws, according to the best definition of the law ‘in genere.’ But if any man will speak otherwise, let him remember that it is yet but ‘lis de nomine,’ and that he may use his liberty, and I will use mine. Now to the question.

1. Canons made by virtue of the pastoral office and God’s general laws (in nature or Scripture for regulating it, are a sort of laws to the subjects or flocks of those pastors.

2. Canons made by the votes of the laity of the church, or private part of that society as private, are no laws at all, but agreements; because they are not acts of any governing power.

3. Canons made by civil rulers about the circumstantialia of the church, belonging to their office, as orderers of such things, are laws, and may be urged by moderate and meet civil or corporal penalties, and no otherwise.

4. Canons made by princes or inferior magistrates, are no laws purely and formally ecclesiastical, which are essentially acts of pastoral power; but only materially ecclesiastical, and formally magistralical.

5. No church officers as such, (much less the people) can make laws with a co-active or coercive sanction; that is, to be enforced by their authority with the sword or any
corporal penalty, mulct, or force; this being the sole privilege of secular powers, civil, or economical, or scholastic.

6. There is no obligation ariseth to the subject for particular obedience of any law, which is evidently against the laws of God (in nature or holy Scripture).

7. They are no laws which pastors make to people out of their power: as the popes, &c.

8. There is no power on earth under Christ, that hath authority to make universal laws; to bind the whole church on all the earth; or all mankind. Because there is no universal sovereign, civil or spiritual, personal or collective.

9. Therefore it is no schism, but loyalty to Christ, to renounce or separate from such a society of usurpation; nor any disobedience or rebellion, to deny them obedience.

10. Pastors may and must be obeyed in things lawful as magistrates, if the king make them magistrates: though I think it unmeet for them to accept a magistracy with the sword, except in case of some rare necessity.

11. If pope, patriarchs, or pastors shall usurp any of the king's authority, loyalty to Christ and him, and the love of the church and state, oblige us to take part with Christ and the king against such usurpation, but only by lawful means, in the compass of our proper place and calling.

12. The canons made by the councils of many churches, have a double nature; as they are made for the people and the subjects of the pastors, they are a sort of laws: that is, they oblige by the derived authority of the pastors; because the pastors of several churches do not lose any of their power by their assembling, but exercise it with the greater advantage of concord. But as they are made only to oblige the present or absent pastors who separately are of equal office-power, so they are no laws, except in an equivocal sense, but only agreements or contracts. So Bishop Usher professed his judgment to be: and before him the council of Carthage in Cyprian's time; but it needs no proof, any more than that a convention of kings may make no laws to bind the kings of England, but contracts only.

*Grotius de Imperio summ. pot. circ. sacr. most solidly resolveth this question.*
13. But yet we are 'aliunde' obliged even by God, to keep these agreements in things lawful, for the church's peace and concord, when greater contrary reasons, 'à fine,' do not disoblige us. For when God saith, 'You shall keep peace and concord, and keep lawful covenants,' the canons afford us the minor, 'But these are lawful contracts or agreements, and means of the church's peace and concord,' 'Therefore, (saith God's law) you shall observe them.' So though the contracts (as of husband and wife, buyer and seller, &c.) be not laws, yet that is a law of God which bindeth us to keep them.

14. Seeing that even the obliging commands of pastors may not by them be enforced by the sword, but work by the power of Divine authority or commission manifested, and by holy reason and love, therefore it is most modest and fit for pastors (who must not lord it over God's heritage, but be examples to all) to take the lower name of authoritative directions and persuasions, rather than of laws: especially in a time when Papal usurpation maketh such ruining use of that name, and civil magistrates use to take it in the nobler and narrower sense.

The Questions, 1. 'If one pastor make orders for his church, and the multitudes or synods be against them; which must be obeyed,' you may gather from what is said before of ordination. And 2. 'What are the particulars proper, materially, to the magistrate's decision, and what to the pastor's?' I here pass by.

Quest. xxvi. Whether church canons, or pastor's directive determinations of matters pertinent to their office, do bind the conscience? And what accidents will disoblige the people; you may gather before in the same case about magistrate's laws, in the political directions: as also by an impartial transferring the case to the precepts of parents and schoolmasters to children; without respect to their power of the rod, (or supposing that they had none such).

Quest. xxvii. What are Christ's appointed means of the unity and concord of the universal church, and consequently  
1 Pet. v. 2, 3. 2 Cor. i. 24.
of its preservation, if there be no human universal head and
governor of it upon earth? And if Christ have instituted
none such, whether prudence and the law of nature oblige not
the church to set up and maintain an universal ecclesiastical
monarchy or aristocracy? Seeing that which is every man's
work, is as no man's, and omitted by all?

I. To the first question I must refer you in part to two
small, popular, yet satisfactory Tractates *, written long ago,
that I do not one thing too oft. Briefly now.

1. The unity of the universal church, is founded in, and
maintained by their common relation to Christ the head, (as
the kingdom in relation to the king).

2. A concord in degrees of goodness, and in integrals
and accidentals of Christianity, will never be obtained on
earth, where the church is still imperfect: and perfect holi-
ness and wisdom, are necessary to perfect harmony and
concord.

3. Experience hath long taught the church, if it will
learn, that the claim of a Papal headship and government
over the church universal, hath been the famous incendiary
and hinderer of concord in the Christian world.

4. The means to attain such a measure of concord and
harmony which is to be hoped for, or endeavoured upon
earth, I have so distinctly, fully, and yet briefly described
(with the contrary impediments) in my Treatise of the
470, 471. in about two leaves, that I will not recite them.
If you say, you are not bound to read the books which I re-
fer you to; I answer, 'Nor this.'

II. To the latter Question I answer, 1. To set up such
an universal head on the supposition of natural reasons and
human policy is, (1.) To cross Christ's institution, and the
laws of the Holy Ghost, as hath been long proved by Pro-
testants from the Scripture.

(2.) It is treason against Christ's sovereign office to
usurp such a vicegerency without his commission.

(3.) It is against the notorious light of nature, which

* "Catholic Unity," and "The True Catholic and Church described."
telleth us of the natural incapacity of mortal man, to be such an universal governor through the world.

(4.) It is to sin against long, and dreadful common experience, and to keep in that fire that hath destroyed emperors, kings, and kingdoms, and set the church’s pastors and Christian world in those divisions, which are the great and serviceable work of satan, and the impediment of the church’s increase, purity, and peace, and the notorious shame of the Christian profession in the eyes of the infidel world.

And if so many hundred years sad experience, will not answer them that say, ‘If the pope were a good man, he might unite us all;’ I conclude that such deserve to be deceived.

Quest. x xviii. Who is the judge of controversies in the church?

1. About the exposition of the Scripture, and doctrinal points in themselves. 2. About either heresies, or wicked practices, as they are charged on the persons who are accused of them; that is, 1. Antecedently to our practice, by way of regulation. 2. Or consequentially, by judicial sentence (and execution) on offenders.

I have answered this question so oft, that I can persuade myself to no more than this short, yet clear solution.

The Papists used to cheat poor, unlearned persons that cannot justly discern things that differ, by puzzling them with this confused, ambiguous question. Some things they cunningly and falsely take for granted, As that there is such a thing on earth, as a political, universal church, headed by any mortal governor. Some things they shuffle together in equivocal words. They confound, 1. Public judgment of decision, and private judgment of discerning. 2. The magistrate’s judgment of church-controversies, and the pastor’s, and the several cases, and ends, and effects of their several judgments. 3. Church-judgment as directive to a particular church, and as a means of the concord of several churches. Which being but distinguished, a few words will serve to clear the difficulty.

1. As there is no universal human church (constituted

4 2 Thess. ii. 10—12.
or governed by a mortal head) so there is no power set up by Christ to be an universal judge of either sort of controversies, by decisive judicial sentence; nor any universal civil monarch of the world.

2. The public, governing, decisive judgment, obliging others, belongeth to public persons, or officers of God, and not to any private man.

3. The public decision of doubts or controversies about faith itself, or the true sense of God's Word and laws, as obliging the whole church on earth to believe that decision, or not gainsay it, because of the infallibility or governing authority of the deciders, belongeth to no one but Jesus Christ; because as is said, he hath made no universal governor, nor infallible expositor. It belongeth to the law-giver only to make such an universally obliging exposition of his own laws.

4. True bishops or pastors in their own particular churches are authorised teachers and guides, in expounding the laws and Word of Christ; and the people are bound as learners to reverence their teaching, and not contradict it without true cause; yea, and to believe them 'fide humanâ,' in things pertinent to their office: for 'oportet discendent credere.'

5. No such pastors are to be absolutely believed, nor in any case of notorious error or heresy, where the Word of God is discerned to be against them.

6. For all the people as reasonable creatures, have a judgment of private discerning to judge what they must receive as truth, and to discern their own duty, by the help of the Word of God, and of their teachers.

7. The same power of governing-judgment lawful synods have over their several flocks, as a pastor over his own, but with greater advantage.

8. The power of judging in many consociate churches, who is to be taken into communion as orthodox, and who to be refused by those churches as heretics, 'in specie,' that is, what doctrine they will judge sound or unsound, as it is 'judicium discernendi;' belongeth to every one of the council singly: as it is a judgment obliging themselves by contract, (and not of governing each other) it is in the con-

* See my 'Key for Catholics.'*
tracters and consenters: and for peace and order usually in the major vote; but with the limitations before expressed.

9. Every true Christian believeth all the essentials of Christianity, with a divine faith, and not by a mere human belief of his teachers, though by their help and teaching his faith is generated, and confirmed, and preserved. Therefore no essential article of Christianity is left to any obliging decision of any church, but only to a subservient obliging teaching: as whether there be a God, a Christ, a heaven, a hell, an immortality of souls; whether God be to be believed, loved, feared, obeyed before man? Whether the Scripture be God's Word, and true? Whether those that contradict it are to be believed therein? Whether pastors, assemblies, public worship, baptism, sacrament of the Lord's supper, be Divine institutions? And the same I may say of any known Word of God: no mortals may judge 'in partem utramlibet,' but the pastors are only authorized teachers and helpers of the people's faith. (And so they be partly to one another.)

10. If the pope or his council, were the infallible, or the governing expositors of all God's laws and Scriptures, 1. God would have enabled them to do it by an universal commentary which all men should be obliged to believe, or at least not to contradict. For there is no authority and obligation given to men (yea, to so many successively) to do that (for the needful decision of controversies) which they never have ability given them to do. For that were to oblige them to things impossible. 2. And the pope and his council would be the most treacherous miscreants on earth, that in so many hundred years, would never write such an infallible, nor governing commentary, to end the differences of the Christian world. Indeed they have judged (with others) against Arius, that Christ is true God, and one with the Father in substance, &c. But if they had said the contrary, must we have taken it for God's truth, or have believed them?

11. To judge, who for heresy or scandal, shall be punished by the sword, belongeth to none but the magistrate in his own dominions: as to judge who shall have communion or be excommunicated from the church, belongeth, as afore-
said, to the pastors. And the said magistrate hath first as a man his own judgment of discerning what is heresy, and who of his subjects are guilty of it, in order to his public governing judgment.

12. The civil, supreme ruler may antecedently exercise this judgment of discerning (by the teaching of their proper teachers) in order to his consequent sentences on offenders: and so in his laws may tell the subjects, what doctrines and practices he will either tolerate or punish. And thus may the church pastors do in their canons to their several flocks, in relation to communion or non-communion.

13. He that will condemn particular persons as heretics or offenders, must allow them to speak for themselves, and hear the proofs, and give them that which justice requireth, &c. And if the pope can do so at the antipodes, and in all the world either 'per se,' or 'per alium' without giving that other his essential claimed power, let him prove it by better experience than we have had.

14. As the prime and sole universal legislation belongeth to Jesus Christ, so the final judgment, universal and particular, belongeth to him, which only will end all controversies and from which there is no appeal.

Quest. xxix. Whether a parent's power over his children, or a pastor, or many pastors or bishops over the same children, as parts of their flock, be greater, or more obliging in matters of religion and public worship?

This being touched on somewhere else, I only now say,
1. That if the case were my own, I would (1.) Labour to know their different powers, as to the matter commanded, and obey each in that which is proper to its place.

(2.) If I were young and ignorant, natural necessity, and natural obligation together, would give my parents with whom I lived such an advantage above the minister (whom I seldom see or understand) as would determine the case 'de eventu,' and much 'de jure.'

(3.) If my parents command me to hear a teacher who is against ceremonies or certain forms, and to hear none that are for them, natural necessity here also (ordinarily) would make it my duty first to hear and obey my parents;
and in many other cases, till I came to understand the
greater power of the pastors, in their own place and work.

(4.) But when I come to church, to know that the judg-
ment of all concordant godly pastors, condemmeth such a
thing as damnable heresy or sin, which my father command-
eth me to receive and profess, I would more believe and fol-
low the judgment of the pastors and churches.

Quest. xxx. May an office teacher or pastor be at once, in a
stated relation of a pastor and a disciple to some other
pastor?

1. That Timothy was still Paul's son in point of learn-
ing, and his disciple, and so that under apostles the same
persons might be stated in both relations at once, seemeth
evident in Scripture.

2. But the same that is a pastor is not at once a mere
layman.

3. That men in the same office may so differ in age, ex-
erience, and degrees of knowledge, as that young pastors
may, and often ought, many years to continue, not only in
occasional reception of their help, but also in an ordinary
stated way of receiving it, and so be related to them as their
ordinary teachers, by such gradual advantages is past all
doubt. And that all juniors and novices owe a certain
reverence and audience, and some obedience to the elder
and wiser.

4. But this is not to be a disciple to him as in lower or-
der or office, but as of lower gifts and grace.

5. It is lawful and very good for the church, that some
ordained persons continue long as pupils to their tutors in
schools or academies, (e.g. to learn the holy languages, if
they have them not, &c.) But this is a relation left to vo-
luntary contractors.

6. In the ancient churches the particular churches had
one bishop and some presbyters and deacons, usually of
much lower parts, who lived all together (single or chaste)
in the bishop's or church house, which was as a college,
where he daily edified them by doctrine and example.

7. The controversy about different orders by Divine in-
stitution, belongeth not to me here to meddle with: but as
to the natural and acquired impurity of age and gifts, and the unspeakable benefit to the juniors and the churches, that it is desirable that there were such a way of their education and edification, I take to be discernible to any that are impartial and judicious.

Ambrose was at once a teacher and a learner: Beda Eccl. Hist. mentioneth one in England, that was at once a pastor and a disciple. And in Scotland some that became bishops were still to be under the government of the abbot of their monasteries according to their first devotion, though the abbot was but a presbyter.

8. Whether a settled, private church-member, may not at once continue his very formal relation, to the pastor of that church, and yet be of the same order with him in another church, as their pastor, at the same time, (as he may in case of necessity continue his apprenticeship or civil service,) is a case that I will not determine. But he that denieth it, must prove his opinion, (or affirmation of its unlawfulness) by sufficient evidence from Scripture or nature; which is hard.

Quest. xxxi. Who hath the power of making church canons?

This is sufficiently resolved before. 1. The magistrate only hath the power of making such canons or laws for church matters as shall be enforced by the sword.

2. Every pastor hath power to make canons for his own congregation; that is, to determine what hour or at what place they shall meet; what translation of Scripture, or version of Psalms shall be used in his church: what chapter shall be read: what psalm shall be sung, &c. Except the magistrate contradict him, and determine it otherwise, in such points as are not proper to the ministerial office.

3. Councils or assemblies of pastors have the power of making such canons for many churches, as shall be laws to the people, and agreements to themselves.

4. None have power to make church laws or canons, about any thing, save, (1.) To put God's own laws in execution. (2.) To determine to that end, of such circumstances as God hath left undetermined in his Word.

5. Canon-making under pretence of order and concord,
hath done a great deal of mischief to the churches; whilst clergymen have grown up from agreements, to tyrannical usurpations and impositions, and from concord about needful accidents of worship, to frame new worship ordinances, and to force them on all others; but especially, (1.) By encroaching on the power of kings, and telling them that they are bound in conscience to put all their canons into execution by force. (2.) And by laying the union of the churches and the communion of Christians upon things needless and doubtful, yea, and at last on many sinful things; whereby the churches have been most effectually divided, and the Christian world set together by the ears; and schisms, yea, and wars have been raised: and these maladies cannot possibly be healed, till the tormenting, tearing engines be broken and cast away, and the voluminous canons of numerous councils, (which themselves also are matter of undeterminable controversy) be turned into the primitive simplicity; and a few necessary things made the terms of concord. Doubtless if every pastor were left wholly to himself for the ordering of worship circumstances and accidents in his own church, without any common canons, save the Scriptures, and the laws of the land, there would have been much less division, than that is, which these numerous canons of all the councils, obstructed on the church, have made.

Quest. xxxii. Doth baptism as such enter the baptized into the universal church, or into a particular church, or both? And is baptism the particular church covenant as such?

Answ. 1. Baptism, as such doth enter us into the universal church, and into it alone; and is no particular church covenant, but the solemnizing of the great Christian covenant of grace, between God, and a believer and his seed.

For, (1.) There is not essentially any mention of a particular church in it.

(2.) A man may be baptized by a general unfixed minister, who is not the pastor of any particular church: and he may be baptized in solitude, where there is no particular church. The eunuch, Acts viii. was not baptized into any particular church.
(3.) Baptism doth but make us Christians, but a man may be a Christian who is no member of any particular church.

(4.) Otherwise baptism should oblige us necessarily to a man, and be a covenant between the baptized and the pastor and church into which he is baptized: but it is only our covenant with Christ.

(5.) We may frequently change our particular church relation; without being baptized again. But we never change our relation to the church which we are baptized into, unless by apostacy.

2. Yet the same person at the same time that he is baptized may be entered into the universal church, and into a particular; and ordinarily it ought to be so where it can be had.

3. And the covenant which we make in baptism with Christ, doth oblige us to obey him, and consequently to use his instituted means, and so to hear his ministers, and hold due communion with his churches.

4. But this doth no more enter us into a particular church, than into a particular family. For we as well oblige ourselves to obey him in family relations as in church relations.

5. When the baptized therefore is at once entered into the universal and particular church, it is done by a double consent, to the double relation. By baptism he professeth his consent to be a member of Christ and his universal church; and additionally he consenteth to be guided by that particular pastor in that particular church; which is another covenant or consent.

Quest. xxxiii. Whether infants should be baptized, I have answered long ago in a Treatise on that subject. Also what infants should be baptized? And who have right to sacraments? And whether hypocrites are unequivocally or equivocally Christians and church-members, I have resolved in my “Disput. of Right to Sacraments.”

Quest. xxxiv. Whether an unbaptized person who yet maketh a public profession of Christianity, be a member of the visible church? And so of the infants of believers unbaptized.
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Answ. 1. Such persons have a certain imperfect, irregular kind of profession, and so of membership; their visibility or visible Christianity is not such as Christ hath appointed. As those that are married, but not by legal celebration, and as those that in cases of necessity are ministers without ordination; so are such Christians as Constantine and many of old without baptism.

2. Such persons ordinarily are not to be admitted to the rights and communion of the visible church, because we must know Christ's sheep by his own mark; but yet they are so far visible Christians, as that we may be persuaded nevertheless of their salvation. As to visible communion, they have but a remote and incomplete 'jus ad rem,' and no 'jus in re,' or legal investiture and possession.

3. The same is the case of unbaptized infants of believers, because they are not of the church merely as they are their natural seed; but because it is supposed that a person himself devoted to God, doth also devote his children to God: therefore not nature only, but this supposition arising from the true nature of his own dedication to God, is the reason why believers' children have their right to baptism: therefore till he hath actually devoted them to God in baptism, they are not legally members of the visible church, but only in 'fieri' and imperfectly as is said. Of which more anon.

Quest. xxxv. Is it certain by the Word of God that all infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are undoubtedly saved; or what infants may we say so of?

Answ. I. 1. We must distinguish between certainty objective and subjective, or more plainly, the reality or truth of the thing, and the certain apprehension of it.

2. And this certainty of apprehension, sometimes signifies only the truth of that apprehension, when a man indeed is not deceived, or more usually that clearness of apprehension joined with truth, which fully quieteth the mind and excludeth doubting.

* Since the writing of this, there is come forth an excellent book for Infant Baptism by Mr. Joseph Whiston, in which the grounds of my present solutions are notably cleared.
3. We must distinguish of infants as baptized lawfully upon just title, or unlawfully without title.

4. And also of title before God, which maketh a lawful claim and reception at his bar; and title before the church, which maketh only the administration lawful before God, and the reception lawful only 'in foro ecclesia,' or 'externo.'

5. The word 'baptism' signifieth either the external part only, consisting in the words and outward action, or the internal covenanting of the heart also.

6. And that internal covenant is either sincere which giveth right to the benefits of God's covenant, or only partial, reserved, and unsound, such as is common to hypocrites.

Conclus. 1. God hath been pleased to speak so little in Scripture of the case of infants, that modest men will use the words, 'certainly' and 'undoubtedly,' about their case with very great caution. And many great divines have maintained that their very baptism itself, cannot be certainly and undoubtedly proved by the Word of God but by tradition: though I have endeavoured to prove the contrary in a special Treatise on that point.

2. No man can tell what is objectively certain or revealed in God's Word, who hath not subjective certainty or knowledge of it.

3. A man's apprehension may be true, when it is but a wavering opinion, with the greatest doubtfulness. Therefore we do not usually by a certain apprehension, mean only a true apprehension, but a clear and quieting one.

4. It is possible to baptize infants unlawfully, or without any right, so that their reception and baptizing shall be a great sin, as is the misapplying of other ordinances. For instance: one in America where there is neither church to receive them, nor Christian parents, nor sponsors, may take up the Indians' children and baptize them against the parents' wills; or if the parents consent to have their children outwardly baptized, and not themselves, as not knowing what baptizing meaneth, or desire it only for outward advantages to their children: or if they offer them to be baptized only in open derision and scorn of Christ; such children have no right to be received. And many other instances nearer may be given.
5. It is possible the person may have no authority at all from Christ who doth baptize them. And Christ's part in reception of the person, and collation and investiture in his benefits, must be done by his commission, or else how can we say that Christ doth it? But open infidels, women, children, madmen, scorners, may do it that have none of his commission.

6. That all infants baptized without title or right by misapplication, and so dying, are not undoubtedly saved, nor any Word of God doth certainly say so, we have reason to believe on these following grounds.

1. Because we can find no such text, nor could ever prevail with them that say so, to shew us such an ascertaining Word of God.

2. Because else gross sin would certainly be the way to salvation. For such misapplication of baptism, by the demanders at least, would certainly be gross sin, as well as misapplying the Lord's supper.

3. Because it is clean contrary to the tenor of the new covenant which promiseth salvation to none but penitent believers and their seed: what God may do for others unknown to us, we have nothing to do with: but his covenant hath made no other promise that I can find; and we are certain of no man's salvation by baptism, to whom God never made a promise of it. If by the children of the faithful, be meant not only their natural seed, but the adopted or bought also of which they are true proprietors, yet that is nothing to all others.

4. To add to God's words, especially to his very promise or covenant, is so terrible a presumption, as we dare not be guilty of.

5. Because this tieth grace or salvation so to the outward washing of the body, or 'opus operatum,' as is contrary to the nature of God's ordinances, and to the tenor of Scripture, and the judgment of the Protestant divines.

6. Because this would make a strange disparity between the two sacraments of the same covenant of grace: when a man receiveth the Lord's supper unworthily (in scorn, in drunkenness, or impenitency) much more without any right (as infidels,) he doth eat and drink damnation or judgment to himself, and maketh his sin greater; therefore he that gets a
child baptized unworthily and without right, doth not therefore infallibly procure his salvation.

7. Because the apostle saith, 1 Cor. vii. 14. "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy;" and the Scripture giveth this privilege to the children of the faithful above others: whereas the contrary opinion levelleth them with the seed of infidels and heathens, as if these had right to salvation by mere baptism, as well as the others.

8. Because else it would be the greatest act of charity in the world, to send soldiers to catch up all heathen's and infidels' children, and baptize them; which no Christians ever yet thought their duty. Yea, it would be too strong a temptation to them to kill them when they had done, that they might be all undoubtedly saved.

Obj. 'But that were to do evil that good might come by it.' Ans. But God is not to be dishonoured as to be supposed to make such laws, as shall forbid men the greatest good in the world, and then to tempt them by the greatness of the benefit to take it to be no evil: as if he said, 'If soldiers would go take up a million of heathen's children and baptize them, it will put them into an undoubted state of salvation: but yet I forbid them doing it: and if they presently kill them, lest they sin after, they shall undoubtedly be saved; but yet I forbid them doing it.' I need not aggravate this temptation to them that know the power of the law of nature, which is the law of love and good works, and how God that is most good is pleased in our doing good. Though he tried Abraham's obedience once, as if he should have killed his son, yet he stopt him before the execution. And doth he ordinarily exercise men's obedience, by forbidding them to save the souls of others, when it is easily in their power? Especially when with the adult the greatest labour and most powerful preaching, is frequently so frustrate, that not one of many is converted by it.

9. Because else God should deal with unaccountable disparity with infants and the adult in the same ordinance of baptism. It is certain that all adult persons baptized, if they died immediately, should not be saved. Even none that had no right to the covenant and to baptism; such as infidels, heathens, impenitent persons, hypocrites, that have not true repentance and faith. And why should baptism
save an infant without title, any more than the adult without title? I still suppose that some infants have no title, and that now I speak of them alone.

Obj. 'But the church giveth them all right by receiving them.'

Answ. This is to be farther examined anon. If you mean a particular church, perhaps they are baptized into none such. Baptism as such is a reception only into the universal church, as in the eunuch's case, Acts viii. appeareth. If you mean the universal church, it may be but one single ignorant man in an infidel country that baptizeth, and he is not the universal church! Yea, perhaps is not a lawfully called minister of that church! However this is but to say, that baptism giveth right to baptism. For this receiving is nothing but baptizing. But there must be a right to this reception, if baptism be a distinguishing ordinance, and all the world have not right to it. Christ saith, Matt. xxviii. 19. "Disciple me all nations, baptizing them—:" they must be initially made disciples first, by consent, and then be invested in the visible state of Christianity by baptism.

10. If the children of heathens have right to baptism, and salvation thereby, it is either, 1. As they are men, and all have right; or 2. Because the parents give them right; 3. Or because remote ancestors give them right; 4. Or because the universal church gives them right; 5. Or because a particular church giveth them right; 6. Or because the sponsors give them right; 7. Or the magistrate; 8. Or the baptizer. But it is none of all these, as shall anon be proved.

II. But as to the second question, I answer, 1. It will help us to understand the case the better, if we prepare the way by opening the case of the adult, because in Scripture times, they were the most famous subjects of baptism. And it is certain of such; 1. That every one outwardly baptized is not in a state of salvation. That no hypocrite that is not a true penitent believer is in such a state. 2. That every true penitent believer is before God in a state of salvation, as soon as he is such; and before the church as soon as he is baptized. 3. That we are not to use the word baptism as a physical term only, but as a moral, theological term. Because words (as in law, physic, &c.) are to be understood according to the art or science in which they are treated of.
And baptism taken theologically doth as essentially include the will’s consent or heart-covenanting with God, as matrimony includeth marriage consent, and as a man containeth the soul as well as the body. And thus it is certain that all truly baptized persons are in a state of salvation; that is, all that sincerely consent to the baptismal covenant when they profess consent by baptism (but not hypocrites). 4. And in this sense all the ancient pastors of the churches, did concur that baptism did wash away all sin, and put the baptized into a present right to life eternal; as he that examineth their writings will perceive: not the outward washing and words alone, but when the inward and outward parts concur, or when by true faith and repentance, the receiver hath right to the covenant of God. 5. In this sense it is no unfit language to imitate the fathers, and to say that the truly baptized are in a state of justification, adoption, and salvation, unless when men’s misunderstanding maketh it unsafe. 6. The sober Papists themselves say the same thing, and when they have said that even ‘ex opere operato’ baptism saveth, they add, that it is only the meet receiver; that is, the penitent believer, and no other of the adult. So that hitherto there is no difference.

2. Now let us by this try the case of infants; concerning which there are all these several opinions among divines.

(1.) Some think that all infants (baptized or not) are saved from hell, and positive punishment, but are not brought to heaven, as being not capable of such joys.

(2.) Some think that all infants (dying such) are saved as others are, by actual felicity in heaven, though in a lower degree. Both these sorts suppose that Christ’s death saveth all that reject it not, and that infants reject it not.

(3.) Some think that all unbaptized infants do suffer the ‘prænem damn’ and are shut out of heaven and happiness, but not sensibly punished or cast into hell. For this Jansenius hath wrote a treatise; and many other Papists think so.

(4.) Some think that all the children of sincere believers dying in infancy are saved, (that is, glorified,) whether baptized or not; and no others.

(5.) Some think that God hath not at all revealed what he will do with any infants.
(6.) Some think that he hath promised salvation as aforesaid to believers and their seed, but hath not at all revealed to us what he will do with all the rest.

(7.) Some think that only the baptized children of true believers are certainly (by promise) saved.

(8.) Some think that all the adopted and bought children of true Christians, as well as the natural, are saved (if baptized, say some; or if not, say others).

(9.) Some think that elect infants are saved, and no other, but no man can know who those are. And of these, 1. Some deny infant baptism. 2. Most say that they are to be baptized, and that thereby the non-elect are only received into the visible church and its privileges, but not to any promise or certainty of justification, or a state of salvation.

(10.) Some think that all that are baptized by the dedication of Christian sponsors are saved.

(11.) Some think that all that the pastor dedicateth to God are saved, (because so dedicated by him say some; or because baptized 'ex opere operato' say others). And so all baptized infants are in a state of salvation.

(12.) Some think that this is to be limited to all that have right to baptism 'coram Deo,' which some think the church's reception giveth them, of which anon.

(13.) And some think it is to be limited to those that have right 'coram ecclesia,' or are rightfully baptized 'ex parte ministrantis,' where some make the magistrate's command sufficient, and some the bishops and some the baptizer's will.

Of the title to baptism I shall speak anon. Of the salvation of infants, it is too tedious to confute all that I dissent from: not presuming in such darkness and diversity of opinions to be peremptory, nor to say, I am certain by the Word of God who are undoubtedly saved, nor yet to deny the undoubted certainty of wiser men, who may know that which such as I do doubt of, but submitting what I say to the judgment of the church of God and my superiors, I humbly lay down my own thoughts as followeth.

1. I think that there can no promise or proof be produced that all unbaptized infants are saved, either from the 'pœna damni' or 'sensus' or both.
2. I think that no man can prove that all unbaptized infants are damned, or denied heaven. Nay, I think I can prove a promise of the contrary.

3. All that are rightfully baptized 'in foro externo' are visible church-members, and have ecclesiastical right to the privileges of the visible church.

4. I think Christ never instituted baptism for the collusion of these outward privileges alone, unless as on supposition that persons culpably fail of the better ends.

5. I think baptism is a solemn mutual contract or covenant between Christ and the baptized person. And that it is but one covenant, even the covenant of grace which is the sum of the Gospel, which is sealed and received in baptism; and that this covenant essentially containeth our saving relation to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and our pardon, justification, and adoption or right to life everlasting: and that God never made any distinct covenant of outward privileges alone, to be sealed by baptism. But that outward mercies are the second and lesser gift of the same covenant which giveth first the great and saving blessings.

6. And therefore that whoever hath right before God, to claim and receive baptism, hath right also to the benefits of the covenant of God, and that is, to salvation: though I say not so of every one that hath such right before the church, as that God doth require the minister to baptize him. For by right before God, or 'in foro coeli' I mean such a right as will justify the claim before God immediately, the person being one whom he commandeth in that present state to claim and receive baptism. For many a one hath no such right before God to claim or receive it, when yet the minister hath right to give it them if they do claim it.

The case stands thus. God saith in his covenant, 'He that believeth shall be saved, and ought to be baptized, to profess that belief, and be invested in the benefits of the covenant; and he that professeth to believe, (whether he do or not,) is by the church to be taken for a visible believer, and by baptism to be received into the visible church.' Here God calleth none but true believers (and their seed) to be baptized, nor maketh an actual promise or covenant with any other; and so I say that none other have right 'in foro coeli.' But yet the church knoweth not men's hearts, and
must take a serious profession for a credible sign of the faith professed, and for that outward title upon which it is a duty of the pastor to baptize the claimer. So that the most malignant, scornful hypocrite, that maketh a seemingly serious profession, hath right 'coram ecclesia,' but not 'coram Deo,' save in this sense, that God would have the minister baptize him. But this I have more largely opened in my "Disputations of Right to Sacraments."

7. I think therefore that all the children of true Christians, do by baptism receive a public investiture by God's appointment into a state of remission, adoption, and right to salvation at the present: though I dare not say I am undoubtedly certain of it, as knowing how much is said against it. But I say as the synod of Dort, art. 1. 'That believing parents have no cause to doubt of the salvation of their children that die in infancy, before they commit actual sin;' that is, not to trouble themselves with fears about it.

The reasons that move me to be of this judgment (though not without doubting and hesitancy) are these; 1. Because whoever hath right to the present investiture, delivery and possession of the first and great benefits of God's covenant made with man in baptism, hath right to pardon, and adoption, and everlasting life: but the infants of true Christians have right to the present investiture, delivery and possession of the first and great benefits of God's covenant made with man in baptism. Therefore they have right to pardon and everlasting life.

Either infants are in the same covenant (that is, are subjects of the same promise of God) with their believing parents, or in some other covenant, or in no covenant. If they be under no covenant (or promise), or under some other promise or covenant only, and not the same, they are not to be baptized. For baptism is a mutual covenanting; where the minister by Christ's commission in his name acteth his part, and the believer his own and his infant's part: and God hath but one covenant, which is to be made, sealed, and delivered in baptism. Baptism is not an equivocal word, so as to signify divers covenants of God.

**Obj.** 'But the same covenant of God hath divers sorts of benefits; the special God giveth to the sincere, and the common to the common and hypocritical receiver.

**Answ.** 1. God indeed requireth the minister to take profession for the visible church-title; and so it being the minister's duty so far to believe a liar, and to receive dissemblers who had no right to lay that claim, you may say that God indirectly and improperly giveth them church-privileges: but properly, that is, by his promise or covenant-deed of gift, he giveth them nothing at all; for his covenant is one and undivided in its action, though it give several benefits, and though providence may give one and not another, yet the covenant giveth all or none. God saith that godliness hath the promise of this life and of that to come: but he never said, (that I know of,) 'To the hypocrite or unsound believer I promise or give right to common mercies.'

2. But suppose it were otherwise, yet either the children of true believers have the true condition of right to the special blessings of the covenant, or they have not the condition of any at all. For there can no more be required of an infant, as to any special blessings of the covenant, than that he be the child of believing parents and by them dedicated to God. Either this condition entitleth them to all the covenant promises which the adult believer is entitled to, (as far as their natures are capable,) or it entitleth them to none at all. Nor are they to be baptized: for God hath in Scripture instituted but one baptism, (to profess one faith,) and that one is ever for the remission of sins: "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."'

3. Or if all the rest were granted you, yet it would follow that all infants in the world, even of true believers, are left out of God's covenant of grace, that is, the covenant or promise of pardon and life; and are only taken into the covenant of church-privileges. And so 1. You will make two covenants, (which you denied,) and not only two sorts of benefits of one covenant. 2. And two species of baptism; while all infants in the world are only under a covenant of outward privileges, and have no baptism, but the seal of that covenant, while believers have the covenant, promise, and seal of pardon and life.

* Mark xvi. 16.
2. And this is my second reason: because then we have no promise or certainty, or ground of faith, for the pardon and salvation of any individual infants in the world. And so parents are left to little comfort for their children. And if there be no promise there is no faith of it, nor any baptism to seal it; and so we still make antipedobaptism unavoidable. For who dare set God's seal to such as have no promise? or pretend to invest any in a near and saving relation to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, (which is the very nature of baptism,) when God hath given no such commission?

Obj. 'Yes: baptism and the covenant of special promises are for all the elect, though we know not who they are.'

Answ. 1. I deny not God's eternal, antecedent election; but I deny that the Scripture ever mentioneth his pardoning or glorifying any, upon the account of election only, without certain spiritual conditions, which may be given as the reason of the difference in judgment. God may freely give the Gospel to whom he will, and also faith or the first grace by the Gospel, without any previous condition in man, but according to his free election only: but he giveth pardon and heaven as a rector by his equal laws and judgment; and always rendereth a reason of the difference, from the qualifications of man.

2. And if this were as you say, it would still overthrow infant baptism. For either we must baptize all indifferently, or none, or else know how to make a difference. All must not be baptized indifferently: and election is a secret thing to us, and by it no minister in the world can tell whom to baptize: therefore he must baptize none, if there be no other differenting note to know them by.

Obj. 'God hath more elect ones among the infants of true believers than among others: and therefore they are all to be baptized.'

Answ. 1. It will be hard to prove that much (that he hath more) if there be no promise to them all as such. 2. If he have more, yet no man knoweth how many, and whether the elect be one of ten, twenty, forty, or an hundred in comparison of the non-elect: for Scripture tells it not. So that no minister of a church is sure that any one infant that,
be ever baptized is elect. 3. And God hath given no such rule for sealing and delivering his covenant with the benefits as to cast it hap hazard among all, because it is possible or probable it may belong to some.

Obj. 'You have no certainty what adult professor is sincere, nor to which of them the special benefits belong; no, not of any one in a church. And yet because there is a probability that among many there are some sincere, you baptize them all. Take then the birth privilege but as equal to the profession of the adult.

Answ. This partly satisfied me sometimes: but I cannot forget that a visible, false, or hypocritical profession is not the condition of God's own covenant of grace, nor that which he requireth in us, to make us partakers of his covenant-benefits; nay, he never at all commandeth it; but only commandeth that profession of consent, which followeth the real consent of the heart; he that condemneth lying, maketh it neither the condition of our church-membership, as his gift by promise, nor yet our duty.

And mark well, that it is a professed consent to the whole covenant that God requireth, as the condition of our true right to any part or benefit of it. He that shall only say, 'I consent to be a visible church-member,' doth thereby acquire no right to that membership; no, not in 'foro ecclésiae:' but he must also profess that he consenteth to have God for his God, and Christ for his Lord and Saviour, and the Holy Spirit for his Sanctifier. So that he must be a liar, or a sound believer that maketh this profession.

But for an infant to be born of true believers, and sincerely by them dedicated in covenant to God, is all the condition that ever God required to an infant-title to his covenant; and it is not the failure of the true condition as a false profession is.

Indeed if the proposition were thus laid, it would hold good: 'As we know not who sincerely covenanteth for himself, and yet we must baptize all that soberly profess it; so we know not who doth sincerely covenant for his infant, and yet we must baptise all whom the parents bring with such a profession, for themselves and them.'

But if the sincere dedication of a sound believer, shall be accounted but equal to the lying profession of the adult,
which is neither commanded, nor hath any promise, then infants are not in the covenant of grace, nor is the sincerest dedication to God either commanded or hath any promise.

If I were but sure that the profession of the adult for himself were sincere, I were sure that he were in a state of grace. And if I am not sure of the same concerning the parent's dedication of his infant, I must conclude that this is not a condition of the same covenant, and therefore that he is not in the same covenant (or conditional promise of God) unless there be some other condition required in him or for him; but there is no other that can be devised.

Object. Election is the condition.

Answer. Election is God's act and not man's; and therefore may be an antecedent, but no condition required of us. And man is not called to make profession that he is elected, as he is to make profession of his faith and consent to the covenant. And God only knoweth who are his by election, and therefore God only can baptize on this account.

And what is the probability which the objecters mean, that many of the infants of the faithful are elected? Either it is a promise, or but a prediction; if no promise it is not to be sealed by baptism: if a promise, it is absolute or conditional. If any absolute promise, as, I will save many children of believers, 1. This terminateth not on any singular person, as baptism doth, and 2. It is not the absolute promise that baptism is appointed by Christ to seal. This is apparent in Mark xvi. 16. and in the case of the adult. And it is not one covenant which is sealed to the adult by baptism, and another to infants. Else baptism also should not be the same. But if it be any conditional covenant, what is it, and what is the condition?

And what is it that baptism giveth to the seed of believers, if they be not justified by it from original sin? You will not say, that it conveyeth inherent sanctifying grace, no not into all the elect themselves, which many are many years after without. And you cannot say, that it sealeth to them any promise, so much as of visible church privileges. For God may suffer them presently to be made janizaries, and violently taken from their parents, and become strangers and despisers of church privileges, as is ordinary with the Greek's children among the Turks. Now God either
promised such church privileges absolutely, or conditionally, or not at all. Not absolutely, for then they would possess them. If conditionally, what is the condition? If not at all, what promise then doth baptism seal to such, and what benefit doth it secure? God hath instituted no baptism, which is a mere present delivery of possession of a church-state, without sealing any promise at all. True baptism first sealeth the promise, and then delivereth possession of some benefits.

Yea, indeed outward church-privileges are such uncertain blessings of the promise, that as they are but secondary, so they are but secondarily given and sealed, so that no man should ever be baptized, if these were all that were in the promise. The holiest person may be cast into a wilderness, and deprived of all visible church-communion; and doth God then break his promise with him? Certainly no. It is therefore our saving relations to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which the promise giveth, and baptism sealeth; and other things but subordinately and uncertainly as they are means to these. So then it is plain, that believers’ infants have a promise of salvation, or no promise at all which baptism was instituted to seal.

I have said so much more of this in my Appendix to the "Treatise of Infant Baptism," to Mr. Bedford, in defence of Dr. Davenant's judgment, as that I must refer the reader thither.

8. I think it very probable that this ascertaining promise belongeth not only to the natural seed of believers, but to all whom they have a true power and right to dedicate in covenant to God; which seemeth to be all that are properly their own, whether adopted or bought; but there is more darkness and doubt about this than the former, because the Scripture hath said less of it.

9. I am not able to prove, nor see any probable reason for it, that any but sound believers have such a promise for their children, nor that any hypocrite shall certainly save his child, if he do but dedicate him to God in baptism. For, 1. I find no promise in Scripture made to such. 2. He that doth not sincerely believe himself, nor consent to God's covenant, cannot sincerely believe for his child, nor consent for him. 3. And that faith which will not save the owner, as
being not the condition of the promise, cannot save another. Much more might be said of this. I confess that the church is to receive the children of hypocrites as well as themselves; and their baptism is valid 'in foro externo ecclesiae,' and is not to be reiterated. But it goeth no further for his child, than for himself.

10. Therefore I think that all that are rightfully baptized by the minister, that is, baptized so as that it is well done of him, are not certainly saved by baptism, unless they be also rightfully baptized, in regard of their right to claim and receive it. Let them that are able to prove more do it, for I am not able.

11. Whereas some misinterpret the words of the old rubric of confirmation in the English liturgy, as if it spake of all that are baptized, whether they had right or not, the words themselves may serve to rectify that mistake, 'And that no man shall think any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation, he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's Word, that children being baptized have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved.' Where it is plain that they mean, they have all things necessary 'ex parte ecclesia,' or all God's applying ordinances necessary, though they should die unconfirmed, supposing that they have all things necessary to just baptism on their own part. Which is but what the ancients were wont to say of the baptized adult; but they never meant that the infidel, and hypoorite, and impenitent person was in a state of life, because he was baptized; but that all that truly consent to the covenant, and signify this by being baptized, are saved. So the Church of England saith, that they receive no detriment by delaying confirmation; but it never said, that they receive no detriment by their parents' or sponsors' infidelity and hypocrisy, or by their want of true right 'coram Deo' to be baptized.

12. But yet before these Questions (either of them) be taken as resolved by me, I must first take in some other Questions which are concerned in the same cause; as

**Quest. xxxvi.** What is meant by this speech, that believers and their seed are in the covenant of God; which giveth them right to baptism?
**Answ.** Though this was opened on the bye before, I add, 1. The meaning is not that they are in that absolute promise of the first and all following grace, supposed ordinarily to be made of the elect (as such unknown) viz. 'I will give them faith, repentance, conversion, justification, and salvation and all the conditions of the conditional promise, without any condition on their part,' which many take to be the meaning of 'I will take the hard heart out of them, &c.' For 1. This promise is not now to be first performed to the adult who repent and believe already; and no other are to be baptized at age. If that absolute promise be sealed by baptism, either it must be so sealed as a promise before it be performed, or after: if before, either to all, because some are elect, or only to some that are elect. Not to all; for it is not common to infidels. Not to some as elect; for 1. They are unknown. 2. If they were known they are yet supposed to be infidels. Not after performance for then it is too late.

2. The meaning is not only that the conditional covenant of grace is made and offered to them; for so it may be said of heathens and infidels, and all the world that hear the Gospel.

But 1. The covenant meant, is indeed this conditional covenant only. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

2. To be in this covenant is, to be a consenting believer, and so to be one that hath by inward heart-consent, the true conditions of right to the benefits of the covenant, and is thereby prepared solemnly by baptism to profess this consent, and to receive an investiture and seal of God's part, by his minister given in his name.

3. Infants are thus in covenant with their parents, because reputatively their parents' wills are theirs, to dispose of them for their good. And therefore they consent by their parents, who consent for them.

**Quest. xxxvii. Are believers' children certainly in covenant before their baptism, and thereby in a state of salvation? Or not till they are baptized?**

*Mark xvi. 16.*
Ans. Distinguish between 1. Heart-covenanting, and
mouth-covenanting. 2. Between being in covenant before
God, and visibly before the church.

1. No person is to be baptized at age, whose inward
heart-consent before professed, giveth him not right to bap-
tism. Therefore all the adult must be in covenant, that is,
consent on their part to the covenant, before they are bap-
tized.

2. Therefore it is so with the seed of the faithful, who
must consent by their parents, before they have right:
otherwise all should have right, and their baptism be es-
entially another baptism, as sealing some other covenant,
or none.

3. If there be no promise made to the seed of the faith-
ful more than to others, they have no right more than others
to baptism or salvation. But if there be a promise made to
them as the seed of believers, then are they as such within
that promise, that is, performers of its conditions by their pa-
rents, and have right to the benefit.

4. If the heart-consent or faith of the adult, do put them-
selves into a state of salvation, before their baptism, then it
doeth so by their children; but, &c.—

5. But this right to salvation in parents and children
upon heart-consent before baptism, is only before God: for
the church taketh no cognizance of secret heart-transactions;
but a man then only consenteth in the judgment of the
church, when he openly professeth it, and desireth to signify
it by being baptized.

6. And even before God, there is a ‘necessitas precepti’
obliger us to open baptism after heart-consent: and he
that heartily consenteth, cannot refuse God’s way of utter-
ing it, unless either through ignorance he knoweth it not to
be his duty, (for himself and his child,) or through want of
ability or opportunity cannot have it. So that while a man
is unbaptized, somewhat is wanting to the completeness of
his right to the benefits of the covenant, viz. A reception of
investiture and possession in God’s appointed way; though
it be not such a want, as shall frustrate the salvation of
those that did truly consent in heart.

7. I take it therefore for certain, that the children of true
believers consent to the covenant by their parents, and are
as certainly saved if they die before baptism, as after; though those that despise baptism, when they know it to be a duty, cannot be thought indeed to believe or consent for their children or themselves.

Quest. xxxviii. Is infant's title to baptism and the covenant-benefits given them by God in his promise, upon any proper moral condition, or only upon the condition of their natural relation, that they be the seed of the faithful.

Ans. That which is called a mere natural condition is properly in law sense no condition at all; nor doth make a contract or promise to be called conditional in a moral sense. But it is matters of morality and not of physics only that we are treating of; and therefore we must take the terms in a moral sense. For a physical condition is either past, or present, or future, or not future: if it be past or present, the proposition may indeed be hypothetical, but it is no such conditional promise as we are speaking of; for instance, if you say, 'If thou wast born in such a city, or if thy name be John, I will give thee so much.' These are the words of an uncertain promiser; but the promise is already either equivalent to an absolute gift, or null. So if the physical condition be 'de futuro,' e.g. 'If thou be alive to-morrow, I will give thee this or that; or if the sun shine to-morrow, &c.' This indeed suspendeth the gift or event; but not upon any moral being which is in the power of the receiver, but upon a natural contingency or uncertainty. And God hath no such conditional covenants or promises to be sealed by baptism. He saith not, 'If thou be the child of such or such a man, thou shalt be saved, as his natural offspring only.' If the Papists that accuse us for holding that the mere natural progeny of believers are saved as such, did well understand our doctrine, they would perceive that in this we differ not from the understanding sort among them, or at least, that their accusations run upon a mistake.

I told you before that there are three things distinctly to be considered in the title of infants to baptism and salvation. 1. By what right the parent covenanteth for his child. 2. What right the child hath to baptism. 3. What right he hath to the benefits of the covenant sealed and delivered in baptism.
To the first, two things concur to the title of the parent to covenant in the name of his child: one is his natural interest in him; the child being his own is at his dispose. The other is God's gracious will and consent that it shall be so; that the parent's will shall be as the child's for his good, till he come at age to have a will of his own.

To the second, the child's right to baptism is not merely his natural or his birth relation from such parents, but it is in two degrees as followeth. 1. He hath a virtual right, on condition of his parent's faith: the reason is, because that a believer's consent and self-dedication to God doth virtually contain in it a dedication with himself of all that is his: and it is a contradiction to say that a man truly dedicateth himself to God, and not all that he hath, and that he truly consenteth to the covenant for himself and not for his child, if he understand that God will accept it. 2. His actual title-condition is his parents (or owners) actual consent to enter him into God's covenant, and his actual mental dedication of his child to God, which is his title before God, and the profession of it is his title before the church. So that it is not a mere physical but a moral title-condition, which an infant hath to baptism, that is, his parent's consent to dedicate him to God.

3. And to the third, his title-condition to the benefits of baptism hath two degrees, 1. That he be really dedicated to God by the heart-consent of his parent as aforesaid. And 2. That his parent express this by the solemn engaging him to God in baptism; the first being necessary as a means 'sine qua non,' and the second being necessary as a duty without which he sinneth, (when it is possible,) and as a means 'coram ecclesia' to the privileges of the visible church.

The sum of all is, that our mere natural interest in our children is not their title-condition to baptism or to salvation, but only that presupposed state which enableth us by God's consent to covenant for them; but their title-condition to baptism and salvation, is our covenanting for them, or voluntary dedicating them to God; which we do 1. Virtually, when we dedicate ourselves, and all that we have or shall have. 2. Actually, when our hearts consent particularly for them, and actually devote them to God, before bap-
tism. 3. Sacramentally, when we express this in our solemn baptismal covenanting and dedication.

Consider exactly of this again; and if you loathe distinguishing, confess ingenuously that you loathe the truth, or the necessary means of knowing it.

**Quest. xxxix.** What is the true meaning of sponsors, 'patri- mi,' or godfathers as we call them? And is it lawful to make use of them?

**Answ.** I. To the first question; all men have not the same thoughts either of their original, or of their present use.

1. Some think that they are sponsors or sureties for the parents rather than the child at first; and that when many in times of persecution, heresy, and apostacy, did baptize their children this month or year, and the next month or year apostatize and deny Christ themselves, that the sponsors were only credible Christians witnessing that they believed that the parents were credible, firm believers, and not like to apostatize. 2. Others think that they were undertakers, that if the parents did apostatize or die, they would see to the Christian education of the child themselves. 3. Others think that they did both these together: (which is my opinion;) viz. That they witnessed the probability of the parents' fidelity; but promised that if they should either apostatize or die, they would see that the children were piously educated. 4. Others think that they were absolute undertakers that the children should be piously educated, whether the parents died or apostatized or not; so that they went joint undertakers with the parents in their lifetime. 5. And I have lately met with some that maintain that the godfathers and godmothers become proprietors, and adopt the child, and take him for their own, and that this is the sense of the Church of England. But I believe them not for these reasons.

1. There is no such word in the liturgy, doctrine or canons of the church of England: and that is not to be feigned and fathered on them, which they never said.

2. It would be against the law of nature to force all parents to give the sole propriety, or joint propriety in their
children to others. Nature hath given the propriety to
themselves, and we cannot rob them of it.

3. It would be heinously injurious to the children of no-
ble and learned persons, if they must be forced to give them
up to the propriety and education of others, even of such as
perhaps are lower and more unfit for it than themselves.

4. It would be more heinously injurious to all godfa-
thers and godmothers, who must all make other men’s
children their own, and therefore must use them as their
own.

5. It would keep most children unbaptized; because if
it were once understood that they must take them as their
own, few would be sponsors to the children of the poor, for
fear of keeping them; and few but the ignorant that know
not what they do, would be sponsors for any, because of the
greatness of the charge, and their averseness to adopt the
children of others.

6. It would make great confusion in the state, while all
men were bound to exchange children with another.

7. I never knew one man or woman that was a godfather
or godmother on such terms, nor that took the child to be
their own; and if such a one should be found among ten
thousand, that is no rule to discern the judgment of the
church by.

8. And in confirmation the godfather and godmother
are expressly said to be for this use, to be witnesses that the
party is confirmed.

9. And in the priest’s speech to the adult that come for
baptism, in the office of baptism of those of riper years, it is
the persons themselves that are to promise and covenant for
themselves, and the godfathers and godmothers are only
called, ‘these your witnesses.’ And if they be but witnesses
to the adult, it is like they are not adopters of infants.

II. Those that doubt of the lawfulness of using sponsors
for their children, do it on these two accounts: 1. As sup-
posing it unlawful to make so promiscuous an adoption of
children, or of choosing another to be a covenanter for the
child instead of the parent, to whom it belongeth; or to
commit their children to another’s either propriety or edu-
cation, or formal promise of that which belongeth to educa-
tion, when they never mean to perform it, nor can do. 2.
Because they take it for an adding to the ordinance of God, a thing which Scripture never mentioneth. To which I answer,

1. I grant it unlawful to suppose another to be the parent or proprietor that is not; or to suppose him to have that power and interest in your child which he hath not; or to desire him to undertake what he cannot perform, and which neither he nor you intend he shall perform; I grant that you are not bound to alienate the propriety of your children, nor to take in another to be joint proprietors; nor to put out your children to the godfather's education. So that if you will misunderstand the use of sponsors, then indeed you will make them unlawful to be so used.

But if you take them but as the ancient churches did, for such as do attest the parents' fidelity (in their persuasion,) and do promise first to mind you of your duty, and next to take care of the children's pious education if you die, I know no reason you have to scruple this much.

Yea more, it is in your own power to agree with the godfathers, that they shall represent your own persons, and speak and promise what they do, as your deputies only, in your names. And what have you against this? Suppose you were sick, lame, imprisoned or banished, would you not have your child baptized? And how should that be done, but by your deputing another to represent you in entering into covenant with God?

Object. 'But when the churchmen mean another thing, this is but to juggle with the world.'

Answ. How can you prove that the authority that made or imposed the liturgy, meant any other thing? And other individuals are not the masters of your sense. Yea, and if the imposers had meant ill, in a thing that may be done well, you may discharge your conscience by doing it well, and making a sufficient profession of your better sense.

2. But then it will be no sinful addition to God's ordinance, to determine of a lawful circumstance, which he hath left to human prudence: as to choose a meet deputy, witness or sponsor, who promiseth nothing but what is meet.
Quest. xl. On whose account or right is it that the infant hath title to baptism and its benefits? Is it on the parents', ancestors', sponsors', the church's, the minister's, the magistrate's, or his own?

Answ. The titles are very various that are pretended; let us examine them all.

I. I cannot think that a magistrate's command to baptize an infant, giveth him right, 1. Because there is no proof of the validity of such a title. 2. Because the magistrate can command no such thing if it be against God's Word, as this is, which would level the case of the seed of heathens and believers. And I know but few of that opinion.

II. I do not think that the minister as such giveth title to the infant: for, 1. He is no proprietor. 2. He can shew no such power or grant from God. 3. He must baptize none but those that antecedently have right. 4. Else he also might level all, and take in heathen's children with believers. 5. Nor is this pretended to by many, that I know of.

III. I cannot think that it is a particular church that must give this right, or perform the condition of it. For, 1. Baptism (as is aforesaid) as such, doth only make a Christian, and a member of the universal church, and not of any particular church. And 2. The church is not the proprietor of the child. 3. No Scripture commission can be shewed for such a power. Where hath God said, All that any particular church will receive, shall have right to baptism? 4. By what act must the church give this right? If by baptizing him; the question is of his antecedent right. If by willing, that he be baptized. (1.) If they will that one be baptized that hath no right to it, their will is sinful, and therefore unfit to give him right. (2.) And the baptizing minister hath more power than a thousand or ten thousand private men, to judge who is to be baptized. 5. Else a church might save all heathen children that they can but baptize, and so level infidel's and Christian's seed. 6. It is not the church in general, but some one person, that must educate the child: therefore the church cannot so much as promise for its education: the church hath nothing to do with those that are without, but only with her own; and
heathen's children are not her own, nor exposed to her occupation.

IV. I believe not that it is the universal church that giveth the infant title to baptism: for, 1. He that giveth title to the covenant and baptism, doth it as a performer of the moral condition of that title. But God hath nowhere made the church's faith, to be the condition of baptism or salvation, either to infidels or their seed. 2. Because the universal church is a body that cannot be consulted with to give their vote and consent: nor have they any deputies to do it by. For there is no universal, visible governor: and if you will pretend every priest to be commissioned to act and judge in the name of the universal church, you will want proof, and that is before confuted. 3. If all, have right that the universal church offereth up to God, or any minister or bishop be counted its deputy or agent to that end, it is in the power of that minister (as is said) to level all, and to baptize and save all; which is contrary to the Word of God.

V. I believe that godfathers as such, being no adopters or proprietors, are not the performers of the condition of salvation for the infant, nor give him right to be baptized. 1. Because he is not their own, and therefore their will or act cannot go for his: because there is no Word of God for it that all shall be baptized or saved that any Christians will be sponsors for. God's church blessings are not tied to such inventions, that were not in being when God's laws were made. Where there is no promise or word, there is no faith. 3. No sponsors are so much as lawful (as is shewed before) who are not owners, or their deputies, or mere secondary subservient parties, who suppose the principal covenaniting party. 4. And as to the infant's salvation, the sponsors may (too oft) be ignorant infidels and hypocrites themselves, that have no true faith for themselves; and therefore not enough to save another. 5. And it were strange if God should make no promise to a wicked parent for his own child, and yet should promise to save by baptism all that some wicked and hypocrite godfathers will offer him. 6. And that thus the seed of heathens and Christians should be levelled, and yet an ignorant, bold undertaker to carry away the privilege of saving persons from them,
both. All this is but men's unproved imaginations. He that never commandeth godfathers, but forbiddeth the usurping sort, and only alloweth human prudence to use the lawful sort, did never put the souls of all children, Christians and heathens into their hands, (any more than into the hands of the priest that baptizeth them).

VI. I do not find that remote ancestors that are dead, or that are not the proprietors of the children, are the performers of the condition by which they have right to baptism or salvation. 1. Because God hath put that power and work in the hands of others, even the parents which they cannot nullify. 2. Because the promise of mercy to thousands is on supposition that the successors make no intercession. 3. Else the threatenings to the seed of the wicked would signify nothing, nor would any in the world be excluded from right, but all be levelled; because Noah was the common father of mankind: and if you lay it on dead ancestors, you have no rule where to stop till you come to Noah.

VII. I conclude therefore that it is clearly, the immediate parents, (both or one) and probably any true domestic owner of the child, who hath the power to choose or refuse for him, and so to enter him into covenant with God, and so by consent to perform the conditions of his right. For, 1. Abundance of promises are made to the faithful and their seed, of which I have spoke at large in my book "Of Infant Baptism." And besides the punishment of Adam's sin, there is scarce a parent infamous for sin in Scripture, but his posterity falleth under the punishment, as for a secondary, original sin or guilt. As the case of Cain, Ham, the Sodomites, the Amalekites, the Jews, Achan, Gehazi, &c. shew. And it is expressly said, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy," (of the sense of which I have spoke as aforecited).

Object. 'But if owners may serve, one may buy multitudes, and a king or lord of slaves, whose own the people are, may cause them all to be baptized and saved.

Answer. 1. Remember that I say, that the Christian parent's right is clear, but I take the other as more dark; for it is principally grounded on Abraham and the Israelites cir-

* 1 Cor. vii. 14.
cumcising their children born to them in the house or bought with money: and how far the parity of reason here will reach is hard to know. All that I say is, that I will not deny it, because 'favores sunt ampliandi.' 2. If such a prince be an hypocrite, and not a sincere Christian himself, his faith or consent cannot save others, that cannot save himself. 3. It is such a propriety as is conjunct with a divine concession only that giveth this power of consenting for an infant: now we find clear proof of God's concession to natural parents, and probable proof of his concession of it to domestic owners, but no further that I know of. For, (1.) It is an act of God's love to the child for the parent's sake; and therefore to such children as we are supposed to have a special nearness to, and love for. (2.) And it is a consent and covenanting which he calls for, which obligeth the promiser to consequent pious education, which is a domestic act. (3.) They are comprised in the name of parents, which those that adopt them and educate them may be called. (4.) And the infants are their children, not their slaves. But now if the emperor of Muscovy, Indostan, &c. had the propriety in all his people as slaves, this would not imitate paternal interest and love, but tyranny, nor could he be their domestic educater. Therefore I must limit it to a pro-parent, or domestic, educating proprietor.

**Quest. xli. Are they really baptized who are baptized according to the English liturgy and canons, where the parent seemeth excluded, and those to consent for the infant who have no power to do it?**

**Ans.** I find some puzzled with this doubt, Whether all our infants' baptism be not a mere nullity: for, say they, the outward washing without covenanting with God, is no more baptism, than the body or corpse is a man. The covenant is the chief essential part of baptism. And he that was never entered into covenant with God was never baptized. But infants according to the liturgy, are not entered into covenant with God, which they would prove thus: they that neither ever covenanted by themselves, or by any authorized person for them, were never entered into covenant with God (for that is no act of their's which is done by
a stranger that hath no power to do it) but, &c.—That they did it not themselves is undeniable: that they did it not by any person empowered by God to do it for them they prove, 1. Because godfathers are the persons by whom the infant is said to promise; but godfathers have no power from God, (1.) Not by nature. (2.) Not by Scripture. 2. Because the parents are not only not included as covenanters, but positively excluded, (1.) In that the whole office of covenanting for the child from first to last is laid on others. (2.) In that the twenty-ninth canon saith, 'No parent shall be urged to be present; nor admitted to answer as godfather for his own child;' by which the parent that hath the power is excluded: therefore our children are all unbaptized.

To all this I answer, 1. That the parent's consent is supposed, though he be absent. 2. That the parent is not required to be absent, but only not to be urged to be present; but he may if he will. 3. That the reason of that canon seems to be their jealousy, lest any would exclude godfathers. 4. While the church hath nowhere declared what person the sponsors bear, nor any further what they are to do, than to speak the covenanting words, and promise to see to the pious education of the child, the parents may agree that the godfathers shall do all this as their deputies, primarily, and in their steads, and secondarily as friends that promise their assistance. 5. While parents really consent, it is not their silence that nullifieth the covenant. 6. All parents are supposed and required to be themselves the choosers of the sponsors or sureties, and also to give notice to the minister beforehand: by which it appeareth that their consent is presupposed. And though my own judgment be, that they should be the principal covenanters for the child expressly, yet the want of that expressness, will not make us unbaptized persons.

Quest. XLIII. But the great question is, How the Holy Ghost is given to infants in baptism? And whether all the children of true Christians have inward sanctifying grace? Or whether they can be said to be justified, and to be in a state of salvation, that are not inherently sanctified? And whether any fall from this infant state of salvation?
Answ. Of all these great difficulties I have said what I know, in my Appendix to Infant Baptism, to Mr. Bradford and Dr. Ward, and of bishop Davenant's judgment. And I confess that my judgment agreeeth more in this with Davenant's than any others, saving that he doth not so much appropriate the benefits of baptism to the children of sincere believers as I do. And though by a letter in pleading Davenant's cause, I was the occasion of good Mr. Gataker's printing of his answer to him, yet I am still most inclined to his judgment; not that all the baptized, but that all the baptized seed of true Christians are pardoned, justified, adopted, and have a title to the Spirit and salvation.

But the difficulties in this case are so great, as drive away most who do not equally perceive the greater inconveniences which we must choose, if this opinion be forsaken: that is, that all infants must be taken to be out of the covenant of God, and to have no promise of salvation. Whereas surely the law of grace as well as the covenant of works included all the seed in their capacity.

I. To the first of these questions, I answer, 1. As all true believers, so all their infants do receive initially by the promise, and by way of obseignation and sacramental investiture in baptism, a 'jus relationis,' a right of peculiar relation to all the three persons in the blessed Trinity: as to God, as their reconciled, adopted Father, and to Jesus Christ as their Redeemer and actual Head and Justifier, so also to the Holy Ghost as their Regenerator and Sanctifier. This right and relation adhereth to them, and is given them in order to future actual operation and communion. As a marriage covenant giveth the relation and right to one another, in order to the subsequent communion and duties of a married life: and as he that sweareth allegiance to a king, or is listed into an army, or is entered into a school, receiveth the right and relation, and is so correlated, as obligeth to the mutual subsequent offices of each, and giveth right to many particular benefits. By this right and relation, God is his own God and Father; Christ is his own Head and Saviour; and the Holy Spirit is his own Sanctifier, without asserting what operations are already wrought on his soul, but only to what future ends and uses these relations are. Now as these rights and relations are given
immediately, so those benefits which are relative, and the infant immediately capable of them, are presently given by way of communion: he hath presently the pardon of original sin, by virtue of the sacrifice, merit and intercession of Christ. He hath a state of adoption, and right to Divine protection, provision and church-communion according to his natural capacity, and right to everlasting life.

2. It must be carefully noted, that the relative union between Christ the Mediator and the baptized persons, is that which in baptism is first given in order of nature, and that the rest do flow from this. The covenant and baptism deliver the covenanter, 1. From Divine dispensacy by reconciliation with the Father: 2. From legal penalties by justification by the Son: 3. From sin itself by the operations of the Holy Ghost. But it is Christ as our Mediator-Head, that is first given us in relative union; and then, 1. The Father loveth us with complacency as in the Son, and for the sake of his first beloved. 2. And the Spirit which is given us in relation is first the Spirit of Christ our Head; and not first inherent in us: so that by union with our Head, that Spirit is next united to us, both relatively, and as radically inherent in the human nature of our Lord, to whom we are united. As the nerves and animal spirits which are to operate in all the body, are radically only in the head, from whence they flow into, and operate on the members as there is need (though there may be obstructions); so the Spirit dwelleth in the human nature of our Head, and there it can never be lost; and it is not necessary that it dwell in us by way of radication, but by way of influence and operation.

These things are distinctly and clearly understood but by very few; and we are all much in the dark about them. But I think (however doctrinally we may speak better,) that most Christians are habituated to this perilous misapprehension (which is partly against Christianity itself,) that the Spirit floweth immediately from the Divine nature of the Father and the Son (as to the authoritative or potestative conveyance) unto our souls. And we forget that it is first given to Christ in his glorified humanity as our Head, and radicated in Him, and that it is the office of this glorified

7 The Spirit is not given radically or immediately to any Christian, but to Christ our Head alone, and from him to us.
Head, to send or communicate to all his members from himself, that Spirit which must operate in them as they have need.

This is plain in many texts of Scripture. "He that spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?" (when he giveth him particularly to us.)

"And this is the record that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son: he that hath the Son hath the life, and he that hath not the Son hath not the life." "

"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his."

"And gave him to be the Head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

"The Advocate or Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father," &c.

"If I depart, I will send him unto you." 

"The Comforter, whom the Father will send in my name."

"And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." 

"I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;" (I know that is true of his living in us objectively and finally, but that seemeth not to be all.)

"For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God; when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 3, 4. I know that in verse 3. by 'life' is meant felicity or glory; but not only; as appeareth by verse 4. where Christ is called 'our life.'

"All power is given unto me in heaven and earth" — "I am with you always" — "The Father hath given all things into his hands." 

"Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him, and this is life eternal to know thee," &c.

- Rom. viii. 32.
- Eph. I. 22, 23.
- 1 John v. 11, 12.
- Gal. iv. 6.
- John xiii. 3.
- Rom. viii. 9.
- John xvi. 7.
- Gal. ii. 20.
- John xvii. 2, 3.
"The Son quickeneth whom he will:" "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."

"Labour for that meat which endureth to everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you, for him hath God the Father sealed.—He giveth life unto the world.—Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life—dwelleth in me and I in him—my flesh is meat indeed. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing."

"This spake he of the Spirit which they that believe in him should receive." "God giveth not the Spirit to him by measure."

"He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." "The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

"Through the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ." "Abide in me and I in you: as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me (or, out of me, or, severed from me) ye can do nothing."

I will add no more: all this is proof enough that the Spirit is not given radically or immediately from God to any believer, but to Christ, and so derivatively from him to us. Not that the Divine nature in the third person is subject to the human nature in Christ; but that God hath made it the office of our Mediator's glorified humanity, to be the cistern that shall first receive the waters of life, and convey them by pipes of his appointed means to all the offices of his house: or to be the head of the animal spirits, and by nerves to convey them to all the members.

3. We are much in the dark concerning the degree of infants' glory; and therefore we can as little know, what degree of grace is necessary to prepare them for their glory.

= John v. 21, 25.  
* John vi. 27, 32, 33, 53—56, 63.  
+ John iii. 34.  
= 1 Cor. vi. 17.  
& Phil. i. 19.  
† John xv. 4, 5.
4. It is certain that infants before they are glorified, shall have all that grace that is prerequisite to their preparation and fruition.

5. No sanctified person on earth is in an immediate capacity for glory; because their sin and imperfection must be done away, which is done at the dissolution of soul and body. The very accession of the soul to God doth perfect it.

6. Infants have no actual faith, or hope, or love to God to exercise; and therefore need not the influence of the Spirit of Christ to exercise them.

7. We are all so very much in the dark, as to the clear and distinct apprehension of the true nature of original inherent pravity or sin, that we must needs be as much ignorant of the true nature of that inherent sanctity or righteousness, which is its contrary or care. Learned Illiricus thought it was a substance, which he hath in his "Clavis" pleaded for at large. Others call it a habit, others a nature or natural inclination, and a privation of a natural inclination to God. Others call it an indisposition of the mind and will to holy truth and goodness, and an ill disposition of them to error and evil. Others call it only the inordinate lust of the sensitive faculties, with a debility of reason and will to resist it. And whilst the nature of the soul itself and its faculties, are so much unknown to itself, the nature of original pravity and righteousness must needs be very much unknown.

8. Though an infant be a distinct natural person from his parents, yet he is not actually a distinct person morally as being not a moral agent, and so not capable of moral actions good or evil. Therefore his parents will goeth for his.

9. His first acceptance into the complacental love of God, as distinct from his love of benevolence,) is not for any inherent holiness in himself; but (1.) As the child of a believing parent who hath dedicated him to Christ; and (2.) As a member of Christ, in whom he is well pleased.

10. Therefore God can complacentially as well as benevolently love an infant in Christ, who only believeth and repenteth by the parents, and not by himself, and is not yet supposed to have the spirit of sanctification.

11. For the spirit of sanctification is not the presupposed
condition of his acceptance into covenant with God, but a gift of the covenant of God itself, following both the condition on our part, and our right to be covenanters, or to God’s promise upon that condition.

12. So the adult themselves have the operation of the Spirit by which they believe and repent, by which they come to have their right to God’s part in the covenant of baptism, (for this is antecedent to their baptism): but they have not that gift of the Spirit, which is called in Scripture the “Spirit of sanctification, and of power, love, and a sound mind,” and is the benefit given by the covenant of baptism, till afterward; because they must be in that covenant before it can be made good to them. And their faith or consent is their infant’s right also, antecedent to the covenant gift.

13. There is therefore some notable difference between that work of the Spirit by which we first repent and believe and so have our title to the promise of the Spirit, and that gift of the Spirit which is promised to believers; which is not only the Spirit of miracles given in the first times, but some notable degree of love to our reconciled Father, suitable to the grace and gospel of redemption and reconciliation, and is called the “Spirit of Christ,” and the “Spirit of adoption”, which the apostles themselves seem not to have received till Christ’s ascension. And this seemeth to be not only different from the gifts of the Spirit common to hypocrites and the unbelievers, but also from the special gift of the Spirit which maketh men believers. So that Mr. Tho. Hooker saith more truly than once I understood, that vocation is a special grace of the Spirit, distinct from common grace on one side, and from sanctification on the other side. Whether it be the same degree of the Spirit which the faithful had before Christ’s incarnation, which causeth men first to believe distinct from the higher following degree, I leave to inquiry: but the most certain distinction is from the different effects.

14. Though an infant cannot be either disposed to a holy life, or fit for glory immediately, without an inward holiness of his own, yet by what is said it seemeth plain, that merely on the account of the condition performed by the parent,

and of his union relatively with Christ thereupon, and his title to God's promise on these grounds, he may be said to be in a state of salvation; that is, to have the pardon of his original sin, deliverance from hell, (in right, adoption, and a right to the needful operations of the Holy Ghost, as given to him in Christ, who is the first receiver of the Spirit.

15. But when and in what sort and degree Christ giveth the actual operations of the Spirit to all covenanted infants, it is wonderfully hard for us to know. But this much seemeth clear, 1. That Christ may when he please work on the soul of an infant to change its disposition, before it come to the use of reason. 2. That Christ and his Spirit as in covenant with infants, are ready to give all necessary assistance to infants for their inherent sanctification, in the use of those means, and on those further conditions, on which we must wait for it and expect it. For the Holy Ghost is not so engaged to us in our covenant or baptism, as to be obliged presently to give us all the grace that we want; but only to give it us on certain further conditions, and in the use of certain means. But because this leads me up to another question, I will suspend the rest of the answer to this till that be handled. Only I must answer this objection.

Obj. 'It is contrary to the holy nature of God, complacently to love an unsanctified infant, that is yet in his original corruption unchanged, and he justifieth none relatively from the guilt of sin, whom he doth not at once inherently sanctify.

AnsW. 1. God's complacential love respecteth every one as he is; for it is goodness only that he so loveth. Therefore he so loveth not those that either actually or habitually love not him, under any false supposition that they do love him when they do not. His love therefore to the adult and infants differeth as the objects differ. But there is this lovely in such infants; 1. That they are the children of believing, sanctified parents; 2. That they are by his covenant relatively united to Christ, and are so far lovely as his

* Mr. Whiston, p. 60. sheweth, 'That even the promises of a new heart, &c. Ezek. xxxvi. xxxvii. &c. though they may run in the external tenor of them absolutely, yet are not absolutely absolute, but have a subordinate condition, and that is, that the parties concerned in them do faithfully use the means appointed of God in a subserviency to his working in or bestowing on them the good promised.'
members; (3.) That they are pardoned all their original sin; (4.) That they are set in the way to actual love and holiness; being thus dedicated to God.

2. All imperfect saints are sinners; and all sinners are, as such, abhorred of God, whose pure eyes cannot behold iniquity. As then it will stand with his purity to accept and love the adult upon their first believing, before their further sanctification, and notwithstanding the remnant of their sins, so may it do also to accept their infants through Christ upon their dedication.

3. As the actual sin imputed to infants was Adam's, and their parents' only by act, and not their own, it is no wonder if, upon their parents' faith and repentance, Christ wash and justify them from that guilt which arose only from another's act.

4. And then the inherent pravity was the effect of that act of their ancestors, which is forgiven them. And this pravity or inherent original sin may two ways be said to be mortified radically, or virtually, or inceptively before any inherent change in them, 1. In that it is mortified in their parents from whom they derived it, who have the power of choosing for them; and 2. In that they are by covenant grafted into Christ, and so related to the cause of their future sanctification; yea, 3. In that also they are by covenant and their parents' promise, engaged to use those means which Christ hath appointed for sanctification.

5. And it must be remembered that as this is but an inceptive, preparatory change, so the very pardon of the inherent vitiocity is not perfect, (as I have elsewhere largely proved;) however some Papists and Protestants deny it. While sin remaineth, sin and corruption is still indwelling, besides all the unremoved penalties of it, the very being of it proveth it to be so far unpardoned, in that it is not yet abolished, and the continuance of it being not its smallest punishment, as permitted, and the Spirit not given so far as to cure it. Imperfect pardon may consist with a present right, both to further sanctification by the Spirit, and so to heaven.

7 God's being a God to any individual person, doth require and presuppose that they do for the present, supposing them capable, or for the future as soon as capable, take God in Christ as their God. Ibid. p. 61.
Obj. 'Christ's body hath no unholy members.'

Answ. 1. "Now are your children holy." They are not wholly unholy who have all the fore-described holiness. 2. As infants in nature want memory and actual reason, and yet initially are men; so, as Christ's members, they may want actual and habitual faith and love, and yet initially be sanctified, by their union with him and his Spirit, and their parents' dedication, and be in the way for more, as they grow fit; and be Christians and saints 'in fieri,' or initially only, as they are men.

Quest. xlili. Is the right of the baptized (infants or adult) to the sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost, now absolute, or suspended on further conditions? And are the parents' further duties for their children such conditions of their children's reception of the actual assistances of the Spirit? Or are children's own actions such conditions? And may apostate parents forfeit the covenant benefits to their baptized infants or not?

Answ. The question is great and difficult, and few dare meddle with it. And almost all infant cases are to us obscure.

I. 1. It is certain that it is the parents' great duty to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

2. It is certain that God hath appointed this to be the means of their actual knowledge, faith, and holiness.

3. And God doth not appoint such means unnecessarily or in vain: nor may we ordinarily expect his grace but in the use of the means of grace, which he hath appointed us to use.

4. It is certain that God's receiving the children of the faithful is an act of God's love to the parents as well as the children, and promised as a part of his blessing on themselves.

5. It is certain that these parents hold their own mercies upon the condition of their own continued fidelity: and (let their apostacy be on other reasons never so impossible, or not future, yet) the promise of continuance and consum-
mation of the personal felicity of the greatest saint on earth, is still conditional, upon the condition of his persevering fidelity.

6. Even before children are capable of instruction, there are certain duties imposed by God on the parents for their sanctification; viz. 1. That the parents pray earnestly and believingly for them. 2. That they themselves so live towards God, as may invite him still to bless their children for their sakes, as he did Abraham's, and usually did to the faithful's seed.

7. It is certain that the church ever required parents, not only to enter their children into the covenant, and so to leave them, but to do their after duty for their good, and to pray for them, and educate them according to their covenant.

8. It is plain that if there were none to promise so to educate them, the church would not baptize them. And God himself who allowed the Israelites, and still alloweth us to bring our children into his covenant, doth it on this supposition, that we promise also to go on to do our duty for them, and that we actually do it.

9. All this set together maketh it plain, 1. That God never promiseth the adult in baptism, though true believers, that he will work in them all graces further by his sanctifying Spirit, let them never so much neglect or resist him; or that he will absolutely see that they never shall resist him; nor that the Spirit shall still help them, though they neglect all his means; or that he will keep them from neglecting the means (election may secure this to the elect as such; but the baptismal covenant as such, secureth it not to the baptized, nor to believers as such). 2. And consequently that infants are in covenant with the Holy Ghost still conditionally as their parents are; and that the meaning of it is that the Holy Ghost as your Sanctifier will afford you all necessary help, in the use of those means which he hath appointed you to receive his help in.

Object. 'Infants have no means to use.'

Answ. While infants stand on their parents' account, or

b The Holy Ghost is promised in baptism to give the child grace in his parents and his own faithful use of the appointed means.
wills, the parents have means to use for the continuance of their grace, as well as for the beginning of it.

10. Therefore I cannot see but that if a believer should apostatize (whether any do so is not the question) and his infant not to be made another's child, he forfeiteth the benefits of the covenant to his infant. But if the propriety in the infant be transferred to another, it may alter the case.

11. And how dangerously parents may make partial forfeitures of the Spirit's assistance to their children, and operations on them, by their own sinful lives, and neglect of prayer, and of prudent and holy education, even in particular acts, I fear many believing parents never well considered.

12. Yet is not this forfeiture such as obligeth God to deny his Spirit; for he may do with his own, as a free benefactor, as he list; and may have mercy freely, beyond his promise, (though not against his Word) on whom he will have mercy. But I say that he that considereth the woful unfaithfulness and neglect of most parents, even the religious, in the great work of holy educating their children, may take the blame of their ungodliness on themselves, and not lay it on Christ or the Spirit who was in covenant with them as their sanctifier, seeing he promised but conditionally to give them the sanctifying heavenly influences of his life, light, and love, in their just use of his appointed means, according to their abilities.

13. Also as soon as children come to a little use of reason, they stand conjunctly on their parents' wills and on their own. As their parents are bound to teach and rule them, so they are bound to learn of them and be ruled by them for their good. And though every sin of a parent or a child be not a total forfeiture of grace, yet both their no-

---

*Mr. Whiton p. 53. 'As Abraham as a single person in the covenant was to accept of and perform the conditions of the covenant—so as a parent he had something of duty incumbent on him with reference to his (immediate) seed: and as his faithful performance of that duty incumbent on him in his single capacity, so his performing that duty incumbent on him as a parent in reference to his seed, was absolutely necessary in order to his enjoying the good promised, with reference to himself and his seed: proved Gen. xvii. 1. xviii. 19. He proved that the promise is conditional, and that as to the continuance of the covenant state the conditions are 1. The parent’s upright life. 2. His duty to his children well done. 3. The children’s own duty as they are capable.*
table actual sins may justly be punished, with a denial of some further help of the Spirit which they grieve and quench.

II. And now I may seasonably answer the former question, whether infants' baptismal saving grace may be lost, of which I must for the most that is to be said refer the reader to Davenant (in Mr. Bedford's book) on this subject, and to Dr. Samuel Ward joined with it, (though Mr. Gataker's answers are very learned and considerable:) and to my small book called "My Judgment of Perseverance."

Augustine who first rose up for the doctrine of perseverance, against its adversaries, carried it no higher than to all the elect as such, and not at all to all the sanctified; but oft affirmeth that some that were justified, sanctified, and love God, and are in a state of salvation, are not elect, and fall away; but since the reformation, great reasons have been brought to carry it further to all the truly sanctified; of which cause Zanchius was one of the first learned and zealous patrons, that with great diligence in long disputations maintained it. All that I have now to say is, that I had rather with Davenant believe that the fore-described infant state of salvation, which came by the parents, may be lost by the parents and the children, (though such a sanctified, renewed nature in holy habits of love as the adult have be never lost) than believe that no infants are in the covenant of grace and to be baptized.

Object. But the child once in possession shall not be punished for the parents' sin.

Answ. 1. This point is not commonly well understood. I have by me a large disputation proving from the current of Scripture, a secondary original sin, besides that from Adam, and a secondary punishment ordinarily inflicted on children for their parents' sins, besides the common punishment of the world for the first sin. 2. But the thing in question is but a loss of that benefit which they received and hold only by another. It is not so properly called a punishment for another's sin, as a non-deliverance, or a non-continuance of their deliverance, which they were to receive on the condition of another's duty.

Object. But the church retaineth them as her members, and so their right is not lost by the fault or apostacy of the parents.
Anno. 1. Lost it is one way or other, with multitudes of true Christians' children, who never shew any signs of grace, and prove sometimes the worst of men. And God breaketh not his covenant.

2. How doth the church keep the Greeks' children that are made Janizaries?

3. No man stayeth in the church without title. If the church or any Christians take them as their own, that is another matter. I will not now stay to discuss the question, whether apostates' baptized infants be still church-members? But what I have said of their right before God, seemeth plain.

4. And mark, that on whomsoever you build an infant's right, you may as well say, that he may suffer for other men's default; for if you build it on the magistrate, the minister, the church, the godfathers, any of them may fail; they may deny him baptism itself; they may fail in his education: shall he suffer then for want of baptism, or good education when it is their faults? Whoever a child or a man is to receive a benefit by, the failing of that person may deprive him of that benefit. More objections I must pretermit, to avoid prolixity.

Quest. XLIV. Doth baptism always oblige us at the present, and give grace at the present? And is the grace which is not given till long after, given by baptism; or an effect of baptism?

Answ. I add this case for two reasons, 1. To open their pernicious error who think that a covenant or promise made by us to God, only for a future, distant duty (as to repent and believe before we die,) is all that is essential to our baptismal covenanting. 2. To open the ordinary saying of many divines, who say, that baptism worketh not always at the present, but sometimes only long afterward. The truth I think may be thus expressed.

1. It is not baptism, if there be not the profession of a present belief, a present consent, and a present dedication, or resignation, or dedication of the person to God, by the adult for themselves, and by parents for their infants. He that only saith, ' I promise to believe, repent, and obey
only at twenty or thirty years of age, is not morally baptized; for it is another covenant of his own which he would make, which God accepteth not.

2. It is not only a future, but a present relation to God, as his own, his subjects, his children by redemption, to which the baptized person doth consent.

3. It is a present correlation and not a future only, to which God consenteth on his part, to be their Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier, their Owner peculiarly, their Ruler graciously, and their chief Benefactor, and Felicity, and End.

4. It is not only a future but a present remission of sin, and adoption and right to temporal and eternal mercies, which God giveth to true consenters by his covenant and baptism.

5. But those mercies which we are not at that present capable of, are not to be given at the present, but afterward when we are capable; as the particular assistances of the Spirit, necessary upon all future particular occasions, &c.; the pardon of future sins; actual glorification, &c.⁴

6. And the duties which are to be performed only for the future, we must promise at present to perform only for the future, in their season, to our lives' end. Therefore we cannot promise that infants shall believe, obey or love God, till they are naturally capable of doing it.

7. If any hypocrite do not indeed repent, believe, or consent when he is baptized, or baptizeth his child, he so far faileth in the covenant professed; and so much of baptism is undone; and God doth not enter into the present covenant-relations to him, as being incapable thereof⁵.

8. If this person afterwards repent and believe, it is a doing of the same thing which was omitted in baptism, and a making of the same covenant; but not as a part of his baptism itself, which is long past.

9. Nor is he hereupon to be re-baptized; because the external part was done before, and is not to be done twice; but the internal part which was omitted, is now to be done, not as a part of baptism (old or new); but as a part of penitence, for his omission.

Object. If covenating be a part of baptism, then this

⁴ Rom. vi. 1. 4. 6, 7. ⁵ Acts viii. 37, 38, 13. 20—23.
person, whose covenant is never a part of his baptism, doth live and die unbaptized.

Answ. As baptism signifieth only the external ordinance, heart-covenanting is no part of it, but the profession of it is; and if there was no profession of faith made, by word or sign, the person is unbaptized. But as baptism signifieth the internal part with the external, so he will be no baptized person while he liveth; that is, one that in baptism did truly consent, and receive the spiritual relations to God; but he will have the same thing in another way of God’s appointment.

10. When this person is after sanctified, it is by God’s performance of the same covenant in specie, which baptism is made to seal, that God doth pardon, justify and adopt him; but this is not by his past baptism as a cause, but by after grace and absolution. The same covenant doth it but not baptism; because indeed the covenant or promise saith, ‘Whenever thou believest and repentest, I will forgive thee;’ but baptism saith, ‘Because thou now believest, I do forgive thee, and wash away thy sin;’ and maketh present application.

11. So if an infant or adult person live without grace, and at age be ungodly, his baptismal covenant is violated; and his after conversion (or faith and repentance) is neither the fulfilling of God’s covenant, nor of his baptism neither. The reason is, because though pardon and adoption be given by that conditional covenant of grace which baptism sealeth, yet so is not that first grace of faith and repentance which is the condition of pardon and adoption, and the title to baptism itself. Else infidels should have right to baptism, and thereby to faith and repentance. But these are only the free gifts of God to the elect, and the fulfilling of some absolute predictions concerning the calling of the elect, and the fulfilling of God’s will or covenant to Christ the Mediator, that “He shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied,” and possess those that are given him by the Father.

12. But when the condition of the covenant is at first performed by the parent for the infant, and this covenant never broken on this child’s behalf, (notwithstanding sins of infirmity,) in this case the first actual faith and repen-
tance of children as they grow up, is from God's fulfilling of his baptismal covenant with them. The reason is, because that God in that covenant did give them a right of relation to the Holy Spirit in Christ their head, as their Sanctifier, to operate on them as they are capable. But if they first prove apostates and be after converted, God is disobedged (yea, to hypocrites never was obliged) as to the engagement made by him in baptism; and doth now, 1. Freely give them faith and repentance as a benefactor to his elect, and then, 2. As a covenanter give them pardon and adoption, &c.

13. So to the adult, that truly made the baptismal covenant and never apostatized from it, all the grace that God giveth them through their lives, is his fulfilling of his promises made to them, and sealed by baptism, and a fruit of their baptism. But to hypocrites and apostates it is otherwise, as is before explained.

Quest. xlv. What is a proper violation of our baptismal covenant.

Anno. Note well, that there is a wide difference between these questions, 1. When doth a man miss of, or lose his present part in the covenant or promise of God in the Gospel? (This is as long as he is impenitent, an unbeliever and refuser.) 2. When doth a man totally lose his part and hope in that promise or covenant of God, so as to be liable to all the penalty of it? That is only by final impenitence, unbelief and refusal, when life is ended. 3. And when doth a man violate his own covenant or promise made to God in baptism? Which is our present question. To which I answer,

1. This promise hath parts essential and parts integral: we promise not both these parts alike, nor on the same terms; though both be promised. The essential parts, are our essential duties of Christianity, (faith, love, repentance in the essential parts,) &c. The integrals are the integral duties of Christianity.

1 John iii. 16—18, 36. i. 11—13.
2 Pet. ii. 20—23. Heb. vi. 2. 4—8. x. 26—28. 1 John i. 9, 10.
James iii. 2, 3.
2. He that performeth not the essential duties is an apostate, or hypocrite.

3. He that performeth not the integral duties is a sinner, not only against the law of nature, and Christ's precepts, but his own promise; (and in this sense we all confess our breach of covenant with Christ,) but he is no apostate, hypocrite, or out of covenant.

Quest. XLVI. May not baptism in some cases be repeated? And when?

Answ. 1. You must distinguish between baptism, taken morally, or only physically. 2. Between baptism morally, as it is a church or visible covenant, and as a heart-covenant. 3. Between real baptism and seeming baptism, which is a nullity. 4. Between certain reception of baptism, and that which is uncertain or justly doubted of. And so I answer,

1. Real and certain baptism as a visible church-ordination may not be repeated. Though the heart-covenant was wanting. And though it wanted not only decent modes, but integral parts.

2. But in these cases baptism may be used where it seemed to have been received before.

1. When the person made no profession of the Christian faith (nor his parents for him, if an infant). 2. If that profession notoriously wanted an essential part; as if he only professed to believe in God the Father, and not in the Son, or the Holy Ghost. 3. If the minister only baptized him into the name of the Father, or Son, or left out any essential part. 4. If the person or ministry only contracted for a distant futurity, (as I will be a Christian when I am old, &c.) and not for the present; which is not to be christened, but only to promise to be christened hereafter. 5. If all application of water (or any watery element) was omitted, which is the external sign. 6. Of the baptizer's power I shall speak anon. 7. If the church or the person himself have just cause of doubting, whether he was truly baptized or not, to do it again, with hypothetical expressions, 'If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee;' yea, or simply while that is understood, is lawful, and fit. And it
is not to be twice baptized morally, but only physically, as
I have fully opened in the question of re-ordination, to which
I must refer the reader.

3. And I confess I make little doubt but that those in
Acts xix. were re-baptized, notwithstanding the witty eva-
sion invented by Phil. Marnixius Aldegandus, and Beza's
improvement of it, and the now common reception of that
interpretation.

For 1. A new and forced exposition which no reader
dreameth of till it be put into his head, is usually to be sus-
ppected, lest art deceive us.

2. The omission of the Holy Ghost is an essential defect,
and maketh baptism specially another thing; and he were
now to be re-baptized who should be so baptized.

3. Whatever some say in heat against the Papists, John's
baptism and our Christian baptism are so especially dis-
tinct also, that he that had now but John's were to be yet
baptized: the person of the Messiah himself being not de-
terminately put into John's baptism as such. Nor can it be
supposed that all the Jews that John baptized, were baptized
into the profession of faith in this numerical person Jesus,
but only to an unknown Saviour undetermined: however he
pointed to Christ in the hearing of some of his disciples.
We must not run from plain truth in peevishness of opposi-
tion to Papists or any other men.

4. The fifth verse would not be true of John's baptism
as the history sheweth, that "When John's hearers heard
this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus."
This is contrary to the text that recordeth it.

5. In the fourth verse, the words "that is, on Christ
Jesus" are plainly Paul's expository words of John's, and
not John's words. John baptized them "into the name of
the Messiah that should come after him," which indeed,
saith Paul was Christ Jesus, though not then personally de-
termined by John.

6. The connexion of the fourth, fifth and sixth verses
puts all out of doubt. 1. In the fourth verse the last words
are Paul's, "that is, on Christ Jesus." 2. In the next
words, verse 4. "When they heard this, they were baptized,
&c." must refer to the last words, or to his that was speak-
ing to them. 3. Verse 6. the pronoun "them" "when
Paul had laid his hands on them," plainly referreth to them last spoken of, verse 5., which therefore were not John's bearers as such. 4. And the words "they were baptized in- to the name of the Lord Jesus," are plainly distinctive from John's baptism. Saith Grotius, 'Sic accipere Latinas, Sy- rus, Arabs, et Veteres omnes ante Marnixium (ut verba Lucae). Yet I say not so hardly of John's baptism, as Ter- tullian on this text, (de Baptis.) 'Adeo postea in Actis Apostolorum invenimus, quoniam qui Johannis baptismum habebant, non accepissent Spiritum Sanctum, quem ne au- ditu quidam noverant: ergo non erat cœleste, quod cœlestia non exhibebat.' See Dr. Hammond in loc.

Quest. xlvii. Is baptism by laymen or women lawful in cases of necessity? Or are they nullities, and the person to be re- baptized?

Answ. I. I know some of the ancients allowed it in ne- cessity. But I know no such necessity that can be: For 1. God hath expressly made it a part of the ministerial office by commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. 2. He hath no where given to any other either command to oblige them to do it, or commission to authorize them, or promise to bless and accept them in it, or threatening if they omit it. 3. He oft severely punisheth such as invade the sacred function, or usurp any part of it. 4. Therefore it is a sin in the doer, and then there can be no necessity of it in such a case in the receiver. 5. He that is in covenant by open, professed consent, wants nothing necessary to his salvation, either 'necessitate medii vel præcepti,' when it cannot be had in a lawful way.

II. As to the nullity I will not determine so controverted a point any further than to say, 1. That if the layman had the counterfeit orders of a minister, and had possession of the place, and were taken for one, his deceit deprived not the receiver of his right, nor made it his sin, and I should not re-baptize him, if after discovered.

2. But if he were in no possession, or pretence of the office, I would be baptized again, if it were my case; be- cause I should fear that what is done in Christ's name by one that notoriously had no authority from him to do it, is
not owned by Christ as his deed, and so is a nullity. As if a deceiver go in my name to make bargains for me.

3. And if any that had after discovered a minister to be indeed no minister that baptized him, should doubt of the validity, and for certainty have it done again by an authorized minister, I would not discommend him; nor would I account it morally twice baptizing, but a physical repeating of that act which morally is but one: (as I explained before of re-ordination).

Therefore if one that was a gross heretic in the very essentials, or an infidel, or one that had not knowledge and parts essentially necessary to the ministry baptize one (in right words) I would not blame him that for certainty would have an authorized person to do it; especially if he was notoriously such an one when he did it. Let those that are angry with this resolution be as fair to me as they will be to Venerable Bede, and that great miracle-working bishop, John, whom in his ecclesiastical history he reporteth to baptize a man again in England, merely because the priest that did it was so dull, ignorant, and insufficient, as in John's judgment to be incapable of the office, and therefore had been by him forbidden to use it, though the person baptized (at age) knew not this: viz. Herebaldu, ut Bed. lib. v. c. 6.

**Quest. xlviii. May Anabaptists, that have no other error, be permitted in church-communion?**

**Answ.** Yes, and tolerated in their own practice also: for 1. They agree with us in all points absolutely necessary to communion.

2. The ancient Christians had liberty either to baptize, or to let them stay till age, as they thought best; and therefore Tertullian and Nazianzen speak against haste; and Augustine, and many children of Christian parents were baptized at age.

3. The controversy is of so great difficulty, that if in all such cases none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the world or church, but endlessly excommunicate or persecute one another.

4. Such sober Antipaedobaptists will consent, to profess
openly, that they do devote their children to God according to all the power or duty which they can find communicated or laid upon them in the Word of God; and that if they believed that God would accept them into his covenant upon their dedication, they would willingly do it. And that actually they do offer them to God according to their power, and promise to bring them up in his way. And who can force men's wills to choose aright for themselves or others?

Quest. xl ix. May one offer his child to be baptized, with the sign of the cross, or the use of chrism, the white garment, milk and honey, or exorcism, as among the Lutherans, who taketh these to be unlawful things?

Answ. I am not now to meddle with the question, Whether they be lawful; but to this question I answer,

1. He that judgeth them unlawful, must first do his best to be certain whether they be so or not.

2. If so, he must never approve of them, or consent to them.

3. He must not offer his child to be so baptized, when 'cæteris paribus,' he may have it done in a better manner on lawful terms.

4. But when he cannot lawfully have better, he may and must offer his child, to them that will so baptize him, rather than to worse, or not at all; because baptism is God's ordinance and his privilege, and the sin is the minister's and not his. Another man's sinful mode will not justify the neglect of our duty; else we might not join in any prayer or sacrament in which the minister modally sinneth; that is, with none.

5. The milk and honey, white garment and chrism, are so ancient (called by Epiphanius and others, the traditions and customs of the universal church) that the original of them is not known. And he that then would not be so baptized, must not have been baptized at all.

6. But in this case he that bringeth his child to baptism, should make known, that it is baptism only that he desireth, and that he disowneth and disalloweth the manner which he accounteth sinful: and then he is no consenter to it.
7. But where law, scandal, or greater inconveniences forbid him, he is not to make this profession openly in the congregation, but in that prudent manner which beseemeth a sober, peaceable person; whether to the minister in private, or to his neighbours in converse: it being easy among neighbours to make known a man's dissent, without a disorderly troubling of the church, or violating the laws of obedience, civility and peace.

8. But he must not, (1.) Either offer his child to baptism, where the ordinance is essentially corrupted, or worse than none. (2.) Or where he cannot be admitted without an actual sin of his own; as by false professions, subscriptions, &c. For we must not do evil for good ends.

Quest. 1. Whence came the ancient, universal custom of anointing at baptism, and putting on a white garment, and tasting milk and honey? And whether they are lawful to us?

Answ. 1. We must remember that the signification of these was not by a new institution of their's, but by former custom of the countries where they lived. As (1.) Anointing in Judea was like bathing at Rome: it was taken in those scorching countries for a wholesome, and easing, and comforting thing; and therefore used to refresh the weary limbs of travellers, and to comfort the sick.

(2.) And it was the long accustomed ceremony also used on officers accounted sacred, kings and priests, who were anointed at their entrance and investiture.

(3.) White cloathing and purple were then and there taken for the noblest attire: not appropriated to sacred things and persons; but as scarlet lately in England, the garb only of great men. On which account, not as a sacred vestment, but as an honourable cloathing, when the bishops began to be advanced, they were allowed to wear white cloathing, not only when they officiated, but at other times.

(4.) The milk and honey were there highly esteemed for food, and accounted the character of the land of promise.
2. Hereupon by application the churches used these signs in the sacred ordinance of baptism: not by new institution of the signification, I say, but by application of the old well known signification.

3. As natural signs are commonly allowed to be applied to holy things, so signs whose signification is of old and commonly stated and well known by agreement or custom, do seem in this not to be different from natural signs. Such are all words, as signs of our minds; no word signifying any thing naturally, but by agreement or custom only. And such is kneeling in prayer, and being uncovered, and many the like: about some of which Paul appealeth to the custom of the churches of God.

4. It is most probable that these two things together brought in anointing; (1.) The common use of anointing then, in both the foresaid cases, (common refreshment and sacred investiture). (2.) And the mistake of all those Scripture texts, which command or mention anointing metaphorical; as 1 John ii. 27. "The anointing which you have received—teacheth you all things." Ezek. xvi. 9. "I washed thee, I anointed thee with oil," &c. Psal. cv. 15. 1 Chron. xvi. 22. "Touch not mine anointed." Rev. iii. 18.

And withal reading that we are made kings and priests to God, and a royal priesthood, they thought this might be signified by the usual honorary signs of such, as well as by words to be called such. So that they took it as if in our age, the baptized should be set in a chair of state, and sumptuously appareled, and a feast made to solemnize it, as they do at weddings, and the baptized person set at the upper end, &c., which are significant actions and ceremonies; but they intended them not as new sacraments, or any part of the sacraments, but as a pompous celebration of the sacrament by such additional ceremonial accidents.

5. And you must remember that they lived among infidels, where their profession was made the common scorn, which tempted them by such ostentation and pomp to seek to make it honourable, and to show that they so accounted it, and to encourage those who were discouraged by the scorn. On which account also they used the cross, and the memorials of the martyrs.

6. Yet some, yea, many afterwards did seem to take the
anointing for a sacramental action. When they read that
the laying on of hands was the sign of giving the Holy
Ghost, as distinct from baptism, and that the Spirit is called
in Scripture the anointing, they joined both together, and
made that which they now call the sacrament of confirma-
tion.

7. Whether the anointing, milk and honey, and the
white garment, were then sinful in themselves to the users,
I determine not. But certainly they proved very ill by ac-
cident, whilst at this door those numerous and unlawful ce-
remonies have entered, which have so troubled the churches,
and corrupted religion; and among the Papists, Greeks,
Armenians, Abassines, and many others, have made the
sauce to become the meat, and the lace to go for clothing,
and turned too much of God's worship into imagery, sha-
dows, and pompous shews.

Quest. LII. Whether it be necessary that they that are baptized
in infancy, do solemnly at age renew and own their baptis-
mal covenant, before they have right to the state and privi-
leges of adult members? And if they do not, whether they
are to be numbered with Christians or apostates?

Answ. 1. Church-membership is the same thing in in-
fants and in the adult.

2. Infants are naturally incapable of doing all that in
baptism which the adult must do: as to understand, profess,
&c. themselves.

3. The baptism of the adult, being the most complete,
because of the maturity of the receivers, is made the stand-
ing pattern in Scripture: for God formeth his ordinances
to the most perfect ordinary receivers.

4. Though an infant be devoted acceptably to God by
his parent's will, yet when he is at age, it must be done by
his own will.

5. Therefore a bare infant title ceaseth when we come to
age, and the person's title ceaseth, unless it be renewed by
himself, or his own consent. The reason is, because the
conditions of his infant title then cease: for his parent's
will, shall go for his no longer.

6. Regularly and 'ad bene esse' the transition out of
the state of infant-membership into the state of adult-membership should be very solemn; and by an understanding, personal owning of the baptismal covenant.

7. There needeth no other proof of this, than, 1. That God in Scripture never gave adult persons title to his covenant, but by their own personal consent; and at the first institution of baptism, both went together, (personal profession and baptism) because the receivers were adult. 2. And that infants are capable of baptism, but not of personal profession. 3. Therefore though they are not to repeat baptism, which was done before, yet they are bound to make that profession at age which they never made before.

8. Where this solemn owning of their covenant cannot be had (by reason of church corruptions, and magistrate's prohibition) there the person's ordinary joining with the church, in the public profession and worship, is to be taken for an owning it.

9. He that being baptized in infancy, doth no way at full age own his baptismal covenant, is to be taken for an apostate. 1. Because his infant title ceaseth. 2. And he notoriously violateth his covenant. 3. Because he can be no adult Christian that no way oweth Christ.

10. But this is to be understood of those that have opportunity; for one in a wilderness among heathens only, cannot join in public worship, nor give testimony of his Christianity to the church.

11. Though the sacrament of the Lord's supper be appointed for the renewing of our covenant at age, yet is it not the first owning of the covenant, by the aged; for that sacrament belongeth neither to infants nor infidels; and he that claimeth it, must be an adult church-member or Christian; which those are not, who at full age no way ever owned their baptismal covenant, nor made any personal profession of Christianity.

But of this I have written purposely in a "Treatise of Confirmation" long ago.

Quest. 111. Whether the universal church consist only of particular churches and their members?

1 See the proofs of all in my "Treatise of Confirmation."
Answ. No: particular churches are the most regular and noble parts of the universal church; but not the whole; no more than cities and corporations be all the kingdom. 1. Some may be as the church, baptized before they can come to any particular church; or as Paul, before they can be received.

2. Some may live where church tyranny hindereth them, by sinful impositions; as all that live among the Papists.

3. Some may live in times of doubting, distraction and confusion, and not know what church ordinarily to join with, and may providently go promiscuously to many, and keep in an unfixed state for a time.

4. Some may be wives, children, or servants, who may be violently hindered.

5. Some may live where no particular churches are; as merchants and embassadors among Mahometans and heathens.

Quest. 311. Must the pastor first call the church, and aggregate them to himself, or the church first congregate themselves, and then choose the pastor?

Answ. 1. The pastors are in order of nature, if not in time, first ministers of Christ in general, before they are related to a particular charge.

2. As such ministers, they first make men fit to be congregate, and tell them their duty therein.

3. But it is a matter variable and indifferent, whether the minister first say, 'All that will join with me, and submit to me as their pastor, shall be my particular charge;' or the people before congregated do call a man to be their pastor.

Quest. 314. Wherein doth a particular church of Christ's institution differ from a consociation of many churches?

Answ. 1. In that such a particular church is a company of Christians associated for personal, immediate communion in God's worship and in holy living; whereas consociations

of churches, are combined for mediate distinct communion, or by delegates or representatives (as in synods*).

2. Such a particular church is constituted of one or more pastors with the people, officiating in the sacred ministry among them, in doctrine, worship, and discipline, in order to the said personal communion. But a consociation of churches hath no particular head as such, of Divine institution, to constitute and govern them as one. In Ignatius's time every particular church was characterized or known by two marks of unity, 1. One altar, (that is, one place for assembling for holy communion). 2. One bishop with the presbyters and deacons: and two altars and two bishops proved two churches.

3. A particular church under one bishop or the same pastors, is a political, holy society; but a combination of many churches consociate, is not so, but only, 1. Either a community agreeing to live in concord, as neighbour kingdoms may. 2. Or else a human policy or society, and not of Divine immediate institution. So that if this consociation of churches be called a church, it must be either equivocally or in a human sense.

Quest. lv. Whether a particular church may consist of more assemblies than one? Or must needs meet all in one place?

Answ. 1. The true distinguishing note of a particular church is, that they be associated for holy communion in worship and holy living, not by delegates, nor distantly only, by owning the same faith, and loving one another, as we may do with those at the antipodes; but personally in presence.

2. Therefore they must necessarily be so near, as to be capable of personal, present communion.

3. And it is most convenient that they be no more than can ordinarily meet in the same assembly, at least for sacramental communion.

4. But yet they may meet in many places or assemblies, as chapels, or oratories, or other subordinate meetings which are appointed to supply the necessity of the weak and aged, and them that cannot travel far. And in times of persecu-

tion, when the church dare not at all meet in one place, they may make up several smaller meetings, under several pastors of the same church. But they should come all together as oft as they can.

5. And it is to be considered that all the persons of a family can seldom go to the assembly at one time, especially when they live far off. Therefore if a church-place would receive but ten thousand, yet twenty thousand might be members, while half meet one day, and half another (or another part of the day).

6. Two congregations distinctly associated for personal worship, under distinct pastors, or having statedly (as Ignatius speaketh) two bishops and two altars, are two particular churches, and can no otherwise be one church, than as that may be called one which is a consociation of divers.

Quest. lvi. Is any form of church-government of Divine institution?

Ans. Yea: there are two essentially different policies or forms of church-government of Christ's own institution, never to be altered by man. 1. The form of the universal church, as headed by Christ himself; which all Christians own, as they are Christians in their baptism.

2. Particular churches which are headed by their particular bishops or pastors, and are parts of the universal, as a troop is of an army, or a city of a kingdom.

Here it is of Divine institution, 1. That there be holy assemblies for the public worship of God.

2. That these assemblies be societies, constituted of the people with their pastors, who are to them as captains to their troops, under the general, or as mayors to cities under the king *.

3. That these pastors have the power of the keys, or the special guidance and governance (by the word, not by the sword) of their own particular charge, in the matters of faith, worship, and holy living; and that the flocks obey

them. And when all this is 'jure divino,' why should any say, that no form of government is 'jure divino?'

3. Moreover it is of Divine appointment, that these churches hold the nearest concord, and help each other as much as they can; whether by synods, or other meet ways of correspondence. And though this be not a distinct government, it is a distinct mode of governing.

Object. 'But that there be pastors with fixed churches or assemblies is not of the law of nature.'

Answ. 1. Hath Christ no law but the law of nature? Wherein then differ the Christian religion and the heathenish? 2. Suppose but Christ to be Christ, and man to be what he is, and nature itself will tell us that this is the fittest way for ordering the worship of God. For nature saith, God must be solemnly and ordinarily worshipped, and that qualified persons should be the official guides in the performance, and that people who need such conduct and private oversight besides, should where they live have their own stated overseers.

Object. 'But particular congregations are not 'de primaria intentione divina:' for if the whole world could join together in the public worship of God, no doubt that would be properly a church. But particular congregations are only accidental, in reference to God's intention of having a church, because of the impossibility of all men's joining together for ordinances, &c.

Answ. 1. The question with me is not whether they be of primary intention, but whether stated churches headed with their proper bishops or pastors be not of God's institution in the Scripture?

2. This objection confirmeth it, and not denieth it. For '1. If confesseth that there is a necessity of joining for God's worship: 2. And an impossibility that all the world should join: 3. But if the whole world could so join, it would be properly a church.' So that it confesseth that 'to be a society joined for God's public worship, is to be properly a church.' And we confess all this: if all the world could be one family, they might have one master, or one kingdom, they might have one king. But when it is confessed, that, 1. A natural impossibility of an universal assembly necessitateth more particular assemblies; 2. And that Christ
hath instituted such actually in his Word, what more can a considerate man require?

3. I do not understand this distinction, 'de primaria intentione divina,' and accidental, &c. The primary intention is property of the ultimate end only: and no man thinketh that a law 'de mediis,' of the means, is no law, or that God hath made no laws 'de mediis:' for Christ as a mediator is a means. But suppose it be limited to the matter of church laws; if this be the meaning of it, that it is not the principal means, but a subordinate means, or that it is not instituted only 'propter finem ultimum,' no more than 'propter se,' but also in order to a higher thing as its immediate end, we make no question of that. Assemblies are not only that there may be assemblies; but for the worship and offices there performed: and those for man; and all for God. But what of all this? Hath God made no laws for subordinate means? No Christian denieth it.

Therefore the learned and judicious disputer of this point declareth himself for what I say, when he saith, 'I engage not in the controversy, Whether a particular congregation be the first political church or no: it sufficeth for my purpose, that there are other churches besides.—The thing in question is, Whether there be no other church but such particular congregations.' Where it seemeth granted that such particular churches are of Divine institution: and for other churches I shall say more anon. In the mean time note, that the question is but 'de nomine' here, whether the name 'church,' be fit for other societies, and not 'de re.'

But lest any should grow to the boldness to deny that 'Christ hath instituted Christian stated societies, consisting of pastors and flocks, associate for personal communion in public worship and holy living;' (which is my definition of a particular church, as not so confined to one assembly, but that it may be in divers, and yet not consisting of divers such distinct stated assemblies with their distinct pastors, nor of such as can have no personal communion, but only by delegates;) I prove it thus from the Word of God.

Dr. Stillingfleet's Lec. p 156. so p. 170. By church here I mean not a particular congregation, &c. So he granteth that, 1. The universal church, 2. Particular congregations are of Divine institution, one 'ex intentione primaria,' and the other, as he calls it, accidentally, but yet of natural necessity.
(1.) The apostles were commissioned by Christ to deliver his commands to all the churches, and settle them according to his will, John xx. 21.—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, &c.


(3.) These apostles wherever the success of the Gospel prepared them materials, did, settle Christian stated societies, consisting of pastors or elders with their flocks, associated for personal communion in public worship and holy living. These settled churches they gave orders to for their direction, and preservation, and reformation: these they took the chief care of themselves, and exhorted their elders to fidelity in their work. They gave command that none should forsake such assemblies; and they so fully describe them, as that they cannot easily be misunderstood. All this is proved, Acts xiv. 23. Titus i. 5. Rom. xvi. 1. 1 Cor. xi. 18. 20. 22. 26. xiv. 4, 5. 12. 19. 23. 28. 33, 34. Col. iv. 16. Acts xi. 26. xiii. 1. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. Acts xiv. 27. xv. 3. to omit many more. Here are proofs enough that such particular churches were 'de facto' settled by the apostles, Heb. x. 25. "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together." So James ii. 2. they are called synagogues.

2. It is confessed that there is a natural necessity of such stated churches or assemblies, supposing but the institution of the worship itself which is there performed: and if so, then we may say that the law of nature itself doth partly require them.

(1.) It is of the law of nature, that God be publicly worshipped, as most expositors of the fourth commandment de confess.

(2.) It is of the law of nature that the people be taught to know God and their duty, by such as are able and fit to teach them.

(3.) The law of nature requireth, that man being a sociable creature, and conjunction working strongest affections, we should use our sociableness in the greatest matters, and by conjunction help the zeal of our prayers and praises of God.
(4.) God's institution of public preaching, prayer and praise, are scarce denied by any Christians.

(5.) None of these can be publicly done but by assembling.

(6.) No assembly can suffice for these without a minister of Christ; because it is only his office to be the ordinary teacher, and to go before the people in prayer and praise, and to administer the Lord's supper, which without a minister may not be celebrated, because Christ's part cannot be otherwise performed, than by some one in his name, and by his warrant, to deliver his sealed covenant to the receivers, and to invest them visibly in the benefits of it, and receive them that offer themselves in covenant to him.

(7.) It is also a ministerial duty to instruct the people personally, and to watch over them at other times, Acts xx. 20. 28. And to be examples of the flock, 1 Pet. v. 1—3. To have the rule over the people, and labour among them, and admonish them, 1 Thess. v. 12. Heb. xiii. 7. 17. 1 Tim. v. 17. To exercise holy discipline among them, Titus iii. 10. Matt. xviii. 17, 18. 1 Cor. v. To visit the sick and pray over them, James v. 14. Yea, to take care of the poor. See Dr. Hammond on 1 Cor. xii. 28. And all this cannot possibly be well done by uncertain, transient ministers, but only by a resident, stated pastor, no more than transient strangers can rule all our families, or all the Christian kingdoms of the world.

(8.) And as this cannot be done but by stated pastors, so neither on transient persons ordinarily: for who can teach them that are here to-day and gone to-morrow? When the pastor should proceed from day to day in adding one instruction to another, the hearers will be gone, and new ones in their place. And how can vigilance and discipline be exercised on such transient persons, whose faults and cases will be unknown? Or how can they mutually help each other? And seeing most in the world have fixed habitations, if they have not also fixed church-relations, they must leave their habitations and wander, or else have no church-communion at all.

(9.) And as this necessity of fixed pastors and flocks is confessed, so that such 'de facto' were ordinarily settled by
the apostles, is before proved, if any Scriptures may pass for proof.

The institution and settlement then of particular worshipping churches is out of doubt. And so that two forms of church-government are ' jure divino,' the universal church form, and the particular.

4. Besides this, in the apostles' days there were under Christ in the church universal, many general officers that had the care of gathering and overseeing churches up and down, and were fixed by stated relation unto none. Such were the apostles, evangelists, and many of their helpers in their days. And most Christian churches think that though the apostolical extraordinary gifts, privileges, and offices cease, yet government being an ordinary part of their work, the same form of government which Christ and the Holy Ghost did settle, in the first age, were settled for all following ages, though not with the same extraordinary gifts and adjuncts. Because, 1. We read of the settling of that form, (viz. general officers as well as particular) but we never read of any abolition, discharge, or cessation of the institution. 2. Because if we affirm a cessation without proof, we seem to accuse God of mutability, as settling one form of government for one age only, and no longer. 3. And we leave room for audacious wits accordingly to question other Gospel institutions, as pastors, sacraments, &c. and to say that they were but for one age. 4. It was general officers that Christ promised to be with to the end of the world.

Now either this will hold true or not. If not, then this general ministry is to be numbered with the human additions to be next treated of. If it do, then here is another part of the form of government proved to be of Divine institution. I say not, another church, (for I find nothing called a church in the New Testament, but the universal church and the particular); but another part of the government of both churches, universal and particular; because such general officers are so in the universal, as to have a general oversight of the particular; as an army is headed only by the general himself, and a regiment by the colonel, and a troop by the captain; but the general officers of the army (the lieutenants general, the majors general, &c.) are

Matt. xxviii. 20.
under the lord general in and over the army, and have a general oversight of the particular bodies (regiments and troops). Now if this be the instituted form of Christ's church-government, that he himself rule absolutely as general, and that he hath some general officers under him (not any one having a charge of the whole, but in the whole anfixedly, or as they voluntarily part their provinces,) and that each particular church have its own proper pastor (one or more), then who can say, that 'No form of church-government is of Divine appointment or command?'

Object. But the question is only whether any sole form be of God's commanding? And whether another may not have as much said for it as this?

Ans. Either you mean 'Another instead of this, as a competitor,' or 'Another part conjunct with these parts.'

1. If the first be your sense then you have two works to do. 1. To prove that these before mentioned were mutable institutions, or that they were settled but disjunctively with some other, and the choice was left indifferent to men. 2. To prove the institution of your other form (which you suppose left with this to men's free choice).

But I have already proved, that both the general and particular church-form are settled for continuance as unchangeable ordinances of God. I suppose you doubt not of the continuance of Christ's supremacy, and so of the universal form: and if you will prove that church-assemblies with their pastors may cease, and some other way supply the room, you must be strange and singular undertakers. The other two parts of the government (by general officers, and by consociation of churches) are more disputed; but it is the circumstances of the last only that is controverted and not the thing; and for the other I shall now add nothing to what I have said elsewhere.

2. But if you only mean that another part of the form may be 'jure divino' as well as this, that will but prove still that some form is 'jure divino.'

But 3. If you mean, that God having instituted the forms now proved, hath left man at liberty to add more of his own, I shall now come to examine that case also.

"'Disput. of Church-government.'"
Quest. LVII. Whether any forms of churches, and church-government, or any new church officers, may lawfully be invented and made by man?

Answ. To remove ambiguities, 1. By the word 'forms' may be meant either that relative form of such aggregate bodies which is their essence, and denominateth them essentially; or only some accidental mode which denominateth them but accidentally.

2. By churches is meant either holy societies related by the foundation of a Divine institution; or else societies related by accident, or by human contract only.

3. By 'Church-government' is meant, either that government formally ecclesiastical, which constituteth a church, of Christ's making; or else some government about the matters of the church, which is formally either magistralical or human, (by contract) &c.

4. So by church-officers are meant, either such as are accounted essential to a church in the pure Christian sense; or integral at least (as deacons); or else such as are accounted but accidental to it, and essential only to the human form. And so I answer,

1. As there are some things 'circa sacra,' or accidents of God's special church-worship, which are left to human prudence to determine of, so the same human prudence may determine who shall do them. As e.g. Who shall repair the buildings of the church; the windows, the bells, the pulpits, the tables, &c.; who shall keep the clock; who shall keep the cups, cloths, and other utensils; who shall be the porter, the keeper of the books, &c.; who shall call the people to church, or ring the bells, or give them notice of church-assemblies; who shall make bread for the sacrament, or provide wine, or bring water for baptism; who shall make the graves, and bury the dead, or attend marriages, or baptizings, &c.; who shall set the tune of the psalm, or use the church-music (if there be any); who shall summon any of the people on any just occasion to come to their pastors; who shall summon the pastors to any synod, or lawful assembly, and give them notice of the time and place; when they are to meet, who shall be called first, and who second; who shall sit highest, and who lowest;
who shall take the votes, or moderate or guide the disputations of the assembly; who shall be the scribe, and record what is done; who shall send abroad their agreements, and who shall be the church-messenger to carry them. The agents of such circumstantial may be chosen by the magistrate, or by the churches, or pastors, as is most convenient. Though I doubt not but in the beginning the deacons were mere servants to the pastors, to do as much of such circumstantial work as they were able; of which serving at tables, and looking to the poor, and carrying bread and wine to the absent, &c. were but parts; and all went under the name of ministering to the pastors or churches. And therefore they seem to be such an accidental office, appointed by the apostles, on such common reasons, as magistrates or churches might have appointed them, if they had not.

2. If one will call all or many of these, 'church-officers,' and another will not, it is but a strife about names, which one will use more largely and the other more narrowly or strictly.

3. If magistrates by authority, or the churches by agreement, shall distribute the country for convenience into parishes (not making all to be church-members that dwell in those precincts, but determining that all persons that are fit in those proximities, and they only, shall be members of that particular church) and then shall denominate the church from this accident of place, it is but what is left to their discretion.

4. And if the said magistrates or churches shall divide a kingdom into provinces, and say, that whereas God commandeth us the use of correspondencies, mutual advice, and synods, for the due help, concord, and communion of churches, and all things must be done in order and to edification; therefore we determine that so many churches shall make up such a synod, and the churches of such a district shall make up another synod, and so shall be specially related to each other for concord as advisers, all this is but the prudent determining of church circumstances or accidents left to man.

5. And if they shall appoint that either a magistrate or one pastor shall be for order's sake the appointer of the times
and places of meeting, or the president of the synod, to regulate and order proceedings, and keep peace, as is aforesaid, it is but an accident of the sacred work which man may determine of. Therefore a layman may be such a president or regulator.

6. And if they will call this man by the name of a church-governor, who doth but a common part therein, and from thence will call this association or province by the name of a church, which is but a company of churches associated for concord and counsel, the name maketh it not another thing than it is without that name; and the name may be lawful or unlawful as times and probable consequences make it fit or unfit to use.

7. So much of church matters as is left to the magistrate's government, may be under monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, and under such subordinate officers as the supreme ruler shall appoint.

8. And if the magistrate will make assemblies or councils of pastors, to be his councils, and require them frequently to meet to advise him in the performance of his own trust and work about religion and the church, he may accordingly distribute them into provinces for that use, or order such circumstances as he please.

9. And if a province of churches is called one church, because it is under one magistrate, or a nation of churches called a national church, because it is under one king, or many kingdoms or an empire called one Catholic church, because they are all under one emperor; it must be confessed that this question is but 'de nomine,' and not 'de re.'

And further, 1. That in sacred things that which is of Divine and primary institution is the 'famosius analogatum,' and not that which is but formed by man. 2. That when such an ambiguous word is used without explication or explicating circumstances, it is to be taken for the 'famosius analogatum.' 3. That in this case the word church or church-form is certainly ambiguous and not unequivocal. 4. That a national, imperial, or provincial church as headed by a king, emperor, magistrate, or any head of man's appointment, is another thing, from a church of Christ's institution; and is but an accident or adjunct of it: and the
head of the human form, if called the head of the church of Christ, is but an accidental head, and not constitutive. And if Christ's churches be denominated from such a head, they are denominated but from an accident, as a man may be denominated clothed or unclothed, clothed gorgeously or sordidly, a neighbour to this man or that, &c. It is no formal denomination of a church in the first acceptation, as it signifieth the 'famosius analogatum;' though otherwise many kind of societies may be called 'ecclesia' or 'conventus;' but divines should not love confusion.

10. It seemeth to me that the first distribution of churches in the Roman empire, into patriarchal, primates, metropolitical, provincial, diocesan, were only the determination of such adjuncts or extrinsic things, partly by the emperors, and partly by the church's consent upon the emperor's permission; and so that these new church governments were partly magistratical, or by power derived from the emperors, and partly mere agreements or contracts by degrees degenerating into governments; and so the new forms and names are all but accidental, of adjuncts of the true Christian churches. And though I cannot prove it unlawful to make such adjunctive or extrinsic constitutions, forms, and names, considering the matter simply itself, yet by accident these accidents have proved such to the true churches, as the accident of sickness is to the body, and have been the causes of the divisions, wars, rebellions, ruins, and confusions of the Christian world. 1. As they have served the covetousness and ambition of carnal men. 2. And have enabled them to oppress simplicity and sincerity. 3. And because princes have not exercised their own power themselves, nor committed it to lay-officers, but to churchmen. 4. Whereby the extrinsic government hath so degenerated, and obscured the intrinsic and been confounded with it, that both going under the equivocal name of ecclesiastical government, few churches have had the happiness to see them practically distinct. Nay, few divines do clearly in their controversy distinguish them: (though Marsilius Patavinus

Which tempteth the Erastians to deny and pull down both together, because they find one in the pastor's hands which belongeth to the magistrate, and we do not teach them to untwist and separate them.
and some few more have formerly given them very fair light, yet hath it been but slenderly improved).

11. There seemeth to me no readier and directer way, to reduce the churches to holy concord, and true reformation, than for the princes and magistrates who are the extrinsic rulers, to re-assume their own, and to distinguish openly and practically between the properly priestly or pastoral intrinsic office, and their extrinsic part, and to strip the pastors of all that is not intrinsically their own (it being enough for them, and things so heterogeneous not well consisting in one person): and then when the people know what is claimed as from the magistrate only, it will take off most of their scruples as to subjection and consent.

12. No mortal man may abrogate or take down the pastoral office, and the intrinsic, real power thereof, and the church-form which is constituted thereby; seeing God hath instituted them for perpetuity on earth.

13. But whether one church shall have one pastor or many is not at all of the form of a particular church; but it is of the integrity or gradual perfection of such churches as need many, to have many, and to others not so: but it is to be varied as natural necessity and cause requireth.

14. The nature of the intrinsic office or power (anon to be described) is most necessary to be understood as distinct from the power of magistrates, by them that would truly understand this. The number of governors in a civil state make that which is called a variety of forms of commonwealths, monarchy, aristocracy or democracy: because commanding power is the thing which is there most notably exercised, and primarily magnified. And a wiser and better man, yea, a thousand must stand by as subjects, for want of authority or true power; which can be but in one supreme, either natural or political person; because it cannot consist in the exercise with self-contradiction. If one be for war, and another for peace, &c., there is no rule. Therefore the many, must be one collective or political person, and must consent or go by the major vote or they cannot govern. But that which is called government in priests or ministers, is of another nature; it is but a secondary subservient branch of their office: the first parts are teaching and guiding the people, as their priests, to God in public worship:
and they govern them by teaching, and in order to further teaching and worshipping God; and that not by might, but by reason and love. Of which more anon. Therefore if a sacred congregation be taught and conducted in public worship, and so governed as conduceth hereunto, whether by one, two, or many, it no more altereth the form of the church, than it doth the form of a school, when a small one hath one schoolmaster, and a great one four: or of a hospital, when a small one hath one physician, and a great one many; seeing that teaching in the one, and healing in the other is the main denominated work, to which government is but subservient in the most notable acts of it.

15. No mortal man may take on him to make another church, or another office for the church, as a divine thing, on the same grounds, and of the same nature pretendedly as Christ hath made those already made. The case of adding new church officers or forms of churches, is the same with that of making new worship ordinances for God, and accordingly to be determined (which I have largely opened in its place). Accidents may be added. Substantials of like pretended nature may not be added; because it is an usurping of Christ's power, without derivation by any proved commission; and an accusing of him, as having done his own work imperfectly.

16. Indeed no man can here make a new church officer of this intrinsic sort, without making him new work, which is to make new doctrine, or new worship (which are forbidden): for to do God's work already made belongs to the office already instituted. If every king will make his own officers, or authorize the greater to make the less, none must presume to make Christ officers and churches without his commission.

17. No man must make any office, church or ordinance, which is corruptive or destructive, or contrary or injurious to the offices, churches and ordinances which Christ himself hath made. This Bellarmin confesseth, and therefore I suppose Protestants will not deny it. Those human officers which usurp the work of Christ's own officers, and take it out of their hands, do malignantly fight against Christ's institutions: and while they pretend that it is but preserving and not corrupting or opposing additions which they make,
and yet with these words in their mouths, do either give Christ's officers' work to others, or hinder and oppress his officers themselves, and by their new church-forms undermine or openly destroy the old, by this expression of their enmity they confute themselves.

18. This hath been the unhappy case of the Roman frame of church innovations, as you may observe in the particulars of its degeneracy.

(1.) Councils were called general or ecumenical in respect to one empire only: and they thence grew to extend the name to the whole world: when they may as well say, that Constantine, Martian, &c., were emperors of the whole world, seeing by their authority they were called.

(2.) These councils at first were the emperor's councils called to direct him what to settle in church orders by his own power; but they were turned to claim an imposing authority of their own to command the churches as by commission from God.

(3.) These councils at first, were only for counsel, or for agreement by way of contract or mutual consent to the particular bishops: but they degenerated into a form of government, and claimed a ruling or commanding power.

(4.) The patriarchs, primates and metropolitanas, at first claimed but a power about circumstantialis extrinsicis to the pastoral office, such as is the timing and placing of councils, the sitting above others, &c. And the exercise of some part of the magistrate's power committed to them, that is, the deposing of other bishops or pastors from their station of such liberty and countenance as the magistrate may grant or deny as there is cause. But in time they degenerated to claim the spiritual power of the keys, over the other bishops, in point of ordination, excommunication, absolution.

(5.) These patriarchs, primates and metropolitanas at first claimed their extrinsic power but from man, that is, either the consent and agreement of the churches, or the grant of the emperors: but in time they grew to claim it as of Divine or apostolical appointment, and as unalterable.

(6.) At first they were taken only for adjuncts, ornaments, supports or conveniences to the churches: but afterwards they pretended to be integral parts of the church universal,
and at last the pope would needs be an essential part; and his cardinals must claim the power of the church universal in being the choosers of an universal head, or a king-priest and teacher for all the Christians of the world.

(7.) At first laymen (now called chancellors, &c.) were only the bishops' counsellors, or officers to the magistrate or them, in performing the extrmical work about church adjuncts, which a layman might do: but at last they came to exercise the intrinsic power of the keys in excommunications and absolutions, &c.

(8.) At first a number of particular churches consociated with their several bishops, were taken to be a community or company of true churches prudentially cantonized or distributted and consociated for concord: but after they grew to be esteemed proper political societies, or churches of Divine appointment, if not the 'Ecclesia minima,' having turned the particular churches into oratories or chapels, destroying Ignatius's character of one church, 'To every church there is one altar, and one bishop with his presbyters and deacons.' Abundance more such instances may be given.

Object. Wherever we find the notion of a church particular, there must be government in that church: and why a national society incorporated into one civil government, joining into the profession of Christianity, and having a right thereby to participate of Gospel ordinances, in the convenient distributions of them in the particular congregations, should not be called a church, I confess I can see no reason.

Answ. 1. Here observe, that the question is only of the name, (whether it may be called a church,) and not of the thing (whether all the churches in a kingdom may be under one king, which no sober man denieth).

2. Names are at men's disposal much: but I confess I had rather the name had been used no otherwise, or for no other societies than Scripture useth it. My reasons are, (1.) Because when Christ hath appropriated or specially applied one name to the sacred societies of his institution, it seemeth somewhat bold to make that name common to other societies. (2.) Because it tendeth to confusion, misunderstanding, and to cherish errors and controversies in the
churches, when all names shall be made common or ambiguous, and holy things shall not be allowed any name proper to themselves, nor any thing can be known by a bare name without a description. If the name of Christ himself should be used of every anointed king, it would seem not a little thus injurious to him. If the name, 'Bible,' 'Scripture,' 'Preachers,' &c., be made common to all that the notation of the names may extend to, it will introduce the aforesaid inconveniences; so how shall we in common talk distinguish, between sacred societies of Divine institution and of human, if you will allow us no peculiar name, but make that common which Christ hath chosen?

3. And that the name is here used equivocally is manifest. For the body political is informed and denominated from the 'pars imperans,' the governing part or head: therefore as a head of Divine institution, authorized for the spiritual or pastoral work, denominateth the society accordingly; so a civil head can make but a civil society, and a head of man's making, but a human society. It is certain that Christ hath appointed the episcopal or pastoral office, and their work, and consequently episcopal or pastoral churches; and it is certain that a king is no constitutive part of one of these churches, but accidental; and therefore that he is an accidental head to a pastoral church as such, to which the pastor is essential.

Therefore if you will needs call both these societies 'churches,' you must distinguish them into pastoral churches, and regal churches, or magistratical churches; for the word 'national,' notifieth not the government which is the constitutive part; and may be used of consociated churches, though under many civil governors (as in the Saxon Heptarchy).

So that our question is much like this, 'Whether all the grammar schools in England as under one king may be called one national school?' Answer: Not without unfitness, and inconveniences: but rather than breed any quarrel, they may call them so that please: but 1. They must confess that a particular school is the 'famosius significatum.' 2. That the king is king of schools, but not a schoolmaster, nor a constitutive part of a school. 3. That if you will needs denominate them from the regent part, as one, you
must call them all one royal school, if you will leave the well-known sense of words for such uncouth phrases. But give us leave to call the body which is essentiated by a king, by the name of a kingdom only, though it have in it many schools, academies, colleges, cities, churches, which they that please may call one royal school, academy, college, city and church, if they love confusion.

4. Christianity giveth men right to communion in particular churches, when they also make known their Christianity to the bishops of those churches, and are received (as stated or transient) members by mutual consent; but not otherwise: nor doth mere regal government, give any subject right to church communion, except by a church you mean a kingdom.

Object. 'A particular church then I would describe thus, it is a society of men joined together in the visible profession of the true faith, having a right to, and enjoying among them, the ordinances of the Gospel.'

Ans. 1. When you tell us by your description what you will mean by 'a particular church,' we may understand your denomination: but yet while it is unusual, you must not expect that other men so use the word. Had you called your description a definition, I would have asked you, 1. Whether by 'a society' you mean not strictly a political society constituted by a 'Pars gubernans, et gubernata?' If not, it is no church save equivocally. If so, should not the 'Pars regens' which is constitutive have been put in? If private men join together, &c., it makes but a community. 2. A right to Gospel ordinances is supposed, but need not be in the definition. 3. The enjoying of them, is not essential to a church. The relation may continue, when the enjoyment is a long time hindered. 4. 'Among them' is a very ambiguous word: is it among them in the same place; or in the same country or kingdom; or in the same world? If you difference and define them not, by relation to the same bishops or pastors, and by intended personal holy communion, your description confoundeth the universal church, as well as the national, with a particular church; for the whole Christian world, is 'a society of men joining together in the visible profession of the true faith, having a right to, and enjoying among them the ordinances of the Gospel.'
Object. 'A nation joining in the profession of Christianity is a true church of God; whence it evidently followeth, that there must be a form of ecclesiastical government over a nation as a church, as well as of civil government over it, as a society governed by the same laws.—— For every society must have its government belonging to it as such a society: and the same reason that makes government necessary in any particular congregation, will make it necessary for all the particular congregations, joining together in one visible society, as a particular national church, for the unity and peace of that church, ought much more to be looked after than of any one particular congregation, &c.

Answ. 1. From one absurdity many follow: our controversy before was but of the name: if an accidental royal or civil head may equivocally denominate an ecclesiastical society, and we grant you the use of an equivocal name (or rather the abuse) you will grow too hard upon us, if thence you will gather a necessity of a real ecclesiastical policy, besides the civil. Names abused infer not the things signified by an unequivocal term.

2. You must first prove the form of government, and thence infer the denomination, and not contrarily, first beg the name, and then infer the government.

3. If yet by a form of ecclesiastical government, you meant nothing but the king's extrinsic government, which you may as well call also a form of school-government, of college-government, &c., we would grant you all. But if I can understand you, you now speak of ecclesiastical government as distinct from that. And then,

4. You are now grown up from a may be, to a must be, and necessity; and a greater necessity of one national ecclesiastical government, than of a particular church government; which being undeniably of Christ's institution (by the Holy Ghost in the apostles) you do not make all forms to be indifferent, or deny this to be 'jure divino.' What! necessary and more necessary than that which is 'jure divino,' and yet indifferent and not 'jure divino?' If you say, It is necessary only on supposition that there be a national church: I answer, But your reasons evidently infer that it is also necessary that there be such a national church where it may be bad; though you deny the necessity of
monarchical government by one high priest in it. But I know you call not this a form of government, unless as determinately managed by one, many or most. But why a national spiritual policy as distinct from congregational, may not be called a form of government, as well as one man is distinct from two, over the same people, I see not: but this is at your liberty. But your necessity of such a national regimen is a matter of greater moment.

In these three senses I confess a national church. 1. As all the Christians in a nation are under one civil church governor. 2. As they are consociated for concord, and meet in synods or hold correspondences. 3. As they are all a part of the universal church, cohabiting in one nation. But all these are equivocal uses of the word 'church;' the denomination being taken in the first from an accident; in the second the name of a policy being given to a community agreeing for concord; in the third the name of the whole is given to a small integral part.

But the necessity of any other church, headed by your ecclesiastical, national governor, personal or collective, monarchical, aristocratical or democratical, I utterly deny, and find not a word of proof which I think I have any need to furnish the reader with an answer to.

5. And your judgment in this is downright against the constitution, canons and judgment of the national church of England; for that they use the word in the sense allowed by me, and not in yours is proved, (1.) From the visible constitution in which there is (besides the king) no distinct ecclesiastical head. For the archbishop of Canterbury is not the proper governor of the archbishop of York and his province.

(2.) From the canons. Can. cxxxix. "A national synod is the church representative; whosoever shall affirm that the sacred synod of this nation, in the name of Christ and by the king's authority assembled, is not the true church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated." &c. So that the synod is but the representative church; and therefore not the political head of the church: whether it be the laity, or the whole clergy or both, which they represent, representation of those that are no national head, maketh them not a national head.
(3.) From the ordinary judgment of episcopal divines, (maintained by Bishop Bilson and many others at large, against the Papists) that all bishops 'jure divino' are equal and independent, further than human laws, or agreements, or difference of gifts may difference them, or as they are bound to consociation for concord.

6. How shall I deny not only the lawfulness, but the necessity of such a Papacy as really was in the Roman Empire, on your grounds? I have proved against W. Johnson that the pope was then actually but the head of the Imperial churches, and not of all the world. And if there must be one national ecclesiastical head under one king, why not one also in one empire? And whether it be one monarch, or a collective person, it is still one political person which is now in question. (Either a ruling pope, or a ruling aristocracy or democracy, which is not the great matter in controversy.)

7. And why will not the same argument carry it also, for one universal visible head of all the churches in the world? At least as lawful? At least as far as human capacity and converse will allow? And who shall choose this universal head? And who can lay so fair a claim to it as the pope? And if the form be indifferent, why may not the churches by consent at least, set up one man as well as many? Whether you carry it to an imperial church, or a Papal, to a patriarchal, or provincial, or national, till you have proved it to be of Divine institution, (and particular churches to be unnecessary, alterable and of human institution) I shall never grant you that it is to be preferred before that which is unquestionably of God. For though I easily grant that all the churches of a nation, empire or the world, are to be more esteemed and carefully preserved, than one bishop's or pastor's particular church; yet I will not grant you that your human policy is more necessary to the safety of all these churches than the Divine. For the safety of these churches may be better preserved by God's three great means (1. The polity of particular churches with the conduct of their present faithful bishops or pastors. 2. The loving consociation of neighbour churches for concord. 3. The protection and countenance of magistrates) without any new church-
form, (or national, or imperial, or universal pastor) than with it.

Nay when that sort of usurpation hath been the very engine of dividing, corrupting and undoing the Christian churches above a thousand years, we are not easily persuaded now, that yet it is either necessary or desirable.

8. But the best and easiest way to discern how far the making new churches or church offices is lawful or unlawful, is by trying it by the quality of their office-work. For it is the work which giveth us the description of the office; and the office of the ruling part, which giveth us the definition of the church, which that office constituteth.

The work which the new human officer is to do, is either, 1. The same which God hath already appointed bishops or pastors to do, or at least the fixed ministers in the universal church. 2. Or it is such as he hath appointed magistrates to do. 3. Or it is such as belongeth to private and laymen. 4. Or it is somewhat different from all these.

1. If it be of the first sort, it is a contradiction. For men that are by office appointed to do the same work which ministers are already appointed to do, are not a new office, but ministers indeed, such as Christ hath instituted: for the office is nothing but an obligation and authority to do the work.

2. If it be the same work which belongeth to the magistrate, then it is no new office, for they are magistrates.

3. If it be that which belongeth to private men, by God's appointment, they cannot disoblige themselves by transferring it to a new officer.

4. If it be none of all these, what is it? I doubt it may prove some needless or rather sinful work, which God committed to none of these three sorts, and therefore unfit to make a church-office of. Unless it be such as I before described and granted. (1.) I confess that the magistrate may make new inferior officers, to do his own part (as church-justices, churchwardens, &c.). (2.) I grant that the people may make an office for the better doing of some parts of their own work: they may make collectors, doorkeepers, artists by office, to keep the clock, and bells, and church-buildings, &c., if the magistrates leave it to them.

(3.) I grant that the bishops or pastors may do some cir-
cumstances of their work by human officers; as to facilitate their concord in synods, by choosing one to preside, to choose time and place, to send messengers to take votes, to moderate disputes, to record agreements, &c., as aforesaid: and these circumstantialis are the things that officers may be made for.

But the very modes and circumstances which are part of the work to which every bishop or pastor is obliged, he cannot commit to another; as to choose his text, subject, method, words, &c. These are parts of his own work; though concord in these is the work of many.

Now what is the work besides all these that we must have new churches or offices made for? Is it to govern all these bishops and churches? How? By the Word or by the sword? If by the sword, the magistrate is to do it; if by the Word (or spiritual authority) either God hath made such an office as archbishops or general bishops over many, or he hath not; if he have, we need no new human office for it, God having provided for it already; if not, but God hath left all bishops independent, and to learn of one another, as equals in office, and unequal only in gifts, then either such an office is fit and necessary, or not. If it be, you accuse God of omission in not appointing a bishop over bishops as well as a bishop of the lowest order. If not, then by what reason or power will you make new, needless officers in the church? When Cyprian and his Carthage council so vehemently disclaimed against being 'Episcopi Episcoporum?'

19. I would fain know whether those new made churches of human and not of Divine fabrication, (whether universal (or Papal), patriarchal, provincial, &c.) were made by former churches, or by no churches. If by no churches, then either by other societies or by single persons: if by other societies, by what power do they make new churches to Christ, who are themselves no churches? If by single persons, either they are before church-members, or not: if not, how can those make new churches that be not so much as members of churches, without a commission from Christ? But if either former churches or their members made these new churches, then, (1.) It followeth that there were another sort of churches before these new or human churches. And if so, either those other that made these were themselves
made of God or not. And so the question will run up till you bring it either to some church of God's making which made these other, or some person commissioned to do it. If you say the first, then he that will confess that there is a species of churches of Christ's institution, and a species not of his institution, must prefer the former, and must well prove the power of making the latter. And so they must do, if they say that it was done by particular persons that were no particular church-members. For if Christ commissioned them to settle any one species of churches, those are to be esteemed settled by Christ. (2.) But if you say that Christ left them to vary the species of churches as they saw cause, and so on to the end of the world, 1. You must well prove it. 2. It is before disproved; (unless you take the word church equivocally).

20. Lastly, all Christians are satisfied of Christ's authority; and therefore in that they can agree; but so they are not of any human church-maker's authority; and therefore in that there will never be an agreement; therefore such new churches, and ecclesiastical governments will be but (as they ever have been) the engines of division and ruin in the churches; and the species of God's making, with the mutability of mutable adjuncts and circumstances, will best preserve the church's peace.

But if the true nature of pastoral or ecclesiastical government were well understood, it would put an end to all these controversies. Which may be mostly gathered from what is said before. To which I will add this little following.

Quest. Wherein consisteth the true nature of pastoral church government?

Answ. 1. Not in any use of the sword, or corporal force.
2. Not in a power to contradict God's Word.
3. Not in a power co-ordinate with Christ's, to do his proper work, or that which hath the same grounds, reasons, and nature.
4. Not in an unquestionable empire, to command things which none must presume to examine, or judge of
by a discerning judgment, whether they be forbidden by God or not.

5. Not now in making a new Word of God, or new articles of faith, or new universal laws, for the whole church.

6. Not in any thing which derogates from the true power of magistrates, or parents, or masters.

But 1. It is a ministerial power, of a messenger or servant, who hath a commission to deliver his master's commands and exhortations*

2. As it is over the laity or flocks, it is a power in the sacred assemblies to teach the people by office, and to be their priests or guides in holy worship†; and to rule the worship-actions for the time, length, method, and orderly performance of them".

3. As to particular persons, it is the power of the church-keys, which is, 1. To judge who is meet to be by baptism taken into the church. 2. To reprove, exhort, and instruct those that by vice or ignorance, in order to repentance, or knowledge, or confirmation do need the pastoral help‡. 3. To judge who is to be forbidden church-communion as impenitent; or at least, with whom that church must be forbidden to communicate. 4. To judge who is meet for absolution as a penitent. 5. To deliver men personally a sealed pardon from Christ in his two sacraments. 6. To visit the sick, and comfort the sad, and resolve the doubting, and help the poor. This is the true church-government, which is like a philosopher's or schoolmaster's in his school among volunteers, supposing them to have no power of the rod or violence but only to take in or put out of their schools; and what need is there of an universal, patriarchal or national head, to do any of this work, which is but the government of a personal teacher and conductor; and which worketh only on the conscience?

4. But besides this there is a necessity of agreeing in the right management of this work; which needeth no new head, but only the consultations of the several bishops or pastors, and the magistrate's civil rule, or extrinsic episcopacy (as Constantine called it).

5. And besides this there is need to ordain pastors and

---

* 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2.  † 1 Pet. v. 1—3. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.  ‡ 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.  § 2 Tim. iv. 1—3. 5.
bishops in the church. And this is not done by any force
neither; but 1. By judging what men are fit. 2. By per-
suading the people to consent and receive them, and 3. By
investing them by a delivery of possession by imposition of
hands. Now for all this, there needs no human species of
bishops or churches to be made.

6. Besides this there is need of some oversight of these
pastors and ministers and fixed bishops when they are made;
and of some general care of pastors and people, if they de-
cline to heresies, errors, vices, or lukewarmness; but for
this, 1. When magistrates have done their part. 2. And
neighbour ministers to one another. 3. And the conso-
ciated bishops to the particular ones. 4. And unfixd
ministers have done their parts in the places where occasion-
ally they come; if moreover any general pastors or arch-
bishops are necessary, to rebuke, direct, and persuade the
bishops or their flocks, by messengers, epistles, or in pre-
sence, no doubt but God hath appointed such as the suc-
cessors of the apostles, evangelists, and other general minis-
ters of those first times. But if no such thing be appointed
by Christ, we may be sure it is not necessary nor best.

If it were but considered that the ruling power in the
church is so inseparable from the teaching power, that it is
exercised by teaching and only by God's Word, (either ge-
erally or personally applied) and that upon none but those
that willingly and by consent receive it, it would quiet the
world about these matters. And O that once magistrates
would take the sword wholly to themselves, and leave
church power to work only by its proper strength and virtue,
and then all things would fall into joint again; though the
Ithacians would be displeased.

Quest. LVIII. Whether any part of the proper pastoral or
episcopal power may be given or deputed to a layman, or to
one of any other office, or the proper work may be performed
by such ?

Answ. 1. Such extrinsical, or circumstantial, or acci-
dental actions as are aforementioned may be done by de-
puties or others (as calling the church together, summoning
offenders, recording actions, &c.).
2. The proper episcopal or pastoral work or office cannot be deputed, in whole or part, any other way than by communication, which is, by ordination, or making another to be of the same office. For if it may be done by a layman, or one that is not of the same order and office, then it is not to be called any proper part of the pastoral or episcopal office; if a layman may baptize, or administer the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, or may ordain, or excommunicate (ecclesiastically), or absolve, merely because a bishop authorizeth or biddeth him, then, 1. What need Christ have made an office-work of it, and persons be devoted and consecrated to it?

2. And why may not the people's election and the king's commission serve to enable a layman to do it? For if commanding only be proper to the bishop or pastor, and executing be common to laymen, it is certain that the king may command all bishops and pastors to do their office-work; and therefore he may command a layman to do that which a bishop may command him to do.

3. And is it not a contradiction to say that a man is a layman or of another order, who is authorized by a bishop to do a bishop's work or office? When as the office itself is nothing (as is oft said) but an obligation and authority to do the work. If therefore a bishop authorize and oblige any other man to do the proper work of a bishop or pastor (to ordain, to baptize, to give the sacrament of the eucharist, to excommunicate, to absolve, &c.) he thereby maketh that man a bishop or a pastor, whatever he call him.

Object. But doth not a bishop preach 'per alios' to all his diocese? And give them the sacraments 'per alios,' &c.?

Answ. Let not the phrase be made the controversy instead of the matter. Those other persons are either ministers of Christ, or laymen. If laymen, their actions are unlawful. If ministers, they are commissioned officers of Christ themselves, and it is the work of their own office which they do, and it is they that shall have the reward or punishment. But if preaching to all these churches or giving to all these persons in a thousand parishes the sacraments, &c. were the bishops' or archbishops' work, that is, which they are obliged to do, then they would sin in not
doing it. But if they were the governor’s only of those that are obliged to do it, and are not obliged to do it themselves, then governing the doers of it is only their work; and therefore it is but equivocally said that the work is theirs, which others and not they are obliged to do; and that they do their work ‘per alios,’ when they do but govern those others in doing their own work.

Of this read the Lord Bacon’s “Considerations,” and Grotius “de Imper. summ. Potest. circa Sacra,” who soundly resolve the case, against doing the pastoral work ‘per alium.’

**Quest. lix. May a layman preach or expound the Scriptures? Or what of this is proper to the pastor’s office?**

Answ. 1. No doubt but there is some preaching or teaching and expounding which a laymen may use. So did Origen; so did Constantine; so may a king or judge on the bench; so may a parent to his children, and a master to his family, and a schoolmaster or tutor to his scholars.

2. It is not any one method or sermon fashion which is proper to a minister and forbidden to a layman: that method which is most meet to the matter and hearers, may be used by one as well as by the other.

3. It is not the mere publicity of the teaching, which must tell us what is unlawful for a layman. For writing and printing are the most public ways of teaching; and these no man taketh to be forbidden the laity. Scaliger, Casaubon, Grotius, Erasmus, Constantine, King James, the Lord Bacon, and abundance more laymen have done the church great service by their writings. And judges on the bench speak oft theologically to many.

But that which is proper to the ministers or pastors of the church is, 1. To make a stated office of it, and to be separated, set apart, devoted, or consecrated and appropriated to this sacred work; and not to do it occasionally only, or sometimes, or on the bye; but as their calling and the employment of their lives.

2. To do it as called and commissioned ministers of Christ, who have a special nunciative and teaching autho-
osity committed to them; and therefore are in a special manner to be heard, according to their special authority.

3. To be the stated teachers of particular churches, as their pastors and guides; (though they may sometimes permit a layman when there is cause to teach them 'pro tempore'). These three are proper to the ministerial and pastor's office.

But for the regulating of laymen's teaching, 1. They must stately keep in their families, or within their proper bounds.

2. They must not presume to go beyond their abilities; especially in matters dark and difficult.

3. They must not thrust themselves without a just call and need into public or numerous meetings as teachers, nor do that which savoureth of pride or ostentation, or which tendeth to cherish those vices in others.

4. They must not live or preach, as from under the government of the church pastors; but being members of their flocks, must do all as under their lawful oversight and guidance; much less must they proudly and schismatically set up themselves against their lawful pastors, and bring them into contempt to get themselves reputation, and to draw away disciples after them.

5. Times and places must be greatly distinguished. In infidel or grossly ignorant countries, where through the want of preachers there is a true necessity, men may go much further than in countries where teachers and knowledge do abound.

Quest. lx. What is the true sense of the distinction of pastoral power, 'in foro interiore et exterioire,' rightly used?

Answ. 1. Not as if the pastors had any power of the sword or outward force, or of men's bodies or estates immediately: for all the pastoral power is immediately on the soul, and but secondarily on the body, so far as the persuaded soul will move it. Reason and love and the authority of a messenger of Christ, are all the power by which bishops or pastors as such can work, 'in foro interiore vel exterioire;' they rule the body but by ruling the soul.

2. But the true use of the distinction is only to serve instead of the usual distinction of public and personal obligation. It is one thing to satisfy a man's private conscience about his own personal case or matters; and another thing to oblige the whole church, or a particular person, of his duty as a member of the society to the rest. When the pastor absolveth a penitent person, 'in foro interiore,' that is, in his own conscience, he delivereth him a discharge in the name of Christ on condition he be truly penitent; else not. But 'in foro exteriore' he actually and absolutely restoreth him to his visible state of church-communion. The rest of the members perhaps may justly think this man unlike to prove a true penitent; and then 'in foro interiore' they are not bound to believe him certainly penitent or pardoned by God; but 'in foro exteriore' that he is restored to church-communion, and that for order's sake they are bound to hold communion with him, they are bound (internally) to believe. So that it comes near the sense of the distinction of the secret judgment (of God and conscience) and church judgment.

Quest. LXI. In what sense is it true that some say, that the magistrate only hath the external government of the church, and the pastors the internal?

Answ. 1. Not as external and internal are opposed in the nature of the action. For the voice of the pastor in preaching is external, as well as the king's.

2. Not as they are opposed in the manner of reception. For the ears of the auditors are external recipients from the preacher as well as from the king.

3. Not as distinguishing the parts that are to obey, the duties commanded, and the sins forbidden, as if the king ruled the body only and the pastor the soul. For the soul is bound to obey the king, or else the body could not be bound to obey him; unless by cords. And the body must obey the preacher as well as the soul. Murder, drunkenness, swearing, lying, and such other external vices, are under the pastor's power to forbid in Christ's name, as well as the king's.

4. Not as if all the external parts or actions of religion
were exempted from the pastor's power. For preaching, praying, reading, sacraments, church-assemblies, are external parts of religion, and under the pastor's care.

But in two respects the external power is only the king's or civil magistrate's. 1. As it is denominated from the sword, or mulcts, or corporal penalties, which is the external means of execution; though in this respect the distinction were far more intelligibly expressed by 'The government by the sword, and by the Sacred Word*.'

2. But the principal sense of their distinction is the same with Constantine's, who distinguished of a bishop without and within; or of our common distinction of intrinsic and extrinsic government. And though internal and external have the same signification, use maketh intrinsic and extrinsic more intelligible. And by internal is meant that power which intrinsically belongeth to the pastor's office as instituted by Christ; and so is intrinsical to the pastorship and the church (as preaching, praying, sacraments, the keys of admission, and exclusion, ordination, &c.). And by external is meant, that which is extrinsical to the pastorship and the church; which princes have sometimes granted them, but Christ hath made no part of their office. In this sense the assertion is good, and clear, and necessary; that the disposal of all things 'circa sacra' all accidents and circumstances whatsoever, which by Christ's institution are not intrinsical to the pastorship and church, but extrinsical, do belong to the power of kings and magistrates.

Quest. LXII. Is the trial, judgment, or consent of the laity necessary to the admittance of a member into the universal or particular church?

Answ. 1. It is the pastor's office to bear and exercise the keys of Christ's church; therefore by office he is to receive those that come in; and consequently to be the trier and judge of their fitness.

2. It belongeth to the same office which is to baptize, to judge who is to be baptized; otherwise ministers should not be rational judges of their own actions, but the ex-

* As Bishop Bilson of Obedience useth still to distinguish them; with many others: see B. Carlton of Jurisdiction.
ecutioners of other men's judgment. It is more the judging who is to be baptized, which the minister's office consisteth in, than in the bare doing of the outward act of baptizing.

3. He that must be the ordinary judge in church-admissions, is supposed to have both ability and leisure to make him fit; and authority and obligation to do the work.

4. The ordinary body of the laity have none of all these four qualifications, much less all. 1. They are not ordinarily able; so to examine a man's faith and resolution with judgment and skill, as may neither tend to the wrong of himself nor of the church: for it is great skill that is required thereunto. 2. They have not ordinarily leisure from their proper callings and labours, to wait on such a work as it must be waited on, especially in populous places. 3. They are not therefore obliged to do that which they cannot be supposed to have ability or leisure for. 4. And where they have not the other three, they can have no authority to do it.

5. It is therefore as great a crime for the laity to usurp the pastor's office in this matter, as in preaching, baptizing, or other parts of it.

6. And though pride often blind men (both people and pastors) so as to make them overlook the burden and look only at the authority and honour; yet is it indeed an intolerable injury to the laity, if any would lay such a burden on them which they cannot bear, and consequently would make them responsible for the emissions or misdoing of it, to Christ their judge.

7. There is not so much as any fair pretence for the laity having power to judge who shall be received into the universal church: for who of the laity should have this power? Not all, nor the major vote of the church: for who ever sought the votes of all the Christians in the world, before he baptized a man? Not any one particular church or persons above the rest: for they have no right to shew for it, more than the rest.

8. It is not in the power of the laity to keep a man out of their own particular church-communion, whom the pastor receiveth: because, as is said, it is his office to judge and bear the keys.
9. Therefore, if it be ill done, and an unworthy person be admitted, the consciences of the people need not accuse themselves of it, or be disturbed, because it is none of their employment.

10. Yet the liberty of the church or people, must be distinguished from their governing power, and their executing duty from the power of judging. And so, 1. The people are to be guided by the pastors as volunteers, and not by violence: and therefore it is the pastor’s duty, in all doubtful cases, to give the people all necessary satisfaction, by giving them the reasons of his doings, that they may understandingly and quietly obey and submit. 2. And in case the people discern any notable appearance of danger, by introducing heretics and grossly impious men to corrupt the church, and by subverting the order of Christ, they may go to their pastors to desire satisfaction in the case. 3. And if by open proof or notoriety it be certain, that by ignorance, fraud, or negligence the pastors thus corrupt the church, the people may seek their due remedy from other pastors and magistrates. 4. And they may protest their own dissent from such proceedings. 5. And in case of extremity may cast off heretical, and impious, and intolerable pastors, and commit their souls to the conduct of fitter men; as the churches did against the Arian bishops, and as Cyprian declareth it his people’s duty to do; as is aforesaid.

Quest. lxiii. What power have the people in church censures and excommunication?

Answ. This is here adjoined, because it requireth but little more than the foregoing answer. 1. As it is the pastor’s office to judge who is to be received, so also to judge who is to be excluded.

2. But the execution of his sentence belongeth to the people as well as to himself. It is they that either hold communion with the person, or avoid him.


b 1 Cor. v. 3. 6. 11. 2 John. Tit. iii. 10.
3. Therefore though ordinarily they must acquiesce in the pastor's judgment, yet if he grossly offend against the law of God, and would bring them, e. g. to communion with heretics and openly impious, and excommunicate the orthodox and godly, they may seek their remedy as before.

Quest. lxxv. What is the people's remedy in case of the pastor's mal-administration?

Answ. This also is here annexed for dispatch, as being almost sufficiently answered already.

1. It must be supposed that all church disorders and mal-administrations cannot be expected to be remedied; but many while we are sinners and imperfect must be borne.

2. The first remedy is to speak submissively to the pastor of his faults, and to say to Archippus, "Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received." And if he hear not more privately, for the people more openly to warn and entreat him; not as his governors, but as Christians that have reason to regard Christ's interest and their own, and have charity to desire his reformation.

(2.) The next remedy is, to consult with the neighbour pastors of other churches, that they may admonish him; not as his governors, but as neighbour pastors.

3. The next remedy is, to seek redress from those governors that have power to correct or cast out the intolerable.

4. The last remedy is that of Cyprian, to desert such intolerable pastors.

But in all this, the people must be sure that they proceed not proudly, ignorantly, erroneously, passionately, factiously, disorderly or rashly.

Quest. lxxv. May one be a pastor or a member of a particular church who liveth so far from it, as to be incapable of personal communion with them?

Answ. The name is taken from the relation; and the relation is founded in capacity, right, and obligation to actual communion, duties, and privileges; 1. He that is so statedly

* Col. iv. 17.  
* Acts xv.
distant is incapable statedly of communion, and therefore incapable of the relation and name.

2. He that is but for a time accidentally so distant, is but for that time incapable of communion with them: and therefore retaineth capacity, right, and obligation statedly for the future, but not for the present exercise. Therefore he retaineth the relation and name, in respect to his future intended exercise; but not in so plesany a sense, as he that is capable of present communion.

3. It is not the length or shortness of the time of absence that wholly cutteth off or continueth the relation and name, but the probability or improbability of a seasonable accession. For if a man be removed but a day, with a purpose to return no more, his relation ceaseth. And if a man be long purposing and probably like to return, and by sickness or otherwise be hindered, it doth not wholly end his relation.

4. If the delay be so long as either maketh the return improbable, or as necessitateth the church to have another statedly in the pastor's place, where they can have but one, and so the people, by taking another, consent (though with grief) to quit their relation and title to the former, there the relation is at an end.

5. It is a delusory formality of some, that call themselves members of a separated (or other) church, from which they most ordinarily and statedly live at an utter distance, and yet take themselves to be no members of the church where they live, and usually join with; and all because they covenanted with one and not with the other.

**Quest. lxvi.** If a man be injuriously suspended or excommunicated by the pastor or people, which way shall he have remedy?

**Ans.** As is aforesaid in the case of mal-administration;

1. By admonishing the pastor or those that wrong him. 2. By consulting neighbour pastors, that they may admonish him. 3. By the help of rulers, where such are, and the church's good forbids it not. 4. In case of extremity, by removing to a church that will not so injure you. And what needs there any more save patience?
Quest. lxviii. Doth presence always make us guilty of the
errors or faults of the pastor in God's worship, or of the
church? Or in what cases are we guilty?

Answ. 1. If it always made us guilty, no man could join
with any pastor or church in the world, without being a wil-
sful sinner. Because no man worshippeth God without sin,
in matter or manner, omission or commission.
2. If it never made us guilty, it would be lawful to join
with Mahometans and bread-worshippers, &c.
3. Therefore the following decision of the question, 'In
what cases it is a duty or a sin to separate,' doth decide this
case also. For when separation is no duty, but a sin, there
our presence in the worship is no sin: but when separation
is a duty, there our presence is a sin.
4. Especially in these two cases our presence is a sin;
1. When the very assembly and worship is so bad as God
will not accept, but judgeth the substance of it for a sin.
2. In case we ourselves be put upon any sin in communion,
or as a previous condition of our communion; (as to make
some false profession, or to declare our consent to other
men's sin, or to commit corporal, visible, reputative idolat-
try, or the like). But the pastor and church shall answer
for their own faults, and not we, when we have cause to be
present, and make them not ours by any sinful action of our
own.

Quest. lxviii. Is it lawful to communicate in the sacrament
with wicked men?

Answ. The answer may be gathered from what is said
before.
1. If they be so wicked for number, and flagitiousness,
and notoriety, as that it is our duty to forsake the church,
then to communicate with them is a sin. Therefore the af-
ter resolution of the just causes of separation must be pe-
rused. As if a church were so far defiled with heresy, or
open impiety, that it were justified by the major vote, and
bore down faith and godliness, and the society were become
incapable of the ends of church-association and communion:
in this and other cases it must be deserted.
2. If we do not perform our own duty to remove unlawful communications, (whether it be by admonition of the offender or pastor, or whatever is proved really our duty,) the omission of that duty is our sin.

3. But if we sin not by omitting our own duty, it will be no sin of ours to communicate with the church, where scandalous sinners or heretics are permitted. The pastor's and delinquent's sins are not ours.

4. Yea, if we do not omit our own duty in order to the remedy, that will not justify us in denying communion with the church while wicked men are there. But it will rather aggravate our sin, to omit one duty first, and thence fetch occasion to omit another.

Quest. lxix. Have all the members of the church right to the Lord's table? And is suspension lawful?

Of this see the defence of the synod's propositions in New England. I answer,

1. You must distinguish between a fundamental right of state, and an immediate right of present possession; or if you will, between a right duly to receive the sacrament, and a right to immediate reception simply considered.

2. You must distinguish between a questioned,controverted right, and an unquestioned right; and so you must conclude as followeth.

(1.) Every church-member, (at least adult,) as such, hath the fundamental right of stated relation, or a right duly to receive the sacrament; that is, to receive it understandingly and seriously at those seasons when by the pastors it is administered.

(2.) But if upon faults or accusations, this right be duly questioned in the church, it is become a controverted right; and the possession or admission may by the bishops or pastors of the church, be suspended, if they see cause, while it is under trial, till a just decision.

3. Though infants are true members, yet the want of natural capacity duly to receive maketh it unlawful to give them the sacrament, because it is to be given only to receivers, and receiving is more than eating and drinking; it is consenting to the covenant, which is the real receiving in a
moral sense, or at least consent professed. So that they
want not a state of right, as to their relation, but a natural
capacity to receive.

4. Persons at age who want not the right of a stated re-
lation, may have such actual natural and moral indispo-
sitions, as may also make them for that time unmeet to re-
ceive. As sickness, infection, a journey, persecution, scat-
tering the church, a prison. And (morally) 1. Want of ne-
cessary knowledge of the nature of the sacrament, (which by
the negligence of pastors or parents may be the case of some
that are but newly past their childhood). 2. Some heinous
sin, of which the sinner hath not so far repented, as to be
yet ready to receive a sealed pardon, or which is so scanda-
lous in the church, as that in public respects the person is
yet unfit for its privileges. 3. Such sins or accusations of
sin, as make the person’s church-title justly controverted,
and his communion suspended, till the case be decided.
4. Such fears of unworthy receiving, as were like to hurt
and distract the person, if he should receive till he were
better satisfied. These make a man incapable of present
reception, and so are a bar to his plenary right: they have
still right to receive in a due manner: but being yet incap-
able of that due receiving, they have not a plenary right to
the thing.

5. The same may be said of other parts of our duty and
privileges. A man may have a relative, habitual, or stated
right to praise God, and give him thanks for his justifica-
tion, sanctification, and adoption, and to godly conference,
to exercises of humiliation, &c. who yet for want of present
actual preparation, may be incapable, and so want a plenary
right.

6. The understanding of the double preparation neces-
sary, doth most clearly help us to understand this case. A
man that is in an unregenerate state, must be visibly cured
of that state, (of utter ignorance, unbelief, ungodliness,) be-
fore he can be a member of the church, and lay a claim to
its privileges. But when that is done, besides this general
preparation, a particular preparation also to each duty is ne-
cessary to the right doing it. A man must understand what
he goeth about, and must consider of it, and come with
some suitable affections. A man may have right to go a
journey, that wants a horse; or may have a horse that is not saddled: he that hath clothes must put them on, before he is fit to come into company: he that hath right to write, may want a pen, or have a bad one: having of gracious habits, may need the addition of bringing them into such acts as are suitable to the work in hand.

Quest. LXX. Is there any such thing in the church, as a rank or classis, or species of church-members at age, who are not to be admitted to the Lord's table, but only to hearing the Word and prayer, between infant members, and adult confirmed ones?

Answ. Some have excogitated such a classis, or species, or order, for convenience, as a prudent, necessary thing; because to admit all to the Lord's table they think dangerous on one side; and to cast all that are unfit for it out of the church, they think dangerous on the other side, and that which the people would not bear. Therefore to preserve the reverence of the sacrament, and to preserve their own and the church's peace, they have contrived this middle way or rank. And indeed the controversy seemeth to be more about the title (whether it may be called a middle order of mere learners and worshippers) than about the matter. I have occasionally written more of it than I can here stay to recite; and the accurate handling of it requireth more words than I will here use. This breviate therefore shall be all.

1. It is certain that such catechumens as are in mere preparation to faith, repentance, and baptism, are no church-members or Christians at all; and so in none of these ranks.

2. Baptism is the only ordinary regular door of entrance into the visible church; and no man (unless in extraordinary cases) is to be taken for a church-member or visible Christian till baptized.

Two objections are brought against this. 1. The infants of Christians are church-members as such, before baptism, and so are believers. They are baptized because members, and not members by baptism.

Answ. This case hath no difficulty. 1. A believer as such, is a member of Christ and the church invisible, but
not of the visible church, till he be an orderly professor of that belief. And this profession is not left to every man’s will how it shall be made, but Christ hath prescribed and instituted a certain way and manner of profession, which shall be the only ordinary symbol or badge, by which the church shall know visible members; and that is baptism. Indeed when baptism cannot be had, an open profession without it may serve; for sacraments are made for man, and not man for sacraments. But when it may be had, it is Christ’s appointed symbol, ‘Tessera,’ and church door. And till a person be baptized, he is but irregularly and initially a professor; as an embryo in the womb is a man; or as a covenant before the writing, sealing, and delivering is initially a covenant; or as persons privately contracted without solemn matrimonies are married; or as a man is a minister upon election and trial before ordination: he hath only in all these cases, the beginning of a title, which is not complete; nor at all sufficient ‘in foro ecclesiae,’ to make a man visibly and legally, a married man, a minister, and so here a Christian. For Christ hath chosen his own visible badge, by which his church-members must be known.

2. And the same is to be said of the infant-title of the children of believers: they have but an initial right before baptism, and not the badge of visible Christians. For there are three distinct gradations to make up their visible Christianity. 1. Because they are their own, (and as it were parts of themselves) therefore believers have power and obligation to dedicate their children in covenant with God. 2. Because every believer is himself dedicated to God, with all that is his own, (according to his capacity,) therefore a believer’s child is supposed to be virtually (not actually) dedicated to God in his own dedication or covenant, as soon as his child hath a being. 3. Being thus virtually and implicitly first dedicated, he is after actually and regularly dedicated in baptism, and sacramentally receiveth the badge of the church; and this maketh him a visible member or Christian, to which the two first were but introductory, as conception is to human nativity.

Object. ‘But the seed of believers as such are in the covenant; and therefore church-members.’

Answ. The word ‘Covenant’ here is ambiguous: either
it signifieth God's law of grace, or prescribed terms for salvation, with his immediate offer of the benefits to accepters, called the single covenant of God; or it signifieth this with man's consent, called the mutual covenant, where both parties covenant. In the former sense, the covenant only offereth church-membership, but maketh no man a church-member, till consent. It is but God's conditional promise, "If thou believe thou shalt be saved," &c. 'If thou give up thyself and children to me, I will be your God, and you shall be my people.' But it is only the mutual covenant that maketh a Christian or church-member.

Object. 'The promise is to us and our children as ours.'

Answ. That is, that you and your children dedicated to God, shall be received into covenant; but not otherwise. Believing is not only bare assenting, but consenting to the covenant, and delivering up yourselves to Christ; and if you do not consent that your child shall be in the covenant, and deliver him to God also, you cannot expect acceptance of him, against your wills; nor indeed are you to be taken for true believers yourselves, if you dedicate not yourselves to him, and all that are in your power.

Object. 'This offer or conditional covenant belongeth also to infidels.'

Answ. The offer is to them, but they accept it not. But every believer accepteth it for himself, and his, or devoteth to God himself and his children when he shall have them; and by that virtual dedication or consent, his children are virtually in the mutual covenant; and actually upon actual consent and dedication.

Object. 'But it is profession and not baptism, that makes a visible member.'

Answ. That is answered before; it is profession by baptism: for baptism is that peculiar act of profession, which God hath chosen to this use, when a person is absolutely devoted, resigned, and engaged to God in a solemn sacrament, this is our regular initiating profession; and it is but an irregular embryo of a profession, which goeth before baptism ordinarily.

Prop. 3. The time of infant-membership, in which we stand in covenant by our parents' consent, cannot be determined by duration, but by the insufficiency of reason,
through immaturity of age, (or continuing idiots) to choose for one's self.

Prop. 4. It is not necessary that the doctrine of the Lord's supper be taught catechumens before baptism; nor was it usual with the ancients so to do (though it may very well be done).

Prop. 5. It is needful that the nature of the Lord's supper be taught all the baptized before they receive it, (as was opened before,) else they must do they know not what.

Prop. 6. Though the sacrament of the Lord's supper seal not another, but the same covenant that baptism seal-eth; yet are there some further truths therein expressed, and some more particular exercises of faith in Christ's sacrifice, and coming, &c.; and of hope, and love, and gratitude, &c. requisite. Therefore the same qualifications which will serve for baptism, justification, and adoption, and salvation, are not enough for the right use of church-communion in the Lord's supper, the one being the sacrament of initiation and our new birth; the other of our confirmation, exercise, and growth in grace.

7. Whether persons be baptized in infancy or at age, if they do not before understand these higher mysteries, they must stay from the exercise of them till they understand them; and so with most there must be a space of time between their baptism and fuller communion.

8. But the same that we say of the Lord's supper must be said of other parts of worship; singing psalms, praise, thanksgivings, &c., men must learn them, before they can practise them; and usually these as eucharistical acts concur with the Lord's supper.

9. Whether you will call men in this state, church-members of a middle rank and order, between the baptized, and the communicants, is but a 'lis de nomine,' a verbal controversy. It is granted that such a middle sort of men there are in the church.

10. It is to be maintained that these are in a state of salvation, even before they thus communicate. And that they are not kept away for want of a stated relation-title, but of an immediate capacity, as is aforesaid.

11. There is no necessity, but upon such unfitness, that
there should be one day's time between baptism and the sacramento of the Lord's supper: nor is it desirable; for if the baptized understand those mysteries the first day they may communicate in them.

12. Therefore as men are prepared, some may suddenly communicate, and some stay longer.

13. When persons are at age, if pastors, parents and themselves be not grossly negligent, they may and ought to learn these things in a very little time; so that they need not be settled in a lower learning state, for any considerable time, unless their own negligence be the cause.

14. And in order to their learning, they have right to be spectators and auditors at the eucharist, and not to be driven away with the catechumens, as if they had no right to be there. For it is a thing best taught by the practice to beholders.

15. But if any shall by scandal or gross neglect of piety, and not only by ignorance give cause of questioning their title, and suspending their possession of those sacred privileges, these are to be reckoned in another rank, even among those whose title to church-membership itself becometh controverted, and must undergo a trial in the church.

And this much I think may serve to resolve this considerable question.

Quest. LXXI. Whether a form of prayer be lawful.

Answ. I have said so much of this and some following questions in many books already, that to avoid repetition, I shall say very little here.

The question must be out of question with all Christians:

1. Because the Scripture itself hath many forms of prayer; which therefore cannot be unlawful.

Obj. 'They were lawful then, but not now.'

Answ. He that saith so, must prove where God hath since forbidden them. Which can never be.

Obj. 'They may lawfully be read in Scripture for instruction, but not used as prayers.'

Answ. They were used as prayers then, and are never
since forbidden: yea, John and Christ did teach their disciples to pray, and Christ thus prefaceth his form, “When ye pray, say”——

2. All things must be done to edification: but to use a form of prayer is for the edification of many persons, at least those that cannot otherwise do so well; therefore those persons must use a form. Full experience doth prove the minor, and nothing but strangeness to men can contradict it.

Quest. LXXII. Are forms of prayer or preaching in the church lawful?

Answ. Yes: most ministers study the methodical form of their sermons before they preach them: and many write the very words, or study them: and so most sermons are a form. And sure it is as lawful to think beforehand what to say in praying as in preaching.*

1. That which God hath not forbidden is lawful; but God hath not forbidden ministers to study their sermons or prayers, either for matter, method or words, and so to make them many ways a form.

2. That which God prescribed is lawful (if he reverse it not): but God prescribed public forms of prayer: as the titles and matter of many of the Psalms prove, which were daily used in the Jewish synagogues.

Object. ‘Psalms being to be sung, are more than prayers.’

Answ. They were prayers, though more. They are called prayers, and for the matter many of them were no more than prayers, but only for the measures of words: nor was their singing like ours now, but more like to our saying. And there are many other prayers recorded in the Scripture.

3. And all the churches of Christ at least these thirteen or fourteen hundred years have taken public forms for lawful; which is not to be gainsay’d without proof.

* God gave forms of preaching to Moses and the prophets: see a large form of prayer for all the people, Deut. xxvii. 19—15. And so elsewhere there are many.
Quest. LXXIII. Are public forms of man's devising or composing lawful?

Answ. Yes: 1. The ministers afore-mentioned throughout the Christian world, do devise and compose the form of their own sermons and prayers: and that maketh them not unlawful. 2. And whoever speaketh 'ex tempore,' his words are a form when he speaketh them, though not a premeditated form. 3. And when Scripture so vehemently commandeth us to search, meditate, study the Scriptures, and take heed to ourselves and unto doctrine, &c. What a person is that who will condemn prayer or preaching, only because we beforehand studied or considered what to say? As if God abhorred diligence and the use of reason. Men are not tied (now) from thinking beforehand what to say to the judge at the bar for estate or life, or what to say on an embassy, or to a king, or any man that we converse with. And where are we forbidden to forethink what to say to God? Must the people take heed how they hear, and look to their foot when they go into the house of God? and must not we take heed what we speak, and look to our words that they be fit and decent?

Object. 'Forms are images of prayer and preaching, forbidden in the second commandment?'

Answ. Prove it, and add not to the Word of God. 1. The Scripture and God's servants, even Christ himself, had broken the second commandment, when they used or prescribed forms. 2. Forms are no more images than extemporaneous words are, as they signify our minds. Are all the catechisms, printed and written sermons and prayers, images or idols? All forms that parents teach their children? O charge not such untruths on God; and invent not falsehoods of his Word, while you cry down man's inventions.

Quest. LXXIV. Is it lawful to impose forms on the congregation or the people in public worship?

Yes, and more than lawful: it is the pastor's duty so to do. For whether he forethink what to pray or not, his prayer is to them a form of words: and they are bound in all the lawful parts, to concur with him in Spirit or desire, and to
say Amen. So that every minister by office is daily to impose a form of prayer on all the people in the congregation. Only some men impose the same form many times over, or every day, and others impose every day a new one.

Quest. lxxv. Is it lawful to use forms composed by man, and imposed not only on the people, but on the pastors of the churches?

Answ. The question concerneth not the lawfulness of imposing, but of using forms imposed. And 1. It is not lawful to use them merely on that account because they are imposed or commanded, without some greater reason of the unlawfulness. For else it would be unlawful for any other to use imposed forms; as for a scholar or child, if the master or parent impose them, or for the congregation when the pastor imposeth them, which is not true.

2. The using of imposed forms may by other accidents be sometimes good and sometimes evil, as the accidents are that make it so.

1. These accidents may make it evil. (1.) When the form is bad for matter or manner, and we voluntarily prefer it before that which is better, being willing of the imposition. (2.) When we do it to gratify our slothfulness, or to cover our wilful ignorance and disability. (3.) When we voluntarily obey and strengthen any unlawful, usurping pastors or powers that impose it without authority, and so encourage church-tyranny. (4.) When we choose a singular form imposed by some singular pastor, and avoid that which the rest of the churches agree in, at a time when it may tend to division and offence. (5.) When the weakness and offence of the congregation is such, that they will not join with us in the imposed form, and so by using it, we drive them from all public worship or divide them.

2. And in the following circumstances the using of an imposed form is lawful and a duty: (1.) When the minister is so weak that he cannot pray well without one, nor compose so good a one himself. (2.) Or when the errors or great weakness of the generality of ministers is such, as that they usually corrupt or spoil God's worship by their own manner of praying, and no better are to be had; and
thereupon the wise and faithful pastors and magistrates shall impose one sound and apt liturgy to avoid error and division in such a distempered time; and the ablest cannot be left at liberty without the relaxing of the rest. (3.) When it is a means of the concord of the churches, and no hindrance to our other prayers. (4.) When our hearers will not join with us if we use them not: (for error and weakness must be borne with on one side, as well as on the other.) (5.) When obedience to just authority requireth it, and no command of Christ is crossed by it. (6.) When the imposition is so severe that we must so worship God publicly, or not at all; and so all God's public worship will be shut out of that congregation, country or nation, unless we will use imposed prayers. (7.) In a word, when the good consequences of obedience, union, avoiding offence, liberty for God's public worship and preaching the Gospel, &c. are greater than the bad consequences which are like to follow the using of such forms: the preponderating accidents must prevail. (8.) And if a man's own judgment and conscience cannot be satisfied, to do God's work comfortably and quietly any other way, it may go far in the determination. And the common good of many churches must still be preferred before a less.

Quest. LXXVI. Doth not the calling of a minister so consist in the exercise of his own ministerial gifts, that he may not officiate without them, nor make use of other men's gifts instead of them?

Ansv. 1. The office of the ministry is an obligation and authority to do the ministerial work, by those personal, competent abilities which God hath given us.

2. This obligation to use our own abilities, forbiddeth us not to make use of the helps, gifts and abilities of others; either to promote our own abilities and habits, or to further us in the act or the exercise of them. For, 1. There is no such prohibition in Scripture. 2. All men are insufficient for themselves; and nature and Scripture require them to use the best help they can get from others. 3. God's service must be done in the best manner we can. But many
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ministers cannot do it so well (consideratis considerandis) without other men's help as with it.

3. We may use other men's gifts to help us, 1. For matter; 2. Method; 3. Words; and so for a threefold form, of preaching or prayer.

4. He that useth a Scripture form of matter, method of words, useth his own abilities no more, than if he used a form out of another book. But it is lawful to use a Scripture form; therefore it is lawful so far to take in assistance in the use of our own abilities.

5. He that useth a form useth his own abilities also (not only perhaps at other times, but) in the use of it. He useth his understanding to discern the true sense and aptitude of the words which he useth: he useth his holy desires in putting up those prayers to God; and his other graces, as he doth in other prayers. He useth his utterance in the apt and decent speaking of them.

6. A minister is not always bound to use his own gifts to the utmost that he can, and other men's as little as he can. For, 1. There is no such command from God. 2. All things must be done to the church's edification: but sometimes the greater use of another man's gifts, and the less use of his own, may be to the church's greater edification.

Instances of the lawful use of other men's gifts are such as these.

1. For matter, an abler minister may tell a young man what subjects are fittest for him in preaching and prayer; and what is the sense of the Scriptures which he is to open; and what is the true solution of several doubts and cases. A minister that is young, raw or ignorant, (yea, the best) may be a learner while he is a teacher: but he that is a learner maketh use so far of the gifts of others. And indeed all teachers in the world make use of the gifts of others; for all teach what they learn from others.

2. For method; it is lawful to learn that as well as matter from another. Christ taught his disciples a method of prayer; and other men may open that method to us. All tutors teach their pupils method as well as matter; for method is needful to the due understanding and using of the matter. A method of divinity, a method of preaching,
and a method of praying may be taught a preacher by word, and may be written or printed for his use.

3. For words, (1.) There is no more prohibition in God's Word, against learning or using another man's words, than his method or matter. Therefore it is not unlawful. (2.) A tutor or senior minister may teach the Scripture words to a pupil or junior minister; yea, and may set them together and compose him a sermon or prayer out of Scripture in its words. (For he that may use an ill-composed Scripture form of his own gathering, may use a well-composed form of another's.) (3.) All the books in our libraries are forms of words; and it is lawful sure to use some of all those words which we read; or else our books would be a snare and limitation to our language. (4.) All preachers ordinarily use citations, testimonies, &c. in other men's words. (5.) All ministers use psalms in the metre of other men's composing (and usually imposing too). And there is no more prohibition against using other men's words in a prayer, than in a psalm. (6.) Almost all ministers use other men's gifts and form of words, in reading the Scriptures, in their vulgar tongues: for God did not write them by his apostles and prophets in English, French, Dutch, &c. but in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek: therefore the wording them in English, &c. is a human form of words: and few ministers think they are bound to translate all the Bible themselves, lest they use other men's words or abilities. (7.) If a young minister that can pray but weakly, hear more apt expressions and sentences in another minister's prayers, than his own are, he may afterward make use of those sentences and expressions. And if of one sentence, why not of two or ten, when God hath not forbidden it? So also in preaching. (8.) It is lawful to read another man's epistles or sermons in the church, as the primitive churches did by Clement's and some others. (9.) An imposition may be so severe, that we shall not use our own words, unless we will use some of other men's. (10.) All churches almost in the world, have consented in the use of creeds, confessions and prayers, and psalms in the words of others.

But yet 1. No minister must on these pretences stifle his own gifts, and grow negligent; 2. Nor consent to church-tyranny or Papal usurpations; 3. Nor do that
which tendeth to eat out seriousness in the worship of God, and turn all into dead imagery or formality.

**Quest. Is it lawful to read a prayer in the church?**

**Answ.** 1. That which is not forbidden is lawful: but to read a prayer is not forbidden (as such, though by accident it may).

2. The prayers in the Scripture psalms, were usually read in the Jewish synagogues lawfully; for they were written to that end, and were indeed the Jewish liturgy. Therefore to read a prayer is not unlawful.

3. He that hath a weak memory may read his own sermon notes; therefore he may read his prayers.

4. I add as to this case and the former together; that 1. Christ did usually frequent the Jewish synagogues.

2. That in those synagogues there were forms of prayer, and that ordinarily read, at least Scripture forms: and if either the Jewish rabbins (cited by Scaliger, Selden in Eutych., Alexandr., &c.,) or the strongest probability may be credited, there were also human forms. For who can imagine that those Pharisees should have no human forms, (1.) Who are so much accused of formality, and following traditions: (2.) And used long and frequent prayers: but if indeed they had no such forms, then long and frequent extemporate prayers are not so great a sign of the Spirit's gifts as is imagined, when such Pharisees abounded in them. But there is little probability, but that they used both ways.

3. That Christ did not separate from the synagogues for such prayers' sake.

4. Yea, that we never read that Christ meddled in the controversy, it being then no controversy; nor that he once reproved such forms, or reading them, or ever called the Jews to repent of them.

If you say, his general reproof of traditions was enough: I answer, 1. Even traditions he reproved not as such, but as set before, or against the commands of God. 2. He named many of their particular traditions and corruptions, Matt. xv. xxiii. &c., and yet never named this. 3. His being usually present at their assemblies, and so joining with
them in their worship, would be such an appearance of his approbation, as would make it needful to express his disallowance of it, if indeed he thought it sinful. So that whoever impartially considereth all this, that he joined with them, that he particularly reprobated other corruptions, and that he never said any thing at all against forms or reading prayers, that is recorded, will sure be moderate in his judgment of such indifferent things, if he know what moderation is.

**Quest. LXXVII. Is it lawful to pray in the church without a prescribed or premeditated form of words?**

**Ans.** There are so few sober and serious Christians that ever made a doubt of this, that I will not bestow many words to prove it.

1. That which is not forbidden is lawful. But church prayer without a premeditated or prescribed form of words is not forbidden (by God); therefore (as to God's laws) it is not unlawful.

2. To express holy desires understandingly, orderly, seriously, and in apt expressions, is lawful praying. But all this may be done without a set form of words; therefore to pray without a set form of words may be lawful.

3. The consent of the universal church, and the experience of godly men, are arguments so strong, as are not to be made light of.

4. To which Scripture instances may be added.

**Quest. LXXVIII. Whether are set forms of words, or free praying without them the better way? And what are the commodities and incommodities of each way?**

**Ans.** I will first answer the latter question, because the former dependeth on it.

1. The commodities of a set form of words, and the discommodities of free praying are these following.

   1. In a time of dangerous heresies which hath infected the pastors, a set form of prescribed words tendeth to keep the church, and the consciences of the joiners from such infection, offence, and guilt.
2. When ministers are so weak as to dishonour God's worship by their unapt, and slovenly and unsound expressions, prescribed or set forms which are well composed, are some preservative and cure. When free praying leaveth the church under this inconvenience.

3. When ministers by faction, passion, or corrupt interests, are apt to put these vices into their prayers, to the injury of others, and of the cause and church of God, free praying cherisheth this, or giveth it opportunity, which set forms do restrain.

4. Concordant set forms do serve for the most exact concord in the churches, that all at once may speak the same things.

5. They are needful to some weak ministers that cannot do so well without them.

6. They somewhat prevent the laying of the reputation of religious worship upon the minister's abilities: when in free praying, the honour and comfort varieth with the various degrees of pastoral abilities; in one place it is excellently well done, in another but drily, and coldly, and meanly; in another erroneously, unedifyingly, if not dishonourably, tending to the contempt of holy things: whereas in the way of set liturgies, though the ablest (at that time) doth no better, yet the weakest doth, (for words) as well, and all alike.

7. And, if proud weak men have not the composing and imposing of it, all know that words drawn up by study, upon sober premeditation and consultation, have a greater advantage, to be exact and apt, than those that were never thought on till we are speaking them.

8. The very fear of doing amiss, disturbeth some unready men, and maketh them do all the rest the worse.

9. The auditors know beforehand, whether that which they are to join in be sound or unsound, having time to try it.

10. And they can more readily put in their consent to what is spoken, and make the prayers their own, when they know beforehand what it is, than they can do when they know not before they hear it; it being hard to the duller sort of hearers, to concur with an understanding and consent as quick as the speaker's words are. Not but that this
may be done, but not without great difficulty in the duller sort.

11. And it tendeth to avoid the pride and self-deceit of many, who think they are good Christians, and have the spirit of grace and supplication, because by learning and use they can speak many hours in variety of expressions in prayer; which is a dangerous mistake.

II. The commodities of free extempore prayers, and the discommodity of prescribed or set forms are these following.

1. It becometh an advantage to some proud men who think themselves wiser than all the rest, to obtrude their compositions, that none may be thought wise enough, or fit to speak to God but in their words; and so introduce church-tyranny.

2. It may become a hindrance to able, worthy ministers that can do better.

3. It may become a dividing snare to the churches, that cannot all agree and consent in such human impositions.

4. It may become an advantage to heretics when they can but get into power (as the Arians of old) to corrupt all the churches and public worship; and thus the Papists have corrupted the churches by the mass.

5. It may become an engine or occasion of persecution, and silencing all those ministers that cannot consent to such impositions.

6. It may become a means of depraving the ministry, and bringing them to a common idleness and ignorance, (if other things alike concur). For when men perceive that no greater abilities are used and required, they will commonly labour for and get no greater, and so will be unable to pray without their forms of words.

7. And by this means Christian religion may decay and grow into contempt; for though it be desirable that its own worth should keep up its reputation and success, yet it never hitherto was so kept up without the assistance of God’s eminent gifts and graces in his ministers; but wherever there hath been a learned, able, holy, zealous, diligent ministry, religion usually hath flourished; and wherever there hath been an ignorant, vicious, cold, idle, negligent and reproached ministry, religion usually hath
died and been reproached. And we have now no reason to look for that which never was, and that God should take a new course in the world.

And the opinion of imposing forms of prayer, may draw on the opinion of imposing forms of preaching as much, and of restraining free preaching as much as free praying, as we see in Moscovy. And then when nothing but bare reading is required, nothing more will be ordinarily sought; and so the ministry will be the scorn of the people.

9. And it will be a shameful and uncomfortable failing, when a minister is not able on variety of occasions, to vary his prayers accordingly; and when he cannot go any further than his book or lesson; it being as impossible to make prayers just fitted to all occasions which will fall out, as to make sermons fit for all, or as they say, to make a coat for the moon; and the people will content the ministers when they perceive this great deficiency.

10. And it is a great difficulty to many ministers to learn and say a form without book; so that they that can all day speak what they know, can scarce recite a form of words one quarter of an hour, the memory more depending upon the body and its temper, than the exercise of the understanding doth. He that is tied just to these words and no other, is put upon double difficulties (like him that on height must walk on a narrow plank, where the fear of falling will make him fall); but he that may express the just desires of his soul in what words occur that are apt and decent, is like one that hath a field to walk in: for my own part, it is easier to me to pray or preach six hours in freedom, about things which I understand, than to pray or preach the tenth part of an hour in the fetters of a form of words which I must not vary. And so the necessity of a book coming in, doth bring down the reputation of the minister's abilities, in the people's eyes.

11. But the grand incommmodity, greater than all the rest is, that it usually occasioneth carelessness, deadness, formality, and heartless lip-labour in our prayers to God; whilst the free way of present prayer tendeth to excite our cogitations to consider what we say. And it is not only the multitude of dead-hearted hypocrites in the church that are thus tempted to persevere in their lip-labour and hypo-
crisy, and to draw near to God with their lips when their hearts are far from him, and are gratified in their self-deceit, whilst parrot-like they speak the words which they regard not, and their tongues do overgo their hearts; but even better men are greatly tempted to dead remissness: I mean both the speakers and the hearers; for, (1.) It is natural to man's mind to have a slothful weariness as well as his body; and to do no more than be findeth a necessity of doing; and though God's presence alone should suffice to engage all the powers of our souls, yet sad experience telleth us, that God's eye and man's together will do more with almost all men, than one alone. And therefore no men's thoughts are so accurately governed as their words. Therefore when a minister knoweth beforehand that, as to man's approbation, he hath no more to do but to read that which he seeth before him, he is apt to let his thoughts fly abroad, and his affections lie down, because no man taketh account of these; but in extemporate diversified prayer, a man cannot do it without an excitation of his understanding to think (to the utmost) what to say; and an excitation of his affections, to speak with life, or else the hearers will perceive his coldness. And though all this may be counterfeit and hypocritically affected, yet it is a great help to seriousness and sincerity to have the faculties all awake; and it is a great help to awaken them to be under such a constant necessity even from man. As those that are apt to sleep at prayer, will do it less when they know men observe them, than at another time.

(2.) And both to speakers and hearers, human frailty maketh it hard to be equally affected with the same thing spoken a hundred times, as we are at first when it is new, and when it is clothed in comely variety of expressions. As the same book affecteth us not at the twentieth reading as it did at the first. Say not, it is a dishonourable weakness to be thus carried by the novelty of things or words; for though that be true, it is a dishonour common to all mankind, and a disease which is your own, and which God alloweth us all lawful means to cure, and to correct the unhappy effects while it is uncured.

12. Lastly, set forms serve unworthy men to hide their unworthiness by, and to be the matter of a controversy in
which they may vent their envy against them that are more able and holy than themselves.

III. Having now truly shewed you the commodities and incomedities of both the ways, for the other question. 'Which of them is the best?' I must give you but some rules to answer it yourselves.

1. That is best which hath most and greatest commodities, and fewest and least incomedities.

2. For neither of them is forbidden, in itself considered, nor evil, but by accident.

3. One may have more commodities and the other more incomedities in one country and age than in another; and with some persons than with others.

4. Sober Christians should be very backward in such cases to quarrel with the churches where they live or come, but humbly submit to them in lawful things, though they think them inconvenient; because it is not they that are the governors and judges.

5. The commands of authority and the concord of the churches may weigh down many lighter accidents.

6. I crave leave to profess that my own judgment is, that somewhat of both ways joined together will best obviate the incomedities of both. To have so much wholesome, methodical, unquestionable forms as near as may be in Scripture phrase, as is necessary to avoid the inconvenience of a total exclusion of forms, and to the attainment of their desirable ends; and to have so much withal of freedom in prayer, as is necessary to its ends, and to avoid the deadness, formality, and other incomedities of forms alone. Though by this opinion I cross the conceits of prejudiced men on both extremes, I think I cross not the judgment of the Church of England, which alloweth free prayers in the pulpit, and at the visitation of the sick; and I cross not the opinion of any ancient church that ever I read of, nor of the fathers and pastors whose works are come to our hands; nor yet of Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and the rest of our famous reformers; nor yet of the famous nonconformists of England, Cartwright, Hildersham, Greenham, Perkins, Bain, Amesius, &c. and I least fear erring in all this company, than with those on either of the extremes.

I have a manuscript of Mr. Cartwright's in which, having fully proved the
Quest. lxxix. Is it lawful to forbear the preaching of some truths, upon man's prohibition, that I may have liberty to preach the rest; yea, and to promise beforehand to forbear them? Or to do it for the church's peace?

Answ. 1. Some truths are of so great moment and necessity, that without them you cannot preach the Gospel in a saving sort. These you may not forbear nor promise to forbear.

2. Some truths are such as God at that time doth call men eminently to publish and receive (as against some heresy when it is at the very height, or the church in greatest danger of it; or concerning some duty which God then specially calleth men to perform, (as the duty of loyalty just in the time of a perilous rebellion, &c.). Such preaching being a duty, must not be forborne, when it cannot be performed upon lawful terms.

3. But some truths are controverted among good men; and some are of a lower nature and usefulness: and concerning these I further say,

(1.) That you may not renounce them or deny them, nor subscribe to the smallest untruth for liberty to preach the greatest truth.

(2.) But you may for the time that the church's benefit requireth it, both forbear to preach them, and promise to forbear, both for the church's peace, and for that liberty to preach the Gospel, which you cannot otherwise obtain. The reasons are:

1. Because it is not a duty to preach them at that time; for no duty is a duty at all times: affirmative precepts bind not 'ad semper,' because man cannot always do them.

2. It is a sin to prefer a lesser truth or good before a greater. You cannot speak all things at once. When you have all done, some, yea, a thousand must be by you omitted. Therefore the less should be omitted rather than the greater.

3. You have your office to the church's edification.

falsehood of Sutliff's suspicion that he was acquainted with Hacket's project, he answered his charge, as if he were against forms of prayer, that all the years that he lived at Middleburg and Antwerp he constantly used the same form before sermon, and mostly after sermon, and also did read prayers in the church; and that since he seldom concluded but with the Lord's prayer.
Preaching is made for man, and not man for preaching. But the church's edification requireth you rather to preach the Gospel, than that opinion or point which you are required to forbear. Without this the hearers may be saved, but not without the Gospel.

And what a man may do and must do, he may on good occasion promise to do.

He that thinketh diocesans, or liturgies, or ceremonies unlawful, and yet cannot have leave to preach the Gospel (in time of need) unless he will forbear, and promise to forbear to preach them, may and ought so to do and promise, rather than not to preach the Gospel.

Object. 'But if men imprison or hinder me from preaching, that is their fault; but if I voluntarily forbear any duty, it is my own fault.'

Answ. 1. It is to forbear a sin, and not a duty at that time; it is no more a duty than reading, or singing, or praying at sermon time. 2. When you are in prison, or know in all probability you shall be there, though by other men's fault, it is your own fault if you will deny a lawful means to avoid it; for your not preaching the Gospel is then your own sin, as well as other men's; and their's excuseth not your's.

Quest. Lxxx. May or must a minister silenced, or forbid to preach the Gospel, go on still to preach it, against the law?


1. Some men are justly forbidden to preach the Gospel, as, 1. Those that are utterly unable, and do worse than nothing when they do it. 2. Those that are heretics and subvert the essentials of Christianity or godliness. 3. Those that are so impious and malignant, that they turn all against the practice of that religion which they profess; in a word, all that do (directly) more hurt than good.

2. In some places there are so many able preachers, that some tolerable men may be spared, if not accounted supernumeraries; and the church will not suffer by their silence. But in other countries either the preachers are so few, or so bad, or the people so very ignorant, and hardened, and un-
godly, or so great a number that are in deep necessity, that the need of preaching is undeniable. And so I conclude,

1. That he that is justly silenced, and is unfit to preach, is bound to forbear.

2. He that is silenced by just power, though unjustly, in a country that needeth not his preaching, must forbear there, and if he can, must go into another country, where he may be more serviceable.

3. Magistrates may not ecclesiastically ordain ministers or degrade them; but only either give them liberty, or deny it them as there is cause.

4. Magistrates are not the fountain of the ministerial office, as the sovereign is of all the civil power of inferior magistrates; but both offices are immediately from God.

5. Magistrates have not power from God to forbid men to preach in all cases, nor as they please; but justly only and according to God's laws.

6. Men are not made ministers of Christ only 'pro tempore' or on trial, to go off again if they dislike it; but are absolutely dedicated to God, and take their lot for better and for worse; which maketh the Romanists say, that ordination is a sacrament (and so it may be aptly called); and that we receive an indelible character, that is, an obligation during life, unless God himself disable us.

7. As we are more nearly devoted and related to God than church-lands, goods, and temples are, so the sacrilege of alienating a consecrated person unjustly, is greater and more unquestionable than the sacrilege of alienating consecrated houses, lands, or things. And therefore no minister may sacrilegiously alienate himself from God and his undertaken office and work.

8. We must do any lawful thing to procure the magistrate's licence to preach in his dominions.

9. All men silenced or forbidden by magistrates to preach, are not thereby obliged or warranted to forbear. For, 1. The apostles expressly determine it, "Whether it be better to hearken to God rather than to you, judge ye." 2. Christ oft foretold his servants, that they must preach against the will of rulers, and suffer by them. 3. The apostles and ordinary ministers also for 300 years after Christ did generally preach against the magistrate's will, throughout the
Roman empire and the world. 4. The orthodox bishops commonly took themselves bound to preach when Arian or other heretical emperors forbade them. A moral duty of stated necessity to the church and men’s salvation is not subjected to the will of men for order sake: for order is for the thing ordered and for the end. Magistrates cannot dispense with us for not loving our neighbours, or not shewing mercy to the poor, or saving the lives of the needy in famine or distress. Else they that at last shall hear, “I was hungry and ye fed me not, I was naked and ye clothed me not, I was in prison and ye visited me not,” might oft say, our parents, masters, or magistrates forbade us. Yet a lesser moral duty may be forbidden by the magistrate for the sake of a greater, because then it is no duty indeed, and may be forborne if he forbid it not: as to save one man’s life, if it would prove the death of a multitude; or to save one man’s house on fire, if so doing would fire many. Therefore,

10. It is lawful and a duty to forbear some certain time or number of sermons, prayers, or sacraments, &c. when either the present use of them would apparently procure more hurt than good, or when the forbearance were like to procure more good than the doing of them: for they are all for our edification, and are made for man and not man for them (though for God). As if forbearing this day would procure me liberty for many days’ service afterward, &c.

11. It is not lawful at the command of man to forsake or forbear our calling and duty, when it is to be judged necessary to the honour of God, to the good of the church, and of men’s souls: that is, when as in Daniel’s case, Dan. vi. our religion itself, and our owning the true God, doth seem suspended by the suspense of our duty: or when the multitude of ignorant, hardenèd, ungodly souls, and the want of fit men for number and quality, doth put it past controversy that our work is greatly necessary.

12. Those that are not immediately called by Christ as were the apostles, but by men, being yet stedfastly obliged to the death when they are called, may truly say as Paul, “Necessity is laid upon me, and woe be to me if I preach not the Gospel.”

---

13. Papists and Protestants concur in this judgment. Papists will preach when the law forbids them; and the judgment of Protestants is, among others, by Bishop Bilson of Subjection, and Bishop Andrews Tortur. Tort. plainly so asserted.

14. But all that are bound to preach, are not bound to do it to the same number, nor in the same manner; as they have not the same opportunity and call. Whether it shall be in this place or that, to more or fewer, at this hour or that, are not determined in Scripture, nor alike to all.

15. The temples, tithes, and such adjuncts of worship and ministry, are at the magistrate’s disposal, and must not be invaded against his laws.

16. Where any are obliged to preach in a forbidden, discountenanced state, they must study to do it with such prudence, caution, peaceableness, and obedience in all the lawful circumstantialls, as may tend to maintain peace and the honour of magistracy, and to avoid temptations to sedition, and unruly passions.

Quest. lxxxi. May we lawfully keep the Lord’s day as a fast?

Answ. Not ordinarily; because God hath made it a day of thanksgiving; and we must not pervert it from the use to which it was appointed by God. But in case of extraordinary necessity, it may be done; as 1. In case that some great judgment call us so suddenly to humiliation and fasting, as that it cannot be deferred to the next day; (as some sudden invasion, fire, sickness, &c.) 2. In case by persecution the church be denied liberty to meet on any other day, in a time when public fasting and prayer is a duty. 3. In case the people be so poor, or servants, children and wives be so hardly restrained, that they cannot meet at any other time. It is lawful in such cases, because positives give way to moral or natural duties, 'ceteris paribus,' and lesser duties unto greater: the sabbath is made for man, and not man for the sabbath.

Quest. lxxxi. How should the Lord’s day be spent in the main?
Ans. I have so far opened that in the family directions, that I will now only say, 1. That eucharistical worship is the great work of the day: and that it should be kept as a day of public thanksgiving for the whole work of redemption, especially for the resurrection of our Lord.

2. And therefore the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper was always a chief part of its observation in the primitive churches: not merely for the sacrament's sake; but because with it was still joined all the laudatory and thanksgiving worship. And it was the pastor's work so to pray, and praise God, and preach to the people, as tendeth most to possess their souls with the liveliest sense of the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, on the account of our redemption.

3. Though confession of sin and humiliation must not be the chief work of the day, yet it may and must come in, as in due subordination to the chief. 1. Because there are usually many persons present, who are members only of the visible church, and are not fit for the laudatory and rejoicing part. 2. Because while we are in the flesh, our salvation is imperfect, and so are we; and much sin still remaineth, which must be a grief and burden to believers: and therefore while sin is mixed with grace, repentance and sorrow must be mixed with our thanksgivings, and we must "rejoice with trembling." And though we "receive a kingdom which cannot be moved," yet must our "acceptable service of God be with reverence and godly fear, because our God is a consuming fire!" 3. Our sin and misery being that which we are saved from, doth enter the definition of our salvation. And without the sense of them, we can never know aright what mercy is, nor ever be truly glad and thankful. But yet take heed that this subordinate duty be not pretended, for the neglecting of that thanksgiving which is the work of the day.

Quest. LXXXIII. May the people bear a vocal part in worship, or do any more than say, Amen?

---


1 Psal. ii. 9—11. Heb. xii. 28, 29.
Answer. Yes: the people should say Amen; that is, openly signify their consent. But the meaning is not that they must do no more, nor otherwise express their consent saving by that single word. For, 1. There is no Scripture which forbiddeth more. 2. The people bear an equal part in singing the psalms; which are prayer, and praise, and instruction. 3. If they may do so in the psalms in metre, there can no reason be given but they may lawfully do so in the psalms in prose; for saying them and singing them are but modes of utterance; both are the speaking of prayer and praise to God: and the ancient singing was more like our saying, than to our tunes, as most judge. 4. The primitive Christians were so full of the zeal and love of Christ, that they would have taken it for an injury and a quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly restrained from bearing their part in the praisings of the church. 5. The use of the tongue keepeth awake the mind, and stirreth up God's graces in his servants. 6. It was the decay of zeal in the people that first shut out responses; while they kept up the ancient zeal, they were inclined to take their part vocally in their worship: and this was seconded by the pride and usurpation of some priests thereupon, who thought the people of God too profane to speak in the assemblies, and meddle so much with holy things.

Yet the very remembrance of former zeal, caused most churches to retain many of the words of their predecessors, even when they lost the life and spirit which should animate them. And so the same words came into the liturgies, and were used by too many customarily, and in formality, which their ancestors had used in the favour of their souls.

6. And if it were not that a dead-hearted, formal people, by speaking the responses carelessly and hypocritically do bring them into disgrace with many that see the necessity of seriousness, I think few good people would be against them now. If all the serious, zealous Christians in the assembly speak the same words in a serious manner, there will appear nothing in them that should give offence. If in the fulness of their hearts, the people should break out into such words of prayer, or confession, or praise, it would be taken

---

1 Cor. xiv. Psalm. cl. lxxxi. 2, 3. xcvi. 5. xcvi. 1—5. &c. cv. 2, 7. &c. calv. throughout. Col. iii. 16.
for an extraordinary pang of zeal; and were it unusual, it would take exceedingly. But the better any thing is, the more loathsome it appeareth when it is mortified by hypocrisy and dead formality, and turned into a mockery, or an affected, scenical act. But it is here the duty of every Christian to labour to restore the life and spirit to the words, that they may again be used in a serious and holy manner as heretofore.

7. Those that would have private men pray and prophesy in public, as warranted by 1 Cor. xiv. "Ye may all speak, &c." do much contradict themselves, if they say also that a layman may say nothing but Amen.

8. The people were all to say amen in Deut. xxvii. 15, 16. 18—20, &c. And yet they oftentimes said more. As Exod. xix. 8. in as solemn an assembly as any of ours, when God himself gave Moses a sermon (in a form of words) to preach to the people, and Moses had repeated it as from the Lord, (it being the narrative of his mercies, the command of obedience, and the promises of his great blessings upon that condition,) "all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." The like was done again, Exod. xxiv. 3. And Deut. v. 27. And lest you should think either that the assembly was not so solemn as ours, or that it was not well done of the people to say more than amen, God himself who was present declared his approbation, even of the words when the speaker's hearts were not so sincere in speaking them as they ought; ver. 28, 29. "And the Lord heard the voice of your words when you spake unto me, and the Lord said unto me, I have heard the voice of the words of this people—They have well said all that they have spoken. O that there were such a heart in them——." 

Object. 'But this is but a speech to Moses and not to God.'

Answ. I will recite to you a form of prayer which the people themselves were to make publicly to God; Deut. xxvi. 13—15. "Then shalt thou say before the Lord thy God, I have brought away the hallowed things out of my house, and also have given them unto the Levite and unto the stranger, to the fatherless and to the widow, according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me: I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have
I forgotten them. I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I taken away ought thereof for any unclean use, nor given ought thereof for the dead; but I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord my God, and have done according to all that thou hast commanded me. Look down from thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless thy people Israel, and the land which thou hast given us, as thou swarest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey." Is not here a full form of prayer to be used by all the people? And remember that Joseph and Mary, and Christ himself were under this law, and that you never read that Christ found fault with the people's speech, nor spake a word to restrain it in his churches.

In Lev. ix. 24. "When all the people saw the glory of the Lord, and the fire that came out from it, and consumed the burnt offering, they shouted and fell on their faces:" which was an acclamation more than bare amen.

2 Kings xxiii. 2, 3. "King Josiah went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, &c. And the priests and the prophets, and all the people both small and great; and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant: and the king stood by a pillar and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, &c. with all their heart, and all their soul, &c. and all the people stood to the covenant?" Where as a king is the speaker, it is like that the people used some words to express their consent.

1 Chron. xvi. 35, 36. When David delivered a psalm for a form of praise: in which it is said to the people, ver. 35. "And say ye, Save us, O God of our salvation, and gather us together, and deliver us from the heathen, that we may give thanks to thy holy name, and glory in thy praise. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for ever and ever. All the people said, Amen, and praised the Lord." Where it is like that their praising the Lord was more than their amen.

And it is a command, Psal. lxvii. 3, 5. "Let all the people praise thee O God, let all the people praise thee." And he that will limit this to single persons, or say that it must not be vocally in the church, or it must be only in metre, and never in prose, or only in tunes and not without, must prove it, lest he be proved an adder to God's Word.
But it would be tedious to recite all the repeated sentences in the psalms, which are commonly supposed to be the responses of the people, repeated by them. And in Rev. xiv. 2, 3. the voice as "of many waters and as of a great thunder, and the voice of harpers harping with their harps, who sung a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts and the elders, a song which none could learn but the hundred forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth, which were not defiled with women, who were virgins and followed the Lamb," &c. doth seem very plainly to be spoken of the praises of all the saints. Chap. xvii. 15. by waters is meant people, multitudes, &c. And chap. xix. 5—8. there is expressly-recited a form of praise for all the people, "A voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give honour to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her it was granted, &c."

And indeed he that hath stiled all his people "priests to God and a holy and royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, and to shew forth the praises, 'râç ðòrâç', the virtues, of him that hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light," doth seem not to take them for so profane a generation, as to be prohibited from speaking to God in public any otherwise than by the mouth of a priest.

And it seemeth to be more allowed (and not less) under the Gospel, than under the law; because then the people as under guilt were kept at a greater distance from God, and must speak to him more by a priest that was a type of Christ our intercessor 1. But now we are brought nigh, and reconciled to God, and have the spirit of sons, and may go by Christ alone unto the Father. And therefore though it be true that minsters yet are sub-intercessors under Christ our high priest, yet they are rarely called priests, but des-
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cried more in the New Testament by other parts of their office.

Object. 'But the people's responses make a confused noise in the assemblies, not intelligible.'

Answ. All things are ill done, that are done by ill men that carnally and formally slubber it over: but if the best and holiest people would unanimously set themselves to do it, as they do in singing psalms, so that they did not only stand by to be the hearers of others, it would be done more orderly and spiritually as well as singing is.

Quest. lxxxiv. Is it not a sin for our clerks to make themselves the mouth of the people, who are no ordained ministers of Christ?

Answ. 1. In those places where ordained deacons do it, this objection hath no place. 2. The clerks are not appointed to be the mouth of the people, but only each clerk is one of the people commanded to do that which all should do, lest it should be wholly left undone. If all the congregation will speak all that the clerk doth, it will answer the primary desire of the church-governors, who bid the people do it: but if they that will not do it themselves, shall pretend that the clerk doth usurp the ministry, because he ceaseth not as well as they; they might as well say so by a few that should sing psalms in the church, when the rest are against it and forbear. May not a man do his duty in singing or saying, when you refuse yours, without pretending to be your mouth, or usurping the ministry?

Quest. lxxxv. Are repetitions of the same words in church prayers, lawful?

Answ. 1. It is not lawful to affect them as the heathens, who think they shall be heard for their battology, or saying over the same words, as if God were moved by them as by a charm. 2. Nor is it lawful to do that which hath a strong appearance of such a conceit, and thereby to make God's worship ridiculous and contemptible; as the Papists in their psalters, and prayer books, repeating over the name of Je-

n Matt. vi. 18.
sus, and Mary so oft together as maketh it seem a ludiurous canting.

But, 1. It is lawful to speak the same words from fulness and fervency of zeal; 2. And when we are afraid to give over lest we have not yet prevailed with God. 3. And in God’s solemn praises (sung or said) a word or sentence oft repeated sometimes hath an elegancy, and affecting decency; and therefore it is so often used in the psalms; yea, and in many Scripture prayers. 4. In such cases, to bring a serious urgency of spirit to the repeated words, and not to quarrel with the repetitions, is the duty of one that joineth with true Christian assemblies, as a son of piety and peace a.

Quest. lxxxvi. Is it lawful to bow at the name of Jesus?

Answ. The question either respecteth the person of Jesus, named by any of his names, or else this name ‘Jesus’ only. And that either simply in itself considered; or else comparatively as excluding, or not including other names.

1. That the person of Jesus is to be bowed to, I never knew a Christian deny.

2. That we may lawfully express our reverence by bowing, when the names, ‘God,’ ‘Jehovah,’ ‘Jesus,’ ‘Christ,’ &c., are uttered, I have met with few Christians who deny, nor know I any reason to deny it.

3. Had I been fit to have prescribed directions to other ministers or churches, I would not have persuaded, much less commanded them to bow at the name of Jesus, any more than at the name of God, Jehovah, Christ, &c., for for many reasons which the reader may imagine, though I will not now mention them.

4. But if I live and join in a church where it is commanded and peremptorily urged to bow at the name of Jesus, and where my not doing it would be divisive, scandalous or offensive, I will bow at the name of God, Jehovah, Jesus, Christ, Lord, &c., one as well as the other; seeing it is not bowing at Christ’s name that I scruple, but the consequents of seeming to distinguish or prefer that name alone before all the rest. b

a Psal. cxxxvi. cvil. 8. 13. 21. &c.

Quest. lxxvii. Is it lawful to stand up at the Gospel as we are appointed?

Answ. 1. Had I been a prescriber to others myself, I should not have required the church to stand up at the reading of one part of a chapter by the name of the gospel, and not at the same words when the whole chapter is read.

2. But if I live where rulers peremptorily command it, (I suppose not forbidding us to stand up at the gospel read in chapters, but selecting this as an instance of their signified consent to the Gospel, who will do no more) I would obey them rather than give offence, by standing up at the reading of the chapters and all; which I suppose will be no violation of their laws.

Quest. lxxviii. Is it lawful to kneel when the Decalogue is read?

Answ. 1. If I lived in a church that mistook the commandments for prayers, as many ignorant people do, I would not so harden them in that error. 2. And if I knew that many of the people present are of that mind, I had rather do nothing that might scandalize or harden them in it.

But, 1. That the thing itself is lawful, is past doubt: as we may kneel to the king when we hear him or speak to him; so it is lawful to kneel to God, when we read a chapter or hear it read, and specially the Decalogue so terribly delivered, and written by his own finger in stone. 2. And if it be peremptorily commanded, and the omission would be offensive, I would use it though mistaking persons are present, (1.) Because I cannot disobey, and also differ from the whole assembly, without a greater hurt and scandal, than seeming to harden that mistaking person. (2.) And because I could and would by other means remove that person's danger, as from me, by making him know that it is no prayer. (3.) And the rather in our times, because we can get the minister in the pulpit publicly to tell the people the contrary. (4.) And in catechizing it is his appoint-
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ed duty so to do. (5.) And we find that the same old silly people who took the commandments for a prayer, took the creed to be so too; when yet none kneeled at the creed; by which it appeareth that it is not kneeling which deceived them.

Quest. LXXXIX. What gestures are fittest in all the public worship?

Answ. 1. The customs of several countries, putting several significations on gestures, much varieth the case.

2. We must not lightly differ from the customs of the churches where we live in such a thing.

3. According to the present state of our churches, and the signification of gestures, and the necessities of men's bodies, all considered, I like best, (1.) To kneel in prayer and confession of sin (unless it be in crowded congregations where there is not room). (2.) To stand up in actions of mere praise to God, that is, at the singing and reading of the psalms of praise, and at the other hymns. (3.) To sit at the hearing of the Word read and preached; (because the body hath a necessity of some rest.)

4. Had I my choice, I would receive the Lord's supper sitting; but where I have not, I will use the gesture which the church useth. And it is to be noted that the church of England requireth the communicant only to receive it kneeling; but not to eat or drink it kneeling when they have received it. The ancient churches took it for an universal custom, established by many general councils, (and continued many hundred years) that no churches should kneel in any act of adoration upon any Lord's day in the year, or any week-day between Easter and Whitsuntide; but only stand all the time. But because the weariness of the body is apt to draw the mind into consent, and make God's service burdensome to us, it seemeth a sufficient compliance with their custom and the reasons of it, if we stand up only in acts of praise (and at the profession of our assent to the Christian faith and covenant).

5. And because there is so great a difference between the auditors in most assemblies, some being weak and not

1 Chron. xvii. 16. 2 Sam. vii. 18.
able to stand long, &c., therefore it is utterly unmeet to
be too rigorous in urging an uniformity of gesture, or for
any to be too censorious of other men for a gesture.

Quest. xc. What if the pastor and church cannot agree about
singing psalms, or what version or translation to use, or
time or place of meeting &c.

Answ. 1. It is the office of the pastor to be the guide
and ruler in such things, (when the magistrate interposeth
not) and the people should obey him. 2. But if the pastor
injure the church by his mis-guidance and mal-administra-
tion, he ought to amend and give them satisfaction; and if
he do not, they have their remedy before-mentioned. 3.
And if the people be obstinate in disobedience upon cause-
less quarrel, the pastor must first labour to convince them
by reason and love, and his authority; and if no means will
bring them to submission, he must consider whether it be
better as to the public good of the church of Christ that he
comply with them, and suffer them, or that he depart and
go to a more tractable people; and accordingly he is to do.
For they cannot continue together in communion if one
yield not to the other: usually or oftentimes it will be better
to leave such an obdurate self-willed people, lest they be
hardened by yielding to them in their sin, and others encou-
raged in the like by their example; and their own experi-
ence may at last convince them, and make them yield to
better things, as Geneva did when they revoked Calvin.
But sometimes the public good requireth that the pastor
give place to the people's folly, and stay among them, and
rather yield to that which is not best (so it be otherwise
lawful) as a worse translation, a worse version, liturgy, or-
der, time, place, &c., than quite forsake them. And he
that is in the right, may in that case yield to him that is in
the wrong, in point of practice.

Quest. xc1. What if the pastor excommunicate a man, and the
people will not forbear his communion, as thinking him un-
justly excommunicated?

Answ. 1. Either the pastor or the people are in the error.
2. Either the person is a dangerous heretic, or grossly wicked, or not. 3. Either the people do own the error or sin, for which he is excommunicated, or only judge the person not guilty. 4. The pastor's and the people's part in the execution must be distinguished. And so I conclude,

1. That if the pastor err and wrong the people, he must repent and give them satisfaction: but if it be their error and obstinacy, then 2. If the pastor foreknow that the people will dissent, in some small dispensable cases he may forbear to excommunicate one that deserveth it: or if he know it after, that they will not forbear communion with the person, he may go on in his office, and be satisfied that he hath discharged his own duty, and leave them under the guilt of their own faults. 3. But if it be an intolerable wickedness or heresy (as Arianism, Socinianism, &c.) and the people own the error or sin as well as the person, the pastor is then to admonish them also, and by all means to endeavour to bring them to repentance; and if they remain impenitent to renounce communion with them and desert them. 4. But if they own not the crime, but only think the person injured, the pastor must give them the proof for their satisfaction; and if they remain unsatisfied, he may proceed in his office as before.

Quest. xcvii. May a whole church, or the greater part be excommunicated?

Answ. 1. To excommunicate is by ministerial authority to pronounce the person unmeet for Christian communion, as being under the guilt of impenitence in heinous sin; and to charge the church to forbear communion with him, and avoid him, and to bind him over to the bar of God.

2. The pastor of a particular church may pronounce all the church incapable of Christian communion and salvation till they repent, e. g. If they should all be impenitent Arians, Socinians, blasphemers, &c., for he hath authority, and they deserve it. But he hath no church that he is pastor of, whom he can command to avoid them. 3. The neighbour pastors of the churches about them, may upon full proof, declare to their own churches, that such a neighbour church that is fallen to Arianism, &c., is unmeet for Christian com-
munion and to be owned as a church of Christ; and therefore charge their flocks not to own them, nor to have occasional communion with their members when they come among them. For there is authority, and a meet object, and necessity for so doing; and therefore it may be done. 4. But a single pastor of another church may not usurp authority over any neighbour church, to judge them and excommunicate them, where he hath neither call nor full proof, as not having had opportunity to admonish them all, and try their repentance. Therefore the pope’s excommunications are rather to be contemned, than regarded. 5. Yet if many churches turn heretics notoriously, one single neighbour pastor may renounce their communion, and require his flock for to avoid them all. 6. And a pastor may as lawfully excommunicate the major part of his church, by charging the minor part to avoid them, as he may do the minor part; except that accidentally the inconveniences of a division may be so great, as to make it better to forbear: and so it may oft fall out also, if it were the minor part.

Quest. xciii. What if a church have two pastors, and one excommunicate a man, and the other absolve him, what shall the church and the dissenter do?

Answ. It was such cases that made the churches of old choose bishops, and ever have but one bishop in one church. But, 1. He that is in the wrong is first bound to repent and yield to the other. 2. If he will not, the other in a tolerable ordinary case may for peace give way to him, though not consent to his injurious dealing. 3. In a dubious case they should both forbear proceeding till the case be cleared. 4. In most cases, each party should act according to his own judgment, if the counsel of neighbour pastors be not able to reconcile them. And the people may follow their own judgments, and forbear obeying either of them formally till they agree.

Quest. xciv. For what sins may a man be denied communion, or excommunicated? Whether for impenitence in every little sin; or for great sin without impenitence?

* 2 John x. 11. 3 John ix. 10. Rev. ii. 5. 16. iii. 3. 6. 15.
Answ. 1. I have shewed before that there is a suspension which is but a forbearance of giving a man the sacrament, which is only upon an accusation till his cause be tried; and an innocent person may be falsely accused, and so tried.

2. Some sins may be of so heinous scandal, that if the person repent of them this day, his absolution and reception may be delayed till the scandal be removed. 1. Because the public good is to be preferred before any man's personal good. 2. And the churches, or enemies about, cannot so suddenly know of a man's repentance. If they hear of a man's murder, perjury or adultery to-day, and hear that he is absolved to-morrow, they will think that the church consisted of such, or that it maketh very light of sin. Therefore the ancient churches delayed and imposed penances, partly to avoid such scandal. 3 And partly because that some sins are so heinous, that a sudden profession is not a sufficient evidence of repentance, unless there be also some evidence of contrition.

3. But ordinarily no man ought to be excommunicated for any sin whatsoever, unless penitence be added to the sin 7. Because he is first to be admonished to repent 8. And repentance is the Gospel condition of pardon to believers.

4. A man is not to be excommunicated for every sin which he repenteth not of. Because, 1. Else all men should be excommunicated. For there are in all men some errors about sin and duty, and so some sins which men cannot yet perceive to be sins. 2. And ministers are not infallible, and may take that for a sin which is no sin, and so should excommunicate the innocent. 3. And daily unavoidable infirmities, though repent ed of, yet awaken not the soul sometimes to a notable contrition; nor are they fit matter for the church's admonition 9. A man is not to be called openly to repentance before the church for every idle word, or hour.

4. Therefore to excommunication these two must concur, 1. A heinousness in the sin. 2. Impenitence after due admonition and patience.

7 Loke xiii. 3. 5. Acts ii. 37—39, &c. 8 Matt. xviii. 15, 16. Tit. iii. 10.
CHRISTIAN DIRECTORY. [PART III.

Quest. xcv. Must the pastors examine the people before the sacrament?

Answ. 1. Regularly they should have sufficient notice after they come to age that they own their baptismal covenant, and that they have that due understanding of the sacrament and the sacramental work, and such a Christian profession as is necessary to a due participation.

2. But this is most fitly done at their solemn transition out of their infant-church-state into their adult: and it is not necessarily to be done every time they come to the Lord's table (unless the person desire help for his own benefit); but only once, before their first communicating: if it be the satisfaction of the pastor or church that is intended by it.

Quest. xcvi. Is the sacrament of the Lord's supper a converting ordinance?

Answ. You must distinguish, 1. Between the conversion of infidels without the church, and of hypocrites within it; 2. Between the primary and the secondary intention of the institutor. 3. Between the primary duty of the receiver, and the event. And so I conclude,

1. That God did not command ministers to give infidels the Lord's supper to convert them to Christianity.

2. He requireth us to give it to none but those that profess themselves converted from infidelity and a state of wickedness, and to none that profess not true saving faith and repentance.

3. God never commanded or allowed any infidel to demand or receive it to his conversion.

4. God commandeth the pastors of the church, to deliver it to hypocrites, (who at the heart are infidels, or impenitent and ungodly) if they profess faith and repentance, and desire or require it.

5. There is much in the nature of the sacrament, which tendeth to the conversion of an hypocrite.

6. And God often blesseth it to the conversion of hypo-

crites; so that it may thence be said to be his secondary inten-
tion.

7. But yet he that knoweth himself to be a mere hypoc-
crite, or void of saving faith and repentance, should not come first and immediately to the sacrament, to be converted by it; but should first so long hear, read, meditate, and pray, till he repent and believe, and his heart consent to the covenant of God; and then he should come with penitent contrition, and solemnly renew his covenant in this sacrament, and there receive a sealed pardon.

Quest. xcvi. Must no man come to the sacrament, that is uncertain or doubtful of the sincerity of his faith and repentance?

Answ. 1. He that is sure of his unsoundness and hypocrisy should not come.

2. He that upon trial is not sure, but yet as far as he can understand his own heart and life, doth judge himself an impenitent hypocrite, should use other means to know himself certainly, and more fully to repent before he cometh. And though some melancholy and timorous persons be falsely persuaded that they are impenitent, yet it is better that such forbear the sacrament, while they use other means for their better acquaintance with themselves, than that all the hypocrites, and wicked, impenitent people be told that it is their duty to come, if they can but make themselves uncertain whether they be impenitent or not.

3. But he that after the best endeavours he can use to know himself, can say, 'I am not certain that I truly repent, but as far as I can know my heart I do;' is not to be hindered from the sacrament by that uncertainty. 1. For few of the best attain to a full certainty of their own sincerity. 2. And all that can be expected from us is, that we proceed according to the best of our understandings, and the best acquaintance with ourselves that we can get. 3. And otherwise it would keep us from all other duties proper to true Christians; as from thanksgiving for our justification, sanctification, adoption, &c.

4. He that only erreth about the nature of true faith and

* 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29, 31.
repentance, and not about the reality of it in himself, should not be kept away by that error; as if he can say, 'As far as I know my heart, I am willing to part with every known sin, and to know every sin that I may part with it; but I am afraid this is not true repentance,' or he that saith, 'I believe the Gospel to be true, and I am willing to have Christ upon his covenant terms, and wholly to resign myself unto him; but I am afraid yet that I am not a true believer.' This person is truly penitent, and is a true believer, and therefore ought to come.

5. The case 'de esse,' whether a man be a true Christian or not, is in order before the case 'de scire,' whether he be certain of it or not. He that is an hypocrite is bound by God first to know that he is so, and then to repent, and then to communicate. He that is sincere, is bound by God to know that he is sincere, and to be thankful, and to communicate; and man's neglect of one duty will not make God change his laws, which still bind them to all this at once.

Quest xcviii. Is it lawful or a duty to join oblations to the sacrament, and how?

Answ. 1. There is no question but a Christian must give up himself soul and body, with all that he hath to God, and for his service; and this oblation is Christianity itself.

2. It is undoubted that the Lord's day is a fit time for our depositing what we have to spare, for charitable and pious uses, and this is partly of Divine appointment.

3. No doubt but what we give to the poor, should be for God's sake, and from our love to God; and therefore must first be devoted or given up to God, and but secondarily to the poor.

4. It is certain that the Lord's supper is as fit a season as any part of that day, for such oblations and collections. The ancient Christians did therefore call it the communion, because in it they shewed their love and communion, and feasted in common to that end. There are two several sorts

1 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6.  
* Rom. xii. 1.  
1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.  
1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.  
*Matt. x. xxv. 40, &c.
of oblations which may lawfully be made (and fitly) at the communion. 1. The creatures of bread and wine should be offered or presented before God, as acknowledging him to be the Creator and Giver of all, and to desire his acceptance and benediction of them for that holy use. 2. Our alms or charitable contribution may be then fitly offered to God, that he may first accept it, and so it may be communicated to the church and poor. When we receive from God the most obliging benefits, when we return our greatest thanks, when we resign ourselves and all to God, it is then sure a seasonable time, to express all by the oblation of our benevolence; that hypocrites may not pretend that they are charitable in secret, but the church may have due notice of it, and the pastors be duly entrusted with it.

Quest. xcix. How many sacraments are there appointed by Christ?

Answ. The word 'Sacrament' hath so many significations, that it is not fit for the question till it be explained. Passing all others now, we must take notice, 1. That our use of it is not so large as the Latin interpreter who putteth it for 'Mystery,' but for 'A solemn dedication of man to God by a vow expressed by some sacred ceremony, signifying mutually our covenant to God, and God's reception of us and his covenant with us.' And it is brought into the church from the Roman military oath called a sacrament, in which as Tertul. "de Cor. Mil." sheweth, the soldier swears fidelity and obedience to Caesar, renouncing father, mother, &c. for his service, and swearing to prefer it and his safety before them all: see Martinius's reciting the oath out of divers authors. This is our sense of the word; let no man now that taketh it in other sense, pretend therefore that we differ in doctrine.

2. Seeing it is no Scripture word, it is not of necessity to the faith or peace of the church; but when disputers agree not of the sense of the word, they are best lay it by, and use such terms whose sense they can agree on.

c 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.
d Of which see Martinius fully in "Onom. de Sacram." Bellarmin himself reckoneth five.

VOL. V.
3. The name 'Sacrament' is either taken from the covenant sworn to, or from the sign or ceremony of consent, by which we oblige ourselves, or from both together.

4. The covenant of Christianity is different from a particular covenant of some office; and accordingly the sacrament is to be distinguished.

5. As civil, economical, and ecclesiastical offices are distinct, so are their several sacraments.

6. The solemn renewing of the sacred vow or covenant, without any instituted, obliging sign, is to be distinguished from the renewing it by such a sign of God's institution: and now I conclude,

1. As the word 'Sacrament' is taken improperly 'secundum quid,' from the nobler part only, that is, the covenant, (as a man's soul is called the man) so there are as many sacraments as covenants; and there is in specie but one covenant of Christianity, and so but one sacrament of Christianity, variously expressed.

2. As the word 'Sacrament' is taken properly and fully according to the aforesaid description; so there are properly two sacraments of Christianity, or of the covenant of grace; that is, baptism, the sacrament of initiation (most fully so called) and the Lord's supper, or the sacrament of confirmation, exercise, and progress.

3. As the word 'Sacrament' is taken less properly, defectively, 'secundum quid,' for the same covenant of grace or Christianity renewed by any arbitrary sign of our own, without a solemn ceremony of Divine institution, so there are divers sacraments of Christianity or the covenant of grace, that is, divers solemn renewals of our covenant with God. As, 1. At our solemn transition from the state of infant-membership unto that of the adult, when we solemnly own our baptismal covenant, which Calvin and many Protestants (and the English rubric) call confirmation. 2. The solemn owning the Christian faith and covenant, in our constant church-assemblies, when we stand up at the creed or profession of our faith, and all renew our covenant with God, and dedication to him. 3. At solemn days of fasting or humiliation, and of thanksgiving when this should be solemnly done. Especially upon some public defection. 4. Upon the public repentance of a particular sinner before his ab-
solution. 5. When a man is going out of the world, and re-
commending his soul to God by Christ; all these are so-
lemn renewings of our covenant with God, in which we may
use any lawful, natural, or arbitrary signs or expressions, to
signify our own minds by, as speaking, subscribing, stand-
ing up, lifting up the hand, laying it upon a book, kissing
the book, &c. These sacraments are improperly so called;
and are Divine as to the covenant renewed, but human as to
the expressing signs.

4. Ordination is not improperly or unfitly called a ‘Sac-
rament,’ because it is the solemnizing of a mutual covenant
between God and man, for our dedication to his special ser-
vice, and his reception of us and blessing on us, though im-
position of hands be not so solemn a ceremony by mere in-
stitution, as baptism and the Lord’s supper. But then it
must be noted, that this is not ‘Sacramentum Christianita-
tis,’ a sacrament of the Christian covenant; but ‘Sacramen-
tum ordinis vel officii particularis;’ a sacrament of orders,
or a particular office; but yet of Divine institution.

5. The solemn celebration of marriage, is an economical
sacrament; that is, a solemn obligation of man and woman
by vow to one another, and of both to God in that relation,
which may be arbitrarily expressed by lawful signs or ce-
remonies.

6. The solemn covenant of a master with his servant, is
on the same account, an economical sacrament.

7. The inauguration of a king, in which he is sworn to
his subjects, and dedicated to God in that office, and his
subjects sworn or consent to him, is a civil sacrament,
whether unction be added or not. And so is a judge’s en-
trance on his office, when it is done so solemnly by an
obliging vow or covenant.

8. Confirmation in the Papists’ sense, as conferred by
chrism on infants for giving them the Holy Ghost, is but an
unwarrantable imitation of the old miraculous operation by
the apostles, and neither a Christian sacrament, nor a war-
rantable practice, but a presumption.

9. The same may be said of their sacrament of extreme
unction.

10. Their sacrament of marriage is no otherwise a sacra-
ment, than the inauguration of a king is; which is approved
by God as well as marriage, and signifieth also an honourable collation of power from the universal king.

11. Their sacrament of penance is no otherwise a sacrament than many other forementioned renewings of our covenant are.

12. Therefore the Papists' seven sacraments, or septenary distribution, is confused, partly redundant, partly defective, and unworthy to be made a part of their faith or religion, or the matter of their peevish and ignorant contendings. And they that peremptorily say, without distinguishing, that there are but two sacraments in all, do but harden them by the unwarrantable narrowing of the word.

Quest. c. How far is it lawful, needful, or unlawful for a man to afflict himself by external penances for sin?

Answ. 1. Not to the destroying of his body, life, or health, or the disabling or unfitting body or mind, for the service of God.

2. Not to be the expression of any sinful, inordinate dejection, despondency, sorrow, or despair.

3. Not so as may be an outward appearance of such inordinate passions, or as may be a scandal to others, and deter them from religion as a melancholy, hurtful thing.

4. Nor as if God would accept the mere external self-afflicting for itself, or as if he loved our hurt, or as if we merited of him by our unprofitable, voluntary troubles.

But 1. It is a duty to express true godly sorrow by its proper exercise and signs, so far as either the acting of it, or the increase or continuance by the means of those expressions is profitable to ourselves.

2. And also so far as is needful to the profiting of others, by shewing them the evil of sin, and drawing them to repentance*

3. And so far as is necessary to the satisfying of the church of the truth of our repentance, in order to our absolution and communion.

4. Especially so far as is necessary to subdue our fleshly lusts, and tame our bodies, and bring them into a due subjection to our faith, and to avoid our sin for the time to come. And also by the exercise of sober mortification, prudently, to keep under all our worldly phantasies, and love of this present world, without unfitting ourselves for duty.

5. And so far as is needful by such mortification, to fit us for fervent prayer, especially by fasting on days of humiliation; and to help us in our meditations of death and judgment, and to further our heavenly contemplations and conversation.

6. The greatest difficulty is, 'Whether any self-revenge be lawful or due;' which is answered by what is said already; none such as disableth us from God's service is lawful. But true repentance is an anger or great displeasure with ourselves for sin, and a hatred of sin, and loathing of ourselves for it; and to judge, condemn, and afflict our own souls by a voluntary self-punishing, is but that exercise of justice on ourselves, which is fit for pardoned sinners that are not to be condemned by the Lord, and indeed the just exercise of repentance and displeasure against ourselves. On which accounts of sober self-revenge we may cherish such degrees of godly sorrow, fasting, coarse cloathing (as sackcloth), and denying ourselves the pleasures of this world, as shall not be hurtful but helpful to our duty. And if great and heinous sinners have of old on these terms, exceeded other men in their austerities, and self-afflictions, we cannot condemn them of superstition, unless we more particularly knew more cause for it. But Popishly to think that self-afflicting without respect to such causes or necessities is a meritorious perfection, fit for others, is superstition indeed. And to think, as many of the melancholy do, that self-murder is a lawful self-revenge, is a heinous sin, and leadeth to that which is more heinous and dangerous.

Quest. c1. Is it lawful to observe stated times of fasting imposed by others, without extraordinary occasions? And particularly Lent?

Ans. Remember that I here meddle not with the question, how far it is lawful for rulers to impose such fasting on others; save only to say, 1. That it is undoubtedly fit for kings to do it by precepts, and churches by consent, in extraordinary cases of defection, sin, or judgments. 2. That it is undoubtedly sinful usurpation, for either pope or any pretended ecclesiastical, universal rulers, to impose such on the universal church; (because there are no universal rulers). Or for a neighbour bishop by usurpation to impose it on a neighbour church. 3. And that it is sinful in all or many churches, to make by their agreements such things to be necessary to their union or communion with their neighbour churches, so that they will take all those for schismatics that differ from them in such indifferent things. But as to the using of such fasts (omitting the imposing) I say,

I. 1. That so great and extraordinary a duty as holy fasting, must not be turned into a mere formality or ceremony.

2. No particular man must be so observant of a public, commanded, anniversary fast, as for it to neglect any duty commanded him by God which is inconsistent with it. As to rejoices or keep a day of thanksgiving in Lent, upon an extraordinary obliging cause; to keep the Lord’s day in Lent, as a day of thanksgiving and rejoicing; to preserve our own health, &c. It is not lawful in obedience to man, to fast so much, or use such diet as is like to destroy our lives or health; these being not so far put into the power of man; nor can man dispense with us as to the duty of self-preservation. If God himself require us not to offer him our lives and health needlessly, as an acceptable sacrifice, nor ever maketh self-destruction our duty, no nor any thing that is not for man’s own good; then we are not to believe without very clear proof that either prince or prelates have more power than ever God doth use himself.


b Isa. lviii. 3. 5—8.
3. Such an anniversary fast as is meet for the remembrance of some great sin or judgment, if commanded, is to be kept, both for the reason of it, and for the authority of the commander. For 1. It is not unlawful as anniversary. (For 1. It is not forbidden, and 2. There may be just occasion. Some arbitrarily keep an anniversary fast on the day of their nativity (as I have long done); and some on the day that they fell into some great sin; and some on the day of the death of a friend, or of some personal, domestic, or national calamity; and none of this is forbidden.) 2. And that which is not unlawful in itself, is not therefore unlawful to be done because it is commanded; seeing obedience to superiors is our duty and not our sin, unless in sinful things.

4. Whether it be lawful or meet to commemorate Christ's sufferings by anniversary fasts, is next to be considered.

II. As for Lent in particular, we must distinguish, 1. Between the ancient Lent, and the later Lent. 2. Between keeping it on a civil account, and on a religious. 3. Between true fasting, and change of diet. 4. Between the imitation of Christ's forty day's fasting, and the mere commemoration of it. Which premised I conclude,

1. The keeping a true fast or abstinence from food, for forty days, on what account soever, being impossible, or self-slaughter, is not to be attempted.

2. The imitation of Christ in his forty day's fasting is not to be attempted or pretended to; because his miraculous works were not done for our imitation. And it is presumption for us to pretend to such a power as is necessary to miracles; or yet to make any essays at such an imitation any more than at the raising of the dead.

3. The pretending of a fast when men do but change their diet; flesh for fish, fruit, sweetmeats, &c. is but hypocritical and ridiculous; most poor labourers, and temperate ministers do live all the year on a more flesh-denying diet, and in greater abstinence than many Papists do in Lent, or on their fasting-days. And what a ridiculous dispute is it to hear, e. g. a Calvin that never eateth but one small meal a day for many years, to plead against the keeping of the Popish fasts, and their clergy call him voracious,
and carnal, and an epicure, and plead for fasting as holy mortification, who eat as many meals and as much meat on a Lent day or fasting day, as Calvin did in three feasting days; and drink as much wine in a Lent, as he in twenty years! Sure I am I know many such on both sides; some that eat but a small meal a day, and never drink wine at all, and others that drink wine daily, and eat of many dishes at a meal, and that to the full, and of the sweetest, as fish, fruits, &c., yet rail at the former for not fasting as they do. So delusory are the outward appearances, and so false the pretensions of the carnal sort!

4. The ancient Lent consisted first of one day (Good Friday) alone; and after that of three days, and then of six, and at last it came up to forty. (Of which read Dallæus ‘ubi supra’ at large).

5. None can question the lawfulness of an obedient keeping of such a civil Lent fast as our statutes command, for the vending of fish, and for the breed of cattle; so be it no bodily necessity or greater duty be against it.

6. It is not unlawful for those that cannot totally fast, yet to use more abstinence and a more mortifying sort of diet than ordinary, for the exercises of repentance and mortification, in due time.

7. If authority shall appoint such a mortifying, abstemious course upon lawful or tolerable grounds and ends, I will obey them, if they peremptorily require it, when my health or some greater duty forbiddeth it not.

8. As for the commanding such an abstinence, as in Lent, not in imitation, but bare commemoration of Christ’s forty day’s fast, I would not command it if it were in my power; but being peremptorily commanded, I cannot prove it unlawful to obey; with the afore-mentioned exceptions.

9. It was anciently held a crime to fast on the Lord’s day, even in Lent; and I take that day to be separated by Christ and the Holy Ghost for a church-festival or day of thanksgiving; therefore I will not keep it as a fast, though I were commanded, unless in such an extraordinary necessity, as aforesaid.

Of pilgrimages, saints, relics and shrines, temples, of
their miracles, of praying to angels, to saints, for the dead, of purgatory, of the pope's pardons, indulgences, dispensations; of the power of true pastors to forgive sins, with a multitude of such cases, which are commonly handled in our controversial writers against the Papists, I must thither refer the reader for a solution, because the handling of all such particular cases would swell my book to a magnitude beyond my intention, and make this part unsuitable to the rest.

Quest. cii. May we continue in a church, where some one ordinance of Christ is wanting, as discipline, prayer, preaching, or sacraments, though we have all the rest?

Answ. Distinguish, 1. Of ordinances. 2. Of a stated want, and a temporary want. 3. Of one that may have better; and one that cannot.

1. Teaching, prayer and praise, are ordinances of such necessity that church-assemblies have not their proper use without them.

2. The Lord's supper is of a secondary need, and must be used when it may, but a church-assembly may attain its ends sometimes without it, in a good degree.

3. Discipline is implicitly exercised when none but the baptized are communicants, and when professed Christians voluntarily assemble, and the preaching of the Word doth distinguish the precious from the vile; much more when notorious, scandalous sinners are by the laws kept from the sacrament (as our rubric and canons do require).

4. But for the more full, explicit, and exact exercise of discipline, it is very desirable for the wellbeing of the churches; but it is but a stronger fence or hedge, and preservative of sacred order; and both the being of a church, and the profitable use of holy assemblies, may subsist without it; as in Helvetia and other countries it is found.

I conclude then, 1. That he that 'consideratis conside randis' is a free man should choose that place where he hath the fullest opportunities of worshipping God, and edifying his soul.

2. He is not to be accounted a free man that cannot remove, without a greater hurt, than the good, either to the
church or country, or to his family, his neighbours, or himself.

3. Without teaching, prayer and Divine praises we are not to reckon that we have proper church-assemblies and communion.

4. We must do all that is in our power to procure the right use of sacraments and discipline.

5. When we cannot procure it, it is lawful and a duty to join in those assemblies that are without it, and rather to enjoy the rest than none. Few churches have the Lord's supper above once a month, which in the primitive church was used every Lord's day and oftener; and yet they meet on other days.¹

6. It is possible that preaching, prayer and praise may be so excellently performed in some churches that want both discipline and the Lord's supper, and all so coldly and ignorantly managed in another church that hath all the ordinances, that men's souls may much more flourish and prosper under the former than the latter.

7. If forbearing and wanting some ordinances for a time, be but in order to a probable procurement of them, we may the better forbear.²

8. The time is not to be judged of only by length, but by the probability of success. For sometimes God's providence, and the disturbances of the times, or the craft of men in power may keep men so long in the dark, that a long expectation or waiting may become our duty.

Quest. ciii. Must the pastors remove from one church to another whenever the magistrate commandeth us, though the bishop contradict it, and the church consent not to dismiss us; and so of other cases of disagreement?

Answ. I. As in man's soul, the intellectual guidance, the will, and the executive power do concur, so in church cases of this nature, the potestative government of the magistrate, the directive guidance of the senior pastors, and the attrac-

¹ Acts xxviii. ult. xi. 26. xx. 7, 20, &c. 1 Cor. xiv. Acts ii. 42. 1 Tim. iv. 13, 14. 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2. 2 Tim. iii. 16. Heb. x. 25, 26. Col. iv. 16. Acts xiii. 27. xv. 21. 1 Thess. v. 27. 1 Cor. v. 34, &c.
tive love of the people (who are the chief inferior, final cause) should all concur; and when they do not it is confusion: and when God's order is broken which commandeth their concurrence, it is hard to know what to do, in such a division which God alloweth not; as it is to know whether I should take part with the heart against the head, or with the head against the stomach and liver, on supposition of cross inclinations or interests; when as nature supposed either a concord of inclination and interest, or else the ruin, sickness and death of the person: and the cure must be by reconciling them, rather than by knowing which to side with against the rest.

But seeing we must suppose such diseases frequently to happen, they that cannot cure them must know how to behave themselves, and to do their own duty. For my own part in such cases I would do thus.

1. I would look at my ultimate end, God's glory, and at the next end, the good of souls and welfare of the church; and so at the people's interest as it is the end of the order of magistracy and ministry: and I would take myself to be so obliged to that end, as that no point of mere order could disoblige me, the end being better than the means as such; therefore I would do all things to edification, supposing that all power of man is as Paul's was for edification and not for destruction 1.

2. But in judging of what is best for the church, I must take in every accident and circumstance, and look to many, more than to a few, and to distant parts as well as to those near me, and to the time and ages to come, as well as to the present, and not go upon mistaken suppositions of the church's good; he that doth not see all things that are to be weighed in such a case, may err by leaving out some one.

3. I would obey the magistrate formally for conscience sake in all things which belong to his office; and particularly in this case, if it were but a removal from place to place, in respect to the temple, or tithes, or for the civil peace, or for the preservation of church order in cases where it is not grossly injurious to the church and Gospel.

4. In cases which by God's appointment belong to the

---
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conduct of bishops, or pastors, or the concord of consociate churches, I would 'formaliter' follow them. And in particular, if they satisfy me that the removal of me is an apparent injury to the church, (as in the Arian's times when the emperors removed the orthodox from all the great churches to put in the Arians) I would not obedientially and voluntarily remove.

5. If magistrates and bishops should concur in commanding my remove in a case notoriously injurious and pernicious to the church (as in the aforesaid case, to bring in an Arian) I would not obey formally for conscience sake; supposing that God never gave them such a power against men's souls and the Gospel of Christ; and there is no power but of God.

6. But I would prefer both the command of the magistrate, and the direction of the pastors, before the mere will and humour of the people, when their safety and welfare were not concerned in the case.

7. And when the magistrate is peremptory, usually I must obey him materially, when I do it not formally (in conscience to his mere command). Because though in some cases he may do that which belongeth not to his office, but to the pastor's, yet his violence may make it become the church's interest, that I yield and give place to his wrath; for as I must not resist him by force, so if I depart not at his command, it may bring a greater suffering on the churches: and so for preventing a greater evil he is to be submitted to in many cases, where he goeth against God and without authority; though not to be formally obeyed.

8. Particular churches have no such interest in their ministers or pastors, as to keep them against their wills and the magistrate's, and against the interest of the universal church, as shall be next asserted.

I have spoken to this instance as it taketh in all other cases of difference between the power of the magistrate, the pastor's and the people's interest, when they disagree, and not as to this case alone.

Quest. civ. Is a pastor obliged to his flock for life? Or is it lawful so to oblige himself? And may he remove without
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their consent? And so also of a church-member, the same questions are put.

These four questions I put together for brevity, and shall answer them distinctly.

I. 1. A minister is obliged to Christ and the universal church for life, (‘durante vita’) with this exception, if God disable him not. 2. But as a pastor he is not obliged to this or that flock for life. There is no such command or example in God’s Word.

II. To the second: 1. It is lawful to oblige ourselves to a people for life in some cases, conditionally; that is, if God do not apparently call us away. 2. But it is never lawful to do it absolutely: 1. Because we shall engage ourselves against God; against his power over us, and interest in us, and his wisdom that must guide us. God may call us whither he please; and though now he speak not by supernatural revelation, yet he may do it by providential alterations. 2. And we shall else oblige ourselves against the universal church, to which we are more strictly bound, than to any particular church, and whose good may oblige us to remove. 3. Yea, we may bind ourselves to the hurt of that church itself; seeing it may become its interest to part with us. 4. And we should so oblige ourselves against our duty to authority, which may remove us.

III. To the third question I answer, 1. A pastor may not causelessly remove, nor for his own worldly commodity when it is to the hurt of the church and hindrance of the Gospel. 2. When he hath just cause, he must acquaint the people with it, and seek their satisfaction and consent. 3. But if he cannot procure it, he may remove without it; as 1. When he is sure that the interest of the Gospel and universal church require it: 2. Or that just authority doth oblige him to it.

The reasons are plain from what is said; and also, 1. He is no more bound to the people, than they are to him; but they are not so bound to him, but they may remove on just occasion. 2. If he may not remove, it is either because God forbids it, or because his own contract with them hath obliged him against it. But 1. God nowhere forbids
it: 2. Such a contract is supposed not made, nor lawful to be made.

IV. As to the people's case, it needs no other answer; 1. No member may remove without cause: 2. Nor abruptly and uncharitably to the church's dissatisfaction, when he may avoid it. But, 3. He may remove upon many just causes (private or public) whether the church and pastors consent or not, so the manner be as becometh a Christian.

Quest. cv. When many men pretend at once to be the true pastors of a particular church against each other's title, through differences between the magistrates, the ordinainers and the flocks, what should the people do, and whom should they adhere to?

Answ. This case is mostly answered before in Quest. lxxxii. &c. I need only to add these Rules of caution.

1. Do not upon any pretence accept of an heretic, or one that is utterly unfit for the office.

2. Do not easily take a dividing course or person, but keep as much as may be in a way of concord with the united, faithful pastors and churches in your proximity or country.

3. Look to the public good and interest of religion, more than to your particular congregation.

4. Neglect not the greatest advantages for your own edification; but rather take them by a removal of your dwelling, though you suffer by it in your estates, than by any division, disturbance of the church's peace, or common detriment.

5. Do not easily go against the magistrate's commands; unless they be apparently unlawful, and to the church's detriment or ruin, in the reception of your pastors.

6. Do not easily forsake him that hath been justly received by the church, and hath possession, that is, till necessity require it.

Quest. cvi. To whom doth it belong to reform a corrupted church? to the magistrates, pastors, or people?

Answ. A church is reformed three several ways, 1. By
the personal reformation of every member: 2. By doctrinal
direction: and, 3. By public, forcible execution, and con-
straint of others.

3. Every member, whether magistrates, pastors or peo-
ple must reform themselves, by forsaking all their own sins,
and doing their own duties. If a ruler command a private
person to go to mass, to own any falsehood, or to do any
sin, he is not to be obeyed, because God is to be first obeyed.

2. The bishops or pastors are to reform the church by
doctrine, reproof, and just exhortations, and nunciative
commands in the name of Christ to rulers and people to do
their several duties: and by the actual doing of his own m.

3. The king and magistrates under him, only, must re-
form by the sword, that is, by outward force, and civil laws
and corporal penalties: as forcibly to break down images,
to cast out idolaters, or the instruments of idolatry from the
temples, to put true ministers in possession of the temples,
or the legal public maintenance; to destroy, punish or hurt
idolaters, &c. Supposing still the power of parents and
masters in their several families.

Quest. cvii. Who is to call synods? princes, pastors, or people ?

Answ. 1. There are several ways of calling synods: 1.
By force and civil mandates. 2. By pastoral persuasion
and counsel; and, 3. By humble entreaty and petition.

1. Magistrates only (that is, the supreme by his own
power, and the inferior by power derived from him) may
call synods by laws and mandates, enforced by the sword or
corporal penalties, or mulcts.

2. Bishops or pastors in due circumstances may call
synods by counsel and persuasive invitation.

3. The people in due circumstances and necessity, may
call synods by way of petition and entreaty.

But what are the due circumstances?

Answ. 1. The magistrate may call them by command at
his discretion, for his own counsel, or for the civil peace, or
for the church's good.

2. The pastors and people may not call them, nor meet

= 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29, 31, 33, 34. 1 Cor. v. 11. Dan. iii. 6. 1 Cor. v. 3—5.
when the magistrate forbiddeth it, except when the necessity of the church requireth it: synods may profitably be stated for order, when it may be lawfully obtained, (both as to limits of place, numbers, and time). But these prudential orders are not of stated necessity, but must give place to weightier reasons on the contrary.

3. Synods themselves are not ordinarily necessary, by nature or institution; (let him that affirmeth it, prove it;) but that which is statedly necessary is, The concord of the churches as the end, and a necessary correspondence of the churches as the means, and synods when they may well be had, as a convenient sort of means.

4. When synods cannot be had, or are needless, messengers and letters from church to church may keep up the correspondence and concord.

5. In cases of real necessity (which are very rare, though usefulness be more frequent), the bishops and people should first petition the king for his consent: and if that cannot be had, they may meet secretly and in small numbers, for mutual consultation and advice about the work of God; and not by keeping up the formality of their set numbers, times, places, and orders, provoke the king against them.

6. The contempt of synods by the Separatists, and the placing more power in synods than ever God gave them by others, yea, and the insisting on their circumstantial orders, making them like a civil senate or court, have been the two extremes which have greatly injured and divided the churches, throughout the world.

Quest. CVIII. To whom doth it belong to appoint days and assemblies for public humiliation and thanksgiving?

Answ. The answer of the last question may serve for this.

1. The magistrate only may do it by way of laws, or civil mandate enforced by the sword.

2. The pastors may do it in case of necessity, by pastoral advice and exhortation, and nunciative command in the name of Christ.

3. The people may do it by petition.

4. As ordinary church-assemblies must be held if the
magistrate forbid them, (of which next,) so must extraordinary ones, when extraordinary causes make it a duty.

5. When the magistrate forcibly hindereth them, natural impossibility resolveth the question about our duty.

Quest. cix. May we omit church-assemblies on the Lord's day, if the magistrate forbid them?

Answ. 1. It is one thing to forbid them for a time, upon some special cause, (as infection by pestilence, fire, war, &c.) and another to forbid them statedly or profanely.

2. It is one thing to omit them for a time, and another to do it ordinarily.

3. It is one thing to omit them in formal obedience to the law; and another thing to omit them in prudence, or for necessity, because we cannot keep them.

4. The assembly and the circumstances of the assembly must be distinguished.

(1.) If the magistrate for a greater good, (as the common safety,) forbid church-assemblies in a time of pestilence, assault of enemies, or fire, or the like necessity, it is a duty to obey him. 1. Because positive duties give place to those great natural duties which are their end: so Christ justified himself and his disciples’ violation of the external rest of the sabbath. "For the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." 2. Because affirmatives bind not 'ad semper,' and out-of-season duties become sins. 3. Because one Lord’s day or assembly is not to be preferred before many, which by the omission of that one are like to be obtained.

(2.) If princes profanely forbid holy assemblies and public worship, either statedly, or as a renunciation of Christ and our religion; it is not lawful formally to obey them.

(3.) But it is lawful prudently to do that secretly for the present necessity, which we cannot do publicly, and to do that with smaller numbers, which we cannot do with greater assemblies, yea, and to omit some assemblies for a time, that we may thereby have opportunity for more: which is not formal but only material obedience.

(4.) But if it be only some circumstances of assembling that are forbidden us, that is the next case to be resolved.
Quest. cx. Must we obey the magistrate if he only forbid us worshipping God, in such a place, or country, or in such numbers, or the like?

Answ. We must distinguish between such a determination of circumstances, modes, or accidents, as plainly destroy the worship or the end, and such as do not. For instance, 1. He that saith, You shall never assemble but once a year, or never but at midnight; or never above six or seven minutes at once, &c. doth but determine the circumstance of time: but he doth it so as to destroy the worship, which cannot so be done, in consistency with its ends. But he that shall say, You shall not meet till nine o'clock, nor stay in the night, &c. doth no such thing.

So 2. He that saith, You shall not assemble but at forty miles distance one from another; or you shall meet only in a room that will hold but the twentieth part of the church; or you shall never preach in any city or populous place, but in a wilderness far from the inhabitants, &c. doth but determine the circumstance of place. But he doth it as to destroy or frustrate the work which God commandeth us. But so doth not he that only boundeth churches by parish bounds, or forbiddeth inconvenient places.

3. So he that saith, You shall never meet under a hundred thousand together, or never above five or six, doth but determine the accident of number. But he so doth it as to destroy the work and end. For the first will be impossible; and in the second way they must keep church-assemblies without ministers, when there is not so many as for every such little number to have one. But so doth not he that only saith, You shall not meet above ten thousand, nor under ten.

4. So he that saith, You shall not hear a Trinitarian, but an Arian; or you shall hear only one that cannot preach the essentials of religion, or that cries down godliness itself; or you shall hear none but such as were ordained at Jerusalem or Rome, or none but such as subscribe the council of Trent, &c. doth but determine what person we shall hear. But he so doth it as to destroy the work and end. But so doth not he, that only saith, You shall hear only this able minister, rather than that.
2. I need not stand on the application. In the latter case we owe formal obedience. In the former we must suffer, and not obey.

For if it be meet so to obey, it is meet in obedience to give over God's worship. Christ said, "When they persecute you in one city, flee to another:" but he never said, If they forbid you preaching in any city, or populous place, obey them. He that said, "Preach the Gospel to every creature, and to all nations, and all the world," and that "would have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," doth not allow us to forsake the souls of all that dwell in cities and populous places, and preach only to some few cottagers elsewhere: no more than he will allow us to love, pity, and relieve the bodies only of those few, and take none for our neighbours that dwell in cities, but with priest and Levite to pass them by.

Quest. cx1. Must subjects or servants forbear weekly lectures, reading, or such helps, above the Lord's day's worship, if princes or masters do command it?

Answ. 1. There is great difference between a mere subject, or person governed, and a servant, slave, or child.

2. There is great difference between such as are hindered by just cause and real necessities, and such as are hindered only through profane malignity.

(1.) Poor people have not so much leisure from their callings, as the rich: and so providing for their families may, at that time, by necessity become the greater and the present duty.

(2.) So it may be with soldiers, judges, and others, that have present urgent work of public consequence; when others have no such impediment.

(3.) He that is the child or slave of another, or is his own by propriety, is more at his power, than he that is only a subject, and so is but to be governed in order to his own and the common good.

(4.) A servant that hath absolutely hired himself to another, is for that time near the condition of a slave: but he
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that is hired but with limitations, and exceptions of liberty, (expressed or understood,) hath right to the excepted liberty.

(5.) If the king forbid judges, soldiers, or others, whose labours are due to the public, to hear sermons at the time when they should do their work; or if parents, or masters so forbid children and servants, they must be obeyed, while they exclude not the public worship of the Lord's own day, nor necessary prayer and duty in our private daily cases.

(6.) But he that is under such bondage as hindereth the needful helps of his soul, should be gone to a freer place, if lawfully he can. But a child, wife, or such as are not free, must trust on God's help in the use of such means as he alloweth them.

(7.) A prince, or tutor, or schoolmaster, who is not a proprietor of the person, but only a governor, is not to be obeyed formally and for conscience sake, if he forbid his subjects or scholars such daily or weekly helps for their salvation as they have great need of, and have no necessity to forbear; such as are hearing or assembling with the church on the week days at convenient time, reading the Scriptures daily, or good books, accompanying with men fearing God, praying, &c.: because God hath commanded these when we can perform them.

Quest. cxii. Whether religious worship may be given to a creature? and what?

Answ. While the terms of the question remain ambiguous, it is incapable of an answer.

1. By worship is meant either 'cultus in genere,' any honour expressed to another; or some special acts of honour. We must understand the question in the first general sense, or else we cannot answer it, till men tell us, what acts of honouring they mean.

2. By religious is meant either in general, that which we are bound to by God, or is done by virtue of a religious, that is, a divine obligation, and so is made part of our religion; that is, of our obedience to God: or else by religious is meant divine or that which is properly due to God. The question must be taken in the first general sense; or else it is no
question, but ridiculous, (to ask whether we may give God's proper worship to a creature).

And so I answer, 1. By way of distinction. 2. Of solution.

(1.) We must distinguish between the honour of worshipping acts of the mind, and of the body. (2.) Between idolatry as against the first commandment, and idolatry or scandal as against the second.

Afr. Prop. 1. There is due to every creature, a true estimation of it according to the degree of its dignity or goodness; and a love proportionable: as also a belief, a trust, a fear, proportionable to every man's credibility, fidelity, power, &c.

2. There is an eminent degree therefore of estimation, reverence, and love, and trust due to good men above bad, and to those in heaven above those on earth; and a peculiar honour to rulers as such, which is not due to their inferiors.

3. This is to be expressed by the body, by convenient actions.

4. The highest honour which we owe to any, is for the image of God in them, viz. 1. His natural image, as men. 2. His moral image, as saints. 3. His relative image of supereminency, as superiors. And so it is God in them first, and they next as the images of God, who are to be honoured.

5. There is no honour to be given to any creature, but that of which God himself is the end; viz. as it referreth to his glory.

6. Therefore all honour given to men must be thus far religious honour (or worship): for as all things are sanctified to and by saints, so all things that religious men do, must be religiously done.

7. As persons, so places, books, words, utensils, times, &c. must be honoured for God's sake, as they are related to God, with such estimations and expressions as are suitable to their relations.

Neg. 1. No creature must be esteemed to be a god; nor any of God's proper attributes or honour given to any creature whatsoever.

* 1 Tim. iv. 5. Tit. i. 15. 1 Cor. x. 14. 1 Pet. iv. 3.
2. No creature must be esteemed better, or greater, or wiser, than it is; (as far as we have means to know it).

3. Whatsoever outward expressions of honour (by word or deed) are appropriated to the true God, 1. By Divine institution; 2. Or by nature; 3. Or by received usage, that expression of honour ought not to be used to a creature, were the heart never so free from honouring it. (1.) Because it is bodily idolatry: (2.) And scandal as being idolatry interpretatively, in the just sense of others.

4. Whatsoever outward expressions of honour idolaters have used, and do use to signify their inward idolatry, or taking a creature or a fiction to be God, and so make it a 'teessa,' or symbol, or professing sign of that their idolatry, if those actions are so used or esteemed among us, or within the notice of our actions, it is unlawful for us to use the like to any creature. Because the use of their expression, maketh it to be a profession of idolatry by us, and so to be interpretative idolatry and scandal: for to use professing symbols is to profess.

Except when there is some notorious reason to use the same words or actions to another lawful signification, which is of greater weight than the scandal; and we make it as public to obviate the scandal, that we do it not to the idolater's intents.

For example, If the Mahometans make it a symbol of their religion, to say 'God is but one,' upon a false supposition that the Christians make more gods than one; yet it is lawful for us to use that symbolical word to a better end. But if they add to their symbol, 'and Mahomet is his prophet,' we must not use that, because it is 1. Symbolical of a false religion; 2. And a falsehood of itself.

So if they make it a distinctive note of their religious meetings, to congregate the people by voice and not by bells; when it will be taken for a professing their religion to do the same, we must avoid it: but not when there is great cause for it, (as if we have no other means,) and the reason against it or scandal may be well avoided.

5. Image worship, (or bowing or otherwise worshipping

towards an image as an object,) in the time of Divine worship, or when we otherwise pretend to be worshipping God, is so gross an appearance of inward idolatry, (either as visibly describing God to be like a creature, or else as seeming to mean what idolaters did by that action,) that God hath thought meet to forbid it to all mankind by a special law. (Command. 2.)

6. The scandal of seeming idolatry is a heinous sin, and not to be excused by the contrary meaning of the heart, no more than lying, idolatrous professions are. Because to blaspheme God as if he were like a creature, or to tell the world by our actions that a creature is God, are both very heinous. And so is it to murder our brethren’s souls, by tempting them to the like 9.

7. It is no appearance of idolatry to kneel to a king, or a father, or superior, when we are professing nothing but to honour them with due honour. But when the church assembleth professedly to worship God, if then they mix expressions of veneration to angels, and saints in heaven, or to a king, or any creature, in their worshipping of God, without a very notorious signification of sufficient difference, it will seem a joining them in part of the same Divine honour 7.

8. So we may put off our hats to the chair of state, or king’s image, yea and kneel towards it as to him, if he command it in due time and place, when it is human worship only which we profess. But to kneel or bow as an act of honour towards the image of king, saints, or angels, in the time of our professed worshipping of God, is scandalous, and an appearance that we give them a part of that which we are giving to God.

9. Yet it is not unlawful even in the sacred assemblies, to bow to our superior at our entrance, or going out, or in the intervals of God’s worship; because the time, and custom, and manner may sufficiently notify the distinction, and prevent the scandal.

10. If any presumptuous clergymen on pretence of their authority, will bring images into the churches, and set them

9 Rom. xi. 4. 1 Kings xix. 18. Rev. xiii. 8, 9. Josh. xiii. 7. 2 Kings xvii. 38. Exod. xxi. 5.
7 Gen. xxvii. 29. xxxii. 10. xlv. 8. Exod. xi. 8. 2 Kings v. 18. Gen. xli. 43. Ruth ii. 10. 1 Sam. xxv. 23. 41.
before us in Divine worship, as objects only of remembrance, and means of exciting our affections to God, that they may shew 'quam proxime se accedere posse ad peccatum sine peccato,' how near they can come to sin without sin, it is not meet for any good Christians to follow them in their presumption, nor by obeying them to invite them to proceed in their church tyranny. Though I now determine not, whether in case of necessity, a man may not be present with such a church, if their worship of God himself be sound, supposing him sufficiently to notify his dissent, and that he do not himself scandalously direct his worship toward such images. (As in the Lutheran churches we may suppose they do not.)

Quest. cxiii. What images, and what use of images is lawful or unlawful?

Answ. 1. It is unlawful to make any image of God. Because it would be a blaspheming of him, as pretending him to be like to that which he is not like to, that is, a creature.

Object. 'Man is God's image: it is lawful to make an image of man; and so an image of God's image, and that may be a secondary image of God.'

Answ. 1. It is the soul of man, of which no image can be drawn or made, which is the image of God, and not the body. 2. The image of him who 'secundum quid' as to the soul is God's image, is not God's image, but man's 'quoad corpus,' as to another part. We need not contend much about the name, whether this may be called a remote image of God (though undoubtedly unfit). But we must not really take it to be like him, or use it for his image.

Object. 'God hath imprinted his image on the whole creation; e.g. he is called a consuming fire; therefore fire may be pictured as his image.'

1 Lev. xxvi. 1. Gal. ii. 4, 5. v. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 23.
Answ. The same answer serveth as to the former objection. And it is not all the impressions and 'vestigia' of God's power, wisdom, and goodness, which is called his image; as the house is not the image of the builder, or a clock of a clockmaker, &c. And if God be metaphorically called fire, as he is called a lion, &c. because of the similitude of some operation or effect, it followeth not that these are his image; much less that the image of these is his image.

2. No image may be made to be a teacher of lies: as we may not lie by words, so neither by images. Therefore false stories, or false images of realities, when made as true, and pretended to be true images or representations, are unlawful.

3. Therefore it is unlawful to make an image of a spirit, pretending it to be a true image. Because it will be a lie.

4. It is unlawful so to make, place, or use any image, as is like to do more harm than good.

5. Therefore it is unlawful so to make, place, or use them, as that they are like to tempt a man to any sin, unless necessity for some greater good require it. (Of which more anon.)

6. Therefore all images of such idols or feigned deities are unlawful, as are like to be any temptation to any to believe in them, or worship them.

7. Therefore also all images of such creatures as others use to give unlawful worship or honour to, are unlawful when they are like to be a temptation to us or others to do the like. As among Papists the image of the crucifix, the virgin Mary, and angels may not be made, placed, or used so as may tempt any to worship them sinfully as they use to do.

8. The image of an over-honoured or falsely honoured person, (though not adored,) may not be so made, placed or used, as tendeth to tempt others also to such honour. As of Mahomet, or Apollonius, (as Alexander Severus placed him and others, with Abraham and Christ in his 'lararium' or chapel). And many give too much honour by images to Alexander, Caesar, and such other great thieves and murderers of mankind.

9. It is unlawful to make lascivious images of naked
persons, and place or use them so, as tendeth to be a temptation to lust or immodesty. A common sin of persons of unclean imaginations.

10. It is also unlawful so to represent plays, pompous honours, splendid clothing or buildings as tendeth more to tempt the beholders to sinful desires, than to any good.

11. It is unlawful to place images in churches or in secret before our eyes when we are worshipping God, when it tendeth to corrupt the imagination, or by possessing it, to hinder the spiritual exercise of the mind. Which is the ordinary effect of images.

12. It is unlawful to use images scandalously, as any of the aforesaid sinners use them, though we do it not with the same intent. That is, so to use them, as is interpretatively or in outward appearance the same with their use: because by so doing we shall dishonour God as they do, and harden them in sin. Therefore images in churches or oratories, in those countries where others use them sinfully, or near such countries, where the same may harden men in their sin, is evil.

13. It is unlawful to make talismans or shapes, upon false suppositions that the very shape naturally disposeth the matter to receive such influences of the stars, by which it shall preserve men from plagues, fire, wild-beasts, serpents, diseases, or shall otherwise work wonders; for which Gaffarel vainly pleadeth at large: such as they call naturally magical and charming shapes.

14. Much more unlawful is it purposely to make shapes to be symbols or instruments by which the devil shall operate, whether it be for good or evil: it being unlawful so far to use him.

15. So is it to make such shapes, on conceit that God or good angels will operate in or by them. As some use the cross or other images, to defend them from devils, to cure the tooth-ache or other diseases, or such like use: when God hath neither appointed any such means to be used, for such ends, nor promised any such blessing or operation by them.

16. It is unlawful to place the image of a tutelary saint or angel in house, church, or town, on supposition that we shall be the safer while that image is there placed; or else
to profess our trust in that particular guardian. Because no man knoweth what angel God doth make his guardian, nor can we distinguish them; much less that he maketh such or such a saint our guardian. And men's own (foolish) choosing such a one to be their guardian, will not make them so. Nor hath God appointed or promised to bless any such imagery.

17. It is sinful to use such amorous images of the persons towards whom your lust is kindled, as tendeth to increase or keep up that lust, or to make profession or ostentation of it. As lustful persons use to carry or keep the pictures of those on whom they dote.

18. It is unlawful to make such use of the pictures of our deceased friends, as tendeth to increase our inordinate sorrow for them.

19. It is unlawful to make such images, monuments or memorials of the best and holiest persons or martyrs, as may endanger or tempt men to any inordinate veneration of, or confidence in the persons honoured.

20. Inward images of God imprinted on the fantasy are sinful: and so are other such false or sinful images as afore-mentioned, though they be not made externally for the use of the eye.

21. I think it is unlawful to make an image, or any equal instituted sign to be the public common symbol of the Christian religion (though it be but a professing sign); because God having already instituted the symbols or public 'tessere' of our Christian profession or religion, it is usurpation to do the like without his commission. As the king having made the wearing of the George and star the badge of the order of the garter, would take it ill, if any shall make another badge of the order, much more if they impose it on all of the order: though I presume not to condemn it.

1. All images painted or engraven are not unlawful; for God himself commanded and allowed the use of many in the Old Testament. And Christ reprehendeth not Caesar's image on his coin. *

2. The civil use of images in coins, sign-posts, banners,

---

* 2 Chron. iii. 10. Matt. xxii. 20. Numb. xxi. 9. 2 Kings x. 17. 1 Kings viii. 18, 19, 25, 26, 29, 30.
ornaments of buildings, or of books, or chambers, or gardens, is not unlawful.

3. As the word 'image' is taken in general for signs, there is no question but they are frequently to be used; as all a man's words are the images, that is, the signifiers of his mind: and all a man's writings are the same made visible. It is therefore a blind, confounding error of some now among us (otherwise very sober, good men) who accuse all forms of prayer, and of preaching as sinful, because (say they) they are idols, or images of prayer and of preaching; they are neither engraved nor painted images of any creature; but all words are or should be signs of the speaker's mind. And if you will 'secundum quid' call only the inward desires by the name of prayer, then the words are the signs of such prayer. But because prayer in the full sense is desire expressed, therefore the expressions are not the signs of such prayer, but part of the prayer itself, as the body is of the man: nor is a form, that is fore-conceived or pre-meditated words (whether in mind or writing) any more an image of prayer, than extempore prayer is. All words are signs, but never the more for being premeditated or written. And according to this opinion, all books are sinful images, and all sermon-notes, and the printing of the Bible itself, and all pious letters of one friend to another, and all catechisms: strangers will hardly believe, that so monstrous an opinion as this, should in these very instances be maintained, by men otherwise so understanding and truly godly, and every way blameless, as have and do maintain it at this day.

4. The making and using of the image of Christ, as born, living, preaching, walking, dying (a crucifix), rising, ascending, is not unlawful in itself, though any of the forementioned accidents may make it so in such cases. As Christ was man like one of us, so he may be pictured as a man.

Object. 'His Divine nature and human soul are Christ, and these cannot be pictured; therefore an image of Christ cannot be made.'

Answ. It is not the name, but the thing which I speak of: choose whether you will call it an image of Christ, 'secundum corpus,' or an image of Christ's body. You can-
not picture the soul of a man, and yet you may draw the picture of a man’s body.

5. It is a great part of a believer’s work, to have Christ’s image very much upon his imagination and so upon his mind*. As if he saw him in the manger, in his temptations, in his preaching, in his praying, watching, fasting, weeping, doing good, as crowned with thorns, as crucified, &c., that a crucified Saviour being still as it were before our eyes, we may remember the price of our redemption, and the example which we have to imitate; and that we are not to live like a Dives or a Caesar, but like the servants of a crucified Christ. A crucifix well befitteth the imagination and mind of a believer.

6. It is a great part of true godliness, to see God’s image in the glass of the creation; to love and honour his image on his saints, and all the impressions of his power, wisdom and goodness on all his works; and to love and honour him as appearing in them.

7. It is lawful on just occasion, to make the image of fire or light as signifying the inaccessible light in which God is said to dwell, and the glory in which he will appear to the blessed in heaven*. For by many such resemblances the Scripture setteth these forth, in Rev. i. xxii. xxiii. &c. And Moses saw God’s back parts, viz. a created glory.

8. It is lawful to represent an angel on just occasions, in such a likeness as angels have assumed in apparitions; or as they are described in Ezekiel or elsewhere in Scripture, so be it we take it not for an image of their true spiritual nature, but an improper representation of them, like a metaphor in speech.

9. It is lawful (seasonably and in fit circumstances) to use images, 1. For memory. 2. For clearer apprehension. 3. For more passionate affection, even in religious cases; which is commonly called the historical use of them. For these ends the Geneva Bible, and some other, have the Scripture histories in printed images; to shew the Papists

---

* Rom. viii. 29. Rev. i. 12. &c. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15. Phil. iii. 8—10. &c.
† 1 Cor. xi. 7. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Col. iii. 10.
‡ Exod. xxvi. 18, 19. xxxvii. 8, 9.
* 1 Kings vi. 24—27. Ezek. x. 2, 4, 7, 9, 14. 1 Kings vii. 29, 36. viii. 6.
7. 1 Sam. iv. 4. 2 Kings xix. 15. Psal. lxxx. 1. xcix. 1. Isa. vi. 2. 6.
that it is not all images, or all use of them, that they were against. And so men were wont to picture Dives in his feasting, with Lazarus in rags, over their tables, to mind them of the sinfulness of sensuality. And so the sacred histories are ordinarily painted, as useful ornaments of rooms, which may profit the spectators.

10. Thus it is lawful to honour the memory of learned, great and virtuous persons, saints and martyrs, by keeping their images; and by the beholding of them to be remembered of our duty, and excited to imitation of them.

11. It is lawful to use hieroglyphics, or images expressing virtues and vices, as men commonly make images to decipher prudence, temperance, charity, fortitude, justice, &c. and envy, sloth, pride, lust, &c. As they do of the five senses, and the four seasons of the year, and the several parts of man's age, and the several ranks and qualities of persons, &c.

12. Thus it is lawful to represent the devil, and idols, when it tendeth but to make them odious. For as we must not take their names into our mouths, that is, when it tendeth to honour them, or tempt men to it; and yet may name them as Elias did in scorn, or as the prophets did by reproof of sin; so is it also in making representations of them. Even as a drunkard may be painted in his fitth and folly to bring shame and odium on the sin.

13. It is lawful to use hieroglyphics instead of letters, in teaching children, or in letters to friends; or to make images to stand as characters instead of words, and so to use them even about sacred things.

14. As it is lawful to use arbitrary professing signs even about holy things, which signify no more than words, and have by nature or custom an aptitude to such a use; while it is extended no farther, than to open our own minds; so it may be lawful to use such a characteristic or hieroglyphical image to that end, when it hath the same aptitude, but not otherwise. As a circular figure or ring being a hieroglyphic of perpetuity, and so of constancy, is used as a significant profession of constancy in marriage; and so the receiving of each other's picture, might be used. And so in

b Ut Beate icones vior. illustrium.
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covenanting, or taking an oath, the professing sign is left to the custom of the country; whether we signify our consent by gesture, words, action, writing. And as it is lawful to make an image on a seal which hath a sacred signification, (as a flaming heart on an altar, a Bible, a praying saint, &c.) as well as to write a religious motto on a seal; so is it lawful to put this seal to a subscribed covenant with God and his church, or our king and country, when we have a lawful call to seal such a covenant. But if law or custom would make such a seal, to be the common badge or symbol of the Christian religion, I think it would become unlawful.

As the crucifix for ought I know might thus have been arbitrarily used as a seal, or as a transient, arbitrary professing sign, as the cross was by the ancients at the beginning. If any man had scorned me for believing in a crucified Christ, I know not but I might have made a crucifix by art, act or gesture, to tell him that I am not ashamed of Christ; as well as I may tell him so by word of mouth. But if men’s institution or custom, shall make this a symbol or badge of a Christian, and twist it in baptism, or adjoin it, as a dedicating sign, and as the common professing symbol that every baptized person must use, to signify and declare that he is not ashamed of Christ crucified, but believeth in him, and will manfully fight under his banner against the flesh, the world, and the devil to the death: though he call it but a professing sign, and say, he doth but signify his own mind, and not God’s act and grace; I should wish him to distinguish between a private or arbitrary act of profession, and a common public badge and professing symbol of our religion; and tell him that I think the instituting of the latter belongs to God alone; and that he hath made two sacraments to that end; which sacraments are essentially such symbols and badges of our profession, and are dedicating signs on the receiver’s part; and that Christ crucified is the chief grace or mercy given to the church, and his sacrifice is his own act: and therefore objectively, the grace, and act of God also, is here signified; and therefore on two accounts set together, I fear this use of the crucifix is a sin: 1. As it is an image, (though it should be transient) used
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as a medium in God's worship, and so forbidden in the second commandment, (for it is not a mere circumstance of worship, but an outward act of worship). 2. Because it is a new human sacrament, or hath too much of the essence of a sacrament, and so it is an usurpation of his prerogative that made the sacraments: for as I said, it belongeth to the king to make the common badge or symbol of his own subjects, or any order honoured by him. And the general giveth out his own colours; and though one may arbitrarily wear another colour, yet if any shall give out common colours to his army, regiment or troop beside his own, to be the symbol or badge of his soldiers, I think he would take it for too much boldness. Yet if only an inferior captain gave but subordinate colours, not to notify a soldier of the army as such, but to distinguish his troop from the rest, it were not so much as the other: so if a bishop or ruler did but make such a symbol by which the Christians of his charge might be discerned from all others, and not as a badge of Christianity itself, though I know no reason for such distinction, and it may be faulty otherwise, yet would it not be this usurping of sacramental institution, which now I speak of. All professing signs are not symbols of Christianity. Christ hath done his own work well already; his colours, sacraments or symbols are sufficient; we need not devise more, and accuse his institutions of insufficiency; nor make more work for ourselves in religion, when we leave undone so much that he hath made us.

15. All abuse of images will not warrant us to separate from the church which abuseth them; nor is all such abuse, idolatry. If the church or our rulers will against our will place images inconveniently in churches, we may lawfully be there, so that they be not symbols of idol worship, or of a religion or worship so sinful in the substance, as that God will not accept it; and so be it we make no sinful use of those inconvenient images ourselves. Though mere temptation and scandal make them sinful in those that so abuse them, and set them up; yet he that is not the author of that temptation or scandal, may not forsake God's worship, because that such things are present, nor is to be interpreted a consent to them, while he cometh only about lawful worship,
and perhaps hath fit opportunity at other times to profess his dissent.

16. It is lawful to preserve the honest and sober love to our friends, by keeping their pictures; or to shew our love by decent monuments.

17. Where we may use creatures themselves to profit us by the sight, we may (ordinarily) use the images of those creatures. As the sight of trees, fruits, cities, &c. may delight us, and mind us of the power, wisdom and goodness of God, (or the sight of the sun, moon, stars, &c.) so may the pictures of the same things. And as a dead body, skeleton or skull, may profitably mind us of our latter end; so may the picture of any of these, which we may more conveniently keep.

18. It is not unlawful to pray before or towards an image, in a room where images are placed only for ornament, and we have no respect to them as a medium or object of our worship, (except by accident as aforesaid).

19. It is not unlawful to make an image (out of the cases of accidental evil before named) to be ‘objectum vel medium excitans ad cultum Dei,’ ‘an object or medium of our consideration, exciting our minds to worship God.’ (As a death’s-head, or a crucifix, or an historical image of Christ or some holy man, yea, the sight of any of God’s creatures, may be so holily used, as to stir up in us a worshipping affection, and so is ‘medium cultus excitans vel efficienter.’) But no creature, or image, (I think) may lawfully be made the ‘medium cultum vel terminus, in genere causae finalis,’ a worshipped medium, or the ‘terminus,’ or the thing which we worship mediately, on pretence of representing God, and that we worship him in it ultimately. And this I take to be the thing forbidden directly in the second commandment; viz. To worship a creature (with mind or body) in the act of Divine worship, as representing God, or as the mediate term of our worship, by which we send it unto God, as if it were the more acceptable to him. So that it is lawful by the sight of a crucifix to be provoked to worship God; but it is unlawful to offer him that worship, by offering it to the crucifix first, as the sign, way, or means of our sending it to God.

20. Yet a creature may be honoured or worshipped with
such worship as is due to him, by the means of such a representing 'terminus' or image. - If the king command his subjects to bow towards his image or throne when he is absent, as an act of honour, or human worship to himself, it is lawful so to do, God having not forbid it. But God hath forbid us to do so by himself, because he hath no image, and is confined to no place, and to avoid the danger and appearance of idolatry.

21. Yet is it lawful to lift up our hand and eyes towards heaven, as the place of God's glory; and I condemn not the ancient churches that worshipped towards the east. But it was not heaven, or the sun, or east that they worshipped, or to which they sent their worship, as any 'terminus medius,' or thing mediately worshipped; but only to God himself, whose glory is in the heavens.

Quest. cxiv. Whether stage-plays, where the virtuous and vicious are personated, be lawful?

Because this is a kind of imagery, the question may be here fitly handled. But I have said so much before of stage-plays, and the sin that is used in them, Part i. Chap. 18. that I have nothing more to say here, but only to decide this particular case of conscience concerning them.

As I am not willing to thrust any man into extremes, nor to trouble men with calling those sins, which God hath not forbidden; so I have reason to advise men to go, in doubtful cases, on the safer side, much more to dissuade them from undoubted sin, and especially from great and multiplied sins; and therefore I must thus decide the question.

1. It is not absolutely unlawful to personate another man, nor doth the second commandment forbid such living images in this extent. I pass by the instance of the woman of Tekoah, 2 Sam. xiv.; because the bare history proveth not the lawfulness. But Paul's speaking as of himself and Apollos the things which concerned others, was approveable; and as Christ frequently taught by parables, so his parables were a description of good and evil, by the way of feigned history, as if such and such things had been
done by such persons as never were. And this fiction is no falsehood; for the hearer knoweth that it is not meant as an historical narrative, but a parable; and it is but an image in words, or a painted doctrine. And if a person and action may be feigned by words, I know not where it is forbidden to feign them by personal representation. Therefore to personate another is not simply a sin.

2. To personate good men in good actions, is not simply unlawful; because, 1. It is not unlawful as it is personating, as is shewed. 2. Nor as lying; because it is not an asserting, but a representing; nor so taken.

3. To personate a bad man, in a bad action, is more dubious; but seemeth not in all cases to be unlawful. To pass by David's feigning himself mad (as of uncertain quality,) it is common with preachers, to speak oft the words of wicked men, as in their names or persons, to disgrace them: and Prov. v. 11, 12, &c. cometh near it. And whether Job be a history, or a dialogue personating such speakers, is doubted by the most learned expositors.

4. I think it possible to devise and act a comedy or tragedy, which should be lawful, and very edifying. It might be so ordered by wise men.

5. I think I never knew or heard of a lawful stage-play, comedy or tragedy, in the age that I have lived in; and that those now commonly used, are not only sins, but heinous, aggravated sins; for these reasons.

1. They personate odious vices commonly viciously, that is, 1. Without need, reciting sinful words, and representing sinful actions; which as they were evil in the first committing, so are they in the needless repetition. "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, (or lust) let it not be once named among you as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting which are not convenient; but rather giving of thanks."—For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." 2. Because they are spoken and acted commonly without that shame, and hatred, and grief which should rightly affect the hearers with an abhorrence of them; and therefore tend to reconcile men to sin, and to tempt them to take it but for a matter of sport.

* Ephes. v. 3. 12.
2. There are usually so many words materially false, (though not proper lies) used in such actions of good and evil, as is unsavoury, and tendeth to tempt men to fiction and false speaking.

3. There are usually such multitudes of vain words poured out on the circumstantial, as are a sin themselves, and tempt the hearers to the like.

4. They usually mix such amorous or other such ensnaring expressions or actions, as are fitted to kindle men's sinful lusts, and to be temptations to the evils which they pretend to cure.

5. A great deal of precious time is wasted in them, which might have been much better spent; to all the lawful ends which they can intend.

6. It is the preferring of an unmeet and dangerous recreation, before many fitter; God having allowed us so great choice of better, it cannot be lawful to choose a worse. The body, which most needeth exercise, with most of the spectators, hath no exercise at all; and the mind might be much more fruitfully recreated many ways; by variety of books, of converse, by contemplating God and his works, by the fore-thoughts of the heavenly glory, &c. So that it is unlawful, as unfitted to its pretended ends.

7. It usually best suiteth with the most carnal minds, and more corrupteth the affections and passions, as full experience proveth: those that most love and use them are not reformed by them, but commonly are the most loose, ungodly, sensual people.

8. The best and wisest persons least relish them, and are commonly most against them. And they are best able to make experiment, what doth most help or hurt the soul. Therefore when the sensual say, 'We profit by them, as much as by sermons,' they do but speak according to their own sense and lust; as one that hath the green-sickness may say, 'Coals, and clay, and ashes do me more good than meat,' because they are not so fit to judge, as those that have a healthful state and appetite. And it seldom pleaseth the conscience of a dying man, to remember the time he spent at stage-plays.

9. Usually there is much cost bestowed on them,
which might be better employed, and therefore is unlawful.

10. God hath appointed a stated means of instructing souls, by parents, ministers, &c., which is much more fit and powerful; therefore that time were better spent. And it is doubtful whether play-houses be not a stated means of man's institution, set up to the same pretended use as the church and ministry of Christ, and so be not against the second commandment. For my part I cannot defend them, if any shall say that the devil hath apishly made these his churches, in competition with the churches of Christ.

11. It seemeth to me a heinous sin for players to live upon this as a trade and function, and to be educated for it, and maintained in it. That which might be used as a recreation, may not always be made a trade of.

12. There is no mention that ever such plays were used in Scripture times by any godly persons.

13. The primitive Christians and churches were commonly against them; many canons are yet to be seen, by which they did condemn them. Read but Dr. J. Regnolds against Albericus Gentilis, and you shall see unanswerable testimonies, from councils, fathers, emperors, kings, and all sober antiquity against them.

14. Thousands of young people in our time have been undone by them; some at the gallows, and many apprentices who run out in their accounts, neglect their master's business, and turn to drunkenness, and whoredom, and debauchery, do confess that stage-plays were not the last or least of the temptations which did overthrow them.

15. The best that can be said of these plays is, that they are controverted and of doubtful lawfulness; but there are other means enough of undoubted and uncontroverted lawfulness, for the same honest ends; and therefore it is a sin to do that which is doubtful without need.

Upon all these reasons, I advise all that love their time, their souls, their God and happiness, to turn away from these nurseries of vice, and to delight themselves in the law and ordinances of their Saviour.

† † Paul. i. 2, 3.
Quest. cxv. Is it ever unlawful to use the known symbols and badges of idolatry?

Answ. 1. Ordinarily it is unlawful, as being the thing forbidden in the second commandment. For he that useth them, 1. Is corporally idolatrous, whatever his secret thoughts may be. 2. And he is interpretatively an idolater, and actually persuadeth others to be so.

2. But yet though no man may ever use such symbols of idolatry formally, 'quä tales,' as such; yet materially he may use them in some cases.

As 1. When an idolater will take an ordinance of God, and an appointed duty, and turn it into a symbol of his idolatry: (as in the foregoing instance of the Mahometans). We may not therefore forsake that duty; but we must do it in such a manner, as may sufficiently disclaim the idolater's use of it. As if any idolaters will make a symbol of some Scripture texts, or of the Lord's day, or of the sacramental bread and wine, &c.; we must not therefore disuse them.

2. When a thing indifferent is made an idolatrous symbol or badge, though I must not use it as idolaters do, yet if any act of Divine providence make it, become necessary as a moral duty, I may be obliged to use it, disclaiming the idolater's manner and end: and then it will be known that I use it not as their symbol. As if a man, by famine or a swoon, were dying in an idol's temple, I might give him meat or drink there to save his life, though such as was a badge of their idolatry, while I disclaim their ends and use. The reason is, 1. Because at such a time it is a natural duty, and therefore may not be omitted for fear of scandal, or seeming sin, which at that time is no sin. 2. Because Christ hath taught us in the instance of himself and his disciples, that positive commands give place to natural, 'ceteris paribus.' And that the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath; and that we must learn what this meaneth, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." And if we must break the rest of the sabbath for the life, yes, the feeding of an ox or ass, much more of a man: and the positives of the second commandment must be regulated as the positives of the fourth. 3. And the scandal in such a case may
be avoided, by declaring that I do disclaim their use and ends.

In a country where kneeling or being uncovered to the prince is a civil, honouring custom, if the prince should be a Caligula, and command the subjects to worship him and his image as a god, and make bowing, kneeling, or being uncovered the badge or symbol of it; here I would ordinarily avoid even that which before was a duty, because it was but by accident a duty, and now interpreted a heinous sin. But in case that the life of any man lay on it, or that the scandal on religion for my denying civil honour to the prince, would be greater and of more perilous consequence, than the scandal of seeming idolatry, I would perform that civil honour which I did before, and which God enjoineth me to perform to my prince. But I would avoid the scandal, by open protesting (seasonably) against the idolatry.

Quest. CXVI. Is it unlawful to use the badge or symbol of any error or sect in the worship of God?

Answ. 1. It is unlawful to use it formally as such.

2. But not materially, when, 1. There are just and weighty reasons for it. 2. And I may disown the error.

For 1. All sects and erroneous persons may turn holy words and duties into symbols of their errors. 2. All Christians in the world being imperfect, do sometimes err in matter or manner in their worship. And he that will materially avoid all the badges or symbols of their errors, shall have no communion with any church or Christian. 3. As we must do our best so to avoid all their errors, that we choose them not, and make them not formally our own practice; (as tautologies, vain repetitions, disorders, unfit phrases, &c. We must ourselves when we are the speakers do as much better as we can). So we must not therefore separate from them that do use them, nor deny them our communion when they use them; else we must separate from all others, and all others from us. 4. But when we are present with them, our minds must disown all the faults of the holiest prayer in the world which we join in: we may be bound to stay with them, and join in all that is good and
warrantable, and yet as we go along, to disown in our minds all that we know to be amiss.

Quest. cxvii. Are all indifferent things made unlawful to us, which shall be abused to idolatrous worship?

Answ. You must distinguish, 1. Of the symbols of idolatry before spoken of, and other bye-abuses. 2. Of an abuse done in former ages or remote countries, and in our own age and country. 3. Of the reasons inviting us to use them, whether necessary or not.

1. The case of symbols or badges is not here spoken of, but other abuses.

2. An abuse committed in the age and place we live in, or any other, which will by the scandal embolden others to the like, may not be complied in without so great reason, as will notably preponderate the evil consequents.

3. But yet in many cases such abused, indifferent things, may after be lawfully used by believers. For instance:

1. Names may be things indifferent, abused to idolatry, and yet lawfully used by us: as the name 'God, Deus, Lord, Holy, Just, Good, temple, altar, sacrifice, priest, heaven, sun, moon, Jupiter, Saturn,' and a hundred such: I mean these letters and syllables in these languages. That these names are all in themselves indifferent appareth in that they are neither naturally necessary, nor by God's institution, but arbitrary signs of human invention and choice: for we may easily and lawfully make new words to signify all the same things that these do: and that they are abused to idolatry is notoriously known: and that yet they are lawfully used, the practice of all Christians, English and Latin, even the most scrupulous themselves doth judge.

2. And the use of temples (those individuals which have been used to idolatry) is lawful.

3. So also of bells, pulpits, cups, tables, and fonts, and other utensils.

4. The Bible itself, as it is this individual book rather than another, is a thing indifferent. Yet it may be read in after it hath been abused to idolatry.
6. If the king would give not only the garments, but the money, lands, lordships, houses, which have been consecrated or otherwise abused to idolatry, to any poor people, or most of the scrupulous, they would think it lawful to receive and use them; yea, it is lawful to dedicate the same lands and money afterwards to holy uses, and to maintain religious worship.

6. Otherwise it were in the power of any idolater whenever he pleased, to deprive all the Christian world of their Christian liberty, and to make nothing indifferent to us, seeing they can abuse them all.

7. Yea, almost nothing is then already indifferent, there being few things that some person in some time and place hath not abused to idolatry.

8. If the question be only of all individual things abused to idolatry, the decision now given will hold good; but if it be also of all species of such things, it will be a dishonour to a man's reason to make a question of it.

Quest. CXVIII. May we use the names of week-days which idolatry honoured their idols with; as Sunday, Monday, Saturday, and the rest? And so the months?

Answ. 1. It were to be wished that the custom were changed; 1. Because the names have been so grossly abused: 2. And we have no need of them: 3. And as the Papists say, 'Our monuments, temple-names, and other relics among you prove ours to be the old religion, and keep possession for us till it be restored.' So the heathens say to all the Christians, 'Your very names of your days and months prove our religion to be older than yours, and keep possession for us, till it be restored.'

2. It is meet that we wisely do our duty towards the reformation of this abuse.

3. But yet long custom and sound doctrine hath so far taken away the scandal and ill effects, that rather than be an offence to any by seeming singularity, it is as lawful still to use these names, as it was to Luke to use the names of Castor and Pollux, Jupiter and Mercury, historically.

4. In such cases, the true solution of the question must be, by weighing accidents and foreseen consequences together
wisely and impartially; and he that can foresee which way is likely to do most good or hurt, may satisfactorily know his duty.

Quest. cxix. Is it lawful to pray secretly when we come first into the church, especially when the church is otherwise employed?

Answ. 1. This is a thing which God hath given us no particular law about; but the general laws must regulate us, "Let all be done decently, in order, and to edification."

2. Our great and principal business in coming to the church-assembly, is to join with them in the public worship; and this is that accordingly, as our great business, we must intend and do.

3. In a place where superstition makes ignorant people think it a matter of necessity, so to begin with secret prayer, when the church is otherwise employed, the use of it is the more scandalous, as encouraging them in their error.

4. It is the best way to come before the public worship begin, and then they that think it most decent may do it without scruple or just offence.

5. But as a man's heart may put up a short ejaculation as he walketh up the church, without losing what else he might hear, so a man may on his knees be so brief, as that his loss shall be but small; and whether his profit preponderate that little time's loss, he can judge better than another. Therefore though I like best keeping to concord with the assembly in our devotion, yet these are things in which it ill beseemeth Christians to judge or despise each other; and I shall take on either side the judging and despising of those that differ from us, to be a far greater sin, than the doing or not doing of the thing.

Object. 'Is it not called, in Eccles. v. 1, 2. "The sacrifice of fools who know not they do evil?"

Answ. No: I have wondered to hear that text so ordinarily thus perverted. The text is, "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to offer the sacrifice of fools." Which is no more,
than that it is the imagination and custom of fools to think
to please God by their sacrifices, and bringing somewhat to
him, while they refuse or neglect to hear his commands and,
obey him. Whereas obedience is better than sacrifice, and
the sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to the Lord; and
he that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, his prayer
is abominable; and because they hate instruction—they
shall cry and God will not hear them. Therefore be first,
careful to hear what God saith to thee, and to learn his will
and do it, and then bring thy sacrifice to him: leave thy gift
at the altar, and go and be reconciled to thy brother: obey
first, and then come and offer thy gift. This is all the
meaning of the text. See also Psal. i. 8.; and compare,
these cited texts, 1 Sam. xv. 22. Prov. xv. 8. xxi. 17.
Matt. v. &c. But whether we should begin with prayer or
hearing when we enter into the church, God hath left to
prudence to be decided by the general rules.

Quest. cxx. May a preacher kneel down in the pulpit, and use
his private prayers, when he is in the assembly?

Answ. This will have the same answer with the former;
and therefore I shall trouble the reader with no more.

Quest. cxxi. May a minister pray publickly in his own name
singly, for himself or others? Or only in the church's name,
as their mouth to God?

Answ. It is good to be as exact in order and decency as
we can; but they that would not have other men's ceremo-
nies brought in on that pretence, should not bring in their
own made doctrines.

1. It is certain that all the assembly come thither, not
only to hear a prayer, but to pray as well as the minister;
and therefore the practice of all churches in the world (as is
seen in all the liturgies) is for the minister to speak in the
plural number, and usually to pray in the church's name.
And so he is both their guide and mouth in prayer. There-
fore even when he prayeth for himself, it is usually most fit
(or very fit) for him rather to say, 'We beseech thee give
the speaker thy assistance, &c.,' than ' I beseech thee.'
2. And even subjectively it is not inconvenient to speak of himself in the third person, 'Give him,' or 'Give the speaker thy help,' instead of 'Give me.'

3. But they that will place a necessity in either of these, and make the contrary a sin, must have more knowledge than I have to be able to prove it.

For, 1. In the latter case the minister doth not pray in his own person, but only for his own person, when he saith, 'We beseech thee give me thy help,' &c.

2. And I know no word of God that saith, either that the minister is only the mouth of the people, or that he is to speak only in their names, or that he may not pray for himself or them in his ministerial capacity in the first person.

For, 1. He is a minister of Christ for the church, and not the minister of the church properly. And he is subordinate to Christ in his priestly office, as well as in his teaching and ruling office; and the priests did always take it for their office, not only to speak as the people's mouth, but as sub-mediators or intercessors for them to God; and as then they were types of Christ by standing between God and the people, so they were his officers as well as types; and so they are his officers to this day: and as they teach and rule in his name by office, so do they intercede in his name; all men confess that they may do this in private; and where is it forbidden to be done in public?

2. And there are some cases in which it is most fit that it should be so. That is, when it is supposed that the congregation doth not join with him. As, 1. When the whole church is fallen into some error of judgment, (as who hath not many) and he knoweth that they differ from him, it is more fit for him to pray as a sub-intercessor for them in his own person, than to speak as in their persons, who he knoweth join not with him. For that hath a plain untruth in it. 2. If the whole church be fallen into some little sin, which seduction yet hindereth them from repenting of, he were better confess it, and profess sorrow for it, in his own person, than in their's that join not with him in it. 3. When he prayeth for somewhat for himself and them, that is above
their understanding (as for direction in some difficult controversies, &c.) I know not that he is bound to speak in their names that understand him not.

Therefore this is no business for Christians that are not possessed with a proud, peevish, self-conceited, quarrelsome humour, to censure or despise a minister for; nor should any introduce that false doctrine of man’s invention into the church, that the minister is only to pray in public as the people’s mouth. But the power of prejudice is great.

Quest. cxxi. May the name, ‘priests,’ ‘sacrifice,’ and ‘altars,’ be lawfully now used instead of, ‘Christ’s ministers,’ ‘worship,’ and the ‘holy table’?

Ans. 1. He that useth them in design to bring in the Popish transubstantiation and real sacrifice of the mass, doth heinously sin in such a design and case.

2. In a time and place where they may not be used without scandal, or tempting or encouraging any to their errors, the scandal will be a grievous sin.

3. The New Testament useth all the Greek names which we translate, Priests, Sacrifice and Altars, therefore we may use the same in Greek; and our translation and English names are not intolerable. If ‘priest’ come from ‘presbyter’ I need not prove that; if it do not, yet all ministers are subordinate to Christ in his priestly office as essentially as in the rest. And Rev. i. 6. v. 10. xx. 6. it is said, that we are or shall be made priests of God, and unto God. And 1 Pet. ii. 5. we are “an holy priesthood,” and ver. 9. a “royal priesthood:” if this be said of all, then especially of ministers.

And the word ‘sacrifice’ is used of us and our offered worship, 1 Pet. ii. 5. Heb. xiii. 15, 16. Phil. iv. 18. Eph. v. 2, Rom. xii. 1.

And Heb. xiii. 10. saith, “We have an altar whereof they partake not,” &c. And the word is frequently used in the Revelations, chap. vi. 9. viii. 3. 5. xvi. 7. &c. in relation to Gospel times. We must not therefore be quarrelsome against the base names, unless they be abused to some ill use.

4. The ancient fathers and churches did ever use all
these words so familiarly without any question or scruple raised about them, either by the orthodox or any heretics that at present I can remember to have ever read of, that we should be the more wary how we condemn the bare words, lest thence we give advantage to the Papists to make them tell their followers, that all antiquity was on their side; which were very easy for them to prove, if the controversy were about the names alone. Extremes and passionate imprudence do give the adversaries great advantages.

5. The names of sacrifice and altar, were used by the ancient churches, not properly, but merely in allusion to the Jewish and heathen sacrifices and altars, together with a tropical use from the Christian reasons of the names.

As the Lord's supper is truly the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice; and therefore called by Protestants, a commemorative sacrifice; so that our controversy with the Papists, is not, whether it may be called a sacrifice; but whether it be only the sacrament of a sacrifice, or a sacramental, commemorative sacrifice, or also a real, proper sacrifice of the very body and blood itself of Christ. For we acknowledge, that 'This is a sacrifice,' is no more tropical a speech, than 'This is my body and blood.'

6. Yet it must be noted, that the Scripture useth the word 'sacrifice' about ourselves, and our thanksgivings, and praises, and works of charity, rather than of the Lord's supper; and the word 'priests' of all men lay or clergy that offer these foresaid sacrifices to God. Though the ancient doctors used them familiarly, by way of allusion, of the sacrament and its administrators.

7. In a word, as no Christian must use these or any words, to false ends or senses, or deceiving purposes, nor yet to scandal; so out of these cases, the words are lawful; and as the fathers are not to be any further condemned for using them, than as the words (which they foresaw not) have given advantage to the Papists, to bring in an ill sense and doctrine; so those that now live in churches and countries where the public professed doctrine doth free them from the suspicion of a Popish ill sense, should not be judged or quarrelled with for the terms; but all sober Christians should allow each other the liberty of such phrases without censoriousness or breach of charity, or peace.
Quest. cxxiii. *May the communion-tables be turned altar-wise, and railed in? And is it lawful to come up to the rails to communicate?*

_Ans_w._ The answer to this is mostly the same with that to the foregoing question. 1. God hath given us no particular command or prohibition about these circumstances; but the general rules, for unity, edification, order and decency; whether the table shall stand this way or that way, here or there, &c., he hath not particularly determined.

2. They that turn the table altar-wise and rail it in, out of a design to draw men to Popery, or in a scandalous way which will encourage men to, or in Popery, do sin.

3. So do they that rail in the table to signify that the vulgar or lay Christians must not come to it; but be kept at a distance; when Christ in his personal presence admitted his disciples to communicate at the table with himself.

4. But where there are no such ends, but only to imitate the ancients that did thus, and to shew reverence to the table on the account of the sacrament, by keeping away dogs, keeping boys from sitting on it: and the professed doctrine of the church condemneth transubstantiation, the real corporal presence, &c. (as ours doth). In this case Christians should take these for such as they are, indifferent things, and not censure or condemn each other for them; nor should any force them upon those that think them unlawful.

5. And to communicate is not only lawful in this case, where we cannot prove that the minister sinneth, but even when we suspect an ill design in him, which we cannot prove; yea, or when we can prove that his personal interpretation of the place, name, situation and rails is unsound; for we assemble there to communicate in, and according to the professed doctrine of Christianity and the churches, and our own open profession, and not after every private opinion and error of the minister. As I may receive from an Anabaptist or Separatist notwithstanding his personal errors; so may I from another man, whose error destroyeth not his ministry, nor the ordinance, as long as I consent not to it, yea, and with the church profess my dissent.

6. Yet *ceteris paribus,* every free man that hath his choice, should choose to communicate rather where there is
most purity and least error, than with those that swerve more from regular exactness.

Quest. cxxiv. Is it lawful to use David’s psalms in our assemblies?

Answ. Yes: 1. Christ used them at his last supper, as is most probable; and he ordinarily joined with the Jews that used them; and so did the apostles.

2. It is confessed lawful to read or say them; therefore also to sing them. For saying and singing difference not the main end.

3. They are suitable to our use, and were the liturgy of the Jewish church, not on a ceremonial account, but for that fitness which is common to us with them.

4. We are commanded in the New Testament to sing psalms; and we are not commanded to compose new ones; nor can every one make psalms, who is commanded to sing psalms. And if it be lawful to sing psalms of our own or our neighbour’s making, much more of God’s making by his Spirit in his prophets h.

Object. They are not suitable to all our cases, nor to all in the assembly.

Answ. 1. We may use them in that measure of suitableness to our cases which they have. You may join with a man in prayer who expresseth part of your wants, though he express not all. Else you must join with no man in the world.

2. If ungodly men are present when the faithful speak to God, must we not speak our proper case, because they are present? The minister in church-administrations speaketh principally in the name of the faithful, and not of hypocrites. Must he leave out of his prayers all that is proper to the godly, merely because some wicked men are there? No more must the church do in singing unto God.

3. They that cannot speak every word in a psalm just as their own case, may yet speak it as instructive; otherwise they might not read or say it.

But the sectarian objections against singing David's psalms are so frivolous, that I will not tire the reader with any more.

Quest. cxxv. May psalms be used as prayers, and praises and thanksgivings, or only as instructive? Even the reading as well as the singing of them?

Answ. The sober reader who knoweth not what errors others hold, will marvel that I trouble men with such questions. But I have oft been troubled with those that (having no other shift to deny the lawfulness of written and set forms of prayer) do affirm that psalms are neither to be read or sung at all as prayers, but only as doctrinal Scriptures for instruction. But that this is false appeareth,

1. In that those that are real, material prayers, and praises and thanksgivings, and were penned to that very use, as the titles shew, and those that were so used by the Jewish synagogues where Christ was ordinarily present, may be so used by us: but such are the psalms both as said and sung.

2. And those that we are commanded to sing as psalms, and have Christ's example so to use (who sung a hymn or psalm of praise at his last supper), we also may so use. But, &c.

3. And those that are by God's Spirit fitted for our use in prayer, praise and thanksgiving, and never forbidden so to be used, may by us be so used: but such are the psalms, &c. I will weary you with no more.

Quest. cxxvi. Are our church-tunes lawful, being of man's invention?

Answ. Yes: they are a lawful invention, allowed us by God, and fitted to the general rules of edification, Scripture is no particular rule for such modes and circumstances. Object 'They breed a carnal pleasure by the melody, which is not fit for spiritual devotion.'

Answ. 1. It is a lawful, sensitive pleasure, sanctified to a
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holy use, not hindering, but greatly helping the soul, in spiritual worship.

Either you call it carnal, because it gratifieth the sinful, corrupt inclinations of man; or only because it is sensitive, or a pleasure in the imagination and lower faculties. If the former, 1. There is nothing in it which is a necessary cause of any sinful pleasure, nor any impediment to spiritual pleasure. 2. But a lustful person will turn all sensitive pleasure into sin; our meat, and drink, and clothes, and houses, and friends, and health: the bread and wine in the sacrament may be thus abused1.

2. But you must know, that as our bodies are here united to our souls, so they act together, and while the sensitive part is subordinate to the rational, it is serviceable to it, and not a hindrance: when you come to have souls that are separated from the body, you shall use no bodily instruments; and yet even then it is uncertain to us, whether the sensitive powers of the soul do not accompany it, and be not used by it. But certainly in the meantime, he that will not use sense, shall not use reason. And he that acteth not sensibly, acteth not as a man; it is not a sin to be a man; and therefore not to see, to hear, to taste, to smell, &c. Nor is it a sin to taste sweetness in our meat or drink, nor is it a sinful pleasure for the eyes to behold the light, or the variety of the beauteous works of God, or to take pleasure in them. "His works are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein m."

You know not what it is to be a man, if you know not that God hath made all the senses, to be the inlets of objects, and so of holy pleasure into the soul. Would he have given us eyes, and ears, and appetites, and made his creatures sweet and beauteous, that all might either be sin or useless to us? No: all things are sanctified, and pure to the pure n. The sense is the natural way to the imagination, and that to the understanding; and he that will have no sensible and natural pleasure, shall have no spiritual pleasure: and he that will have none but sensitive pleasure, were better have none at all. It is therefore a foolish pretence of spirituality, to dream of acting without our senses, or avoiding those de-
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lights, which may and must be sanctified to us. Harmony and melody are so high a pleasure of the sense, that they are nearest to rational delights, if not participating of them, and exceedingly fitted to elevate the mind and affections unto God.

And as it is the very nature of true holiness, to be so suited to holy things, as that they may be our delight, and he is the genuine saint, and the best of Christians, who most delighteth in God and holiness: so that is the best means to make us the best Christians, which helpeth us best to these delights; and if any thing on earth be like to heaven, it is to have our delight in God. And therefore if any thing may make us heavenly, it is that which raiseth us to such delights. And therefore a choir of holy persons, melodiously singing the praises of Jehovah, are most like to the angelical society.

Quest. cxxvii. Is church-music by organs or such instruments, lawful?

Answ. I know that in the persecuted and poorer times of the church, none such were used (when they had not temples, nor always a fixed meeting place). And that the author of the Quest. et Resp. in Justin Martyr speaketh against it: (which Perkins and others cite to that purpose.) And I grant,

1. That as it is in the power of weak, diseased Christians, to make many things unlawful to their brethren lest we be hurtful to them, and to deprive us of much, not only of our liberties but our helps; so in abundance of congregations, church-music is made unlawful by accident, through their mistake. For it is unlawful (‘cæteris paribus’) by an unnecessary thing to occasion divisions in the churches; but where one part judgeth church-music unlawful, for another part to use it, would occasion divisions in the churches, and drive away the other part. Therefore I would wish church-music to be nowhere set up, but where the con-

= Psal. cl.
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gregation can accord in the use of it; or at least where they will not divide thereupon.

2. And I think it unlawful to use such strains of music as are light, or as the congregation cannot easily be brought to understand; much more on purpose to commit the whole work of singing to the choristers, and exclude the congregation. I am not willing to join in such a church where I shall be shut out of this noble work of praise.

3. But plain, intelligible church-music, which occasioneth not divisions, but the church agreeeth in, for my part I never doubted to be lawful. For, 1. God set it up long after Moses' ceremonial law, by David, Solomon, &c.

2. It is not an instituted ceremony merely, but a natural help to the mind's alacrity: and it is a duty and not a sin to use the helps of nature and lawful art, though not to institute sacraments, &c. of our own. As it is lawful to use the comfortable helps of spectacles in reading the Bible, so is it of music to exhilarate the soul towards God.°

3. Jesus Christ joined with the Jews that used it, and never spake a word against it.

4. No Scripture forbiddeth it, therefore it is not unlawful.

5. Nothing can be against it, that I know of, but what is said against tunes and melody of voice. For whereas they say that it is a human invention; so are our tunes (and metre, and versions). Yea, it is not a human invention; as the last psalm and many others shew, which call us to praise the Lord with instruments of music.

And whereas it is said to be a carnal mind of pleasure, they may say as much of a melodious, harmonious concert of voices, which is more excellent music than any instruments.

And whereas some say that they find it do them harm, so others say of melodious singing: but as wise men say they find it do them good. And why should the experience of some prejudiced self-conceited person, or of a half-man that knoweth not what melody is, be set against the experience of all others, and deprive them of all such helps and mercies, as these people say they find no benefit by.

° 1 Sam. xviii. 6. 1 Chron. xv. 16. 2 Chron v. 13. vii. 6. xiii. 13. xxxiv. 22. Psal. xcix. xclix. cl.
And as some deride church-music by many scornful names, so others do by singing (as some congregations near me testify, who these many years have forsaken it, and will not endure it: but their pastor is fain to unite them, by the constant and total omission of singing psalms). It is a great wrong that some do to ignorant Christians, by putting such whimsies and scruples into their heads, which as soon as they enter, turn that to a scorn, and snare, and trouble, which might be a real help and comfort to them, as it is to others.

Quest. cxxviii. Is the Lord's day a sabbath, and so to be called and kept, and that of Divine institution? And is the seventh-day sabbath abrogated? &c.

Answ. All the cases about the Lord's day (except those practical directions for keeping it, in the Economical part of this book) I have put into a peculiar treatise on that subject by itself; and therefore shall here pass them over, referring the reader to them in that discourse.

Quest. cxxix. Is it lawful to appoint human holy days, and observe them?

Answ. This also I have spoke to in the aforesaid Treatise, and in my "Disput. of Church Government and Cer." Briefly, 1. It is not lawful to appoint another weekly sabbath, or day wholly separated to the commemoration of our redemption; for that is to mend (pretendedly) the institutions of God; yea, and to contradict him who hath judged one day only in seven to be the fittest weekly proportion.

2. As part of some days may be weekly used in holy assemblies, so may whole days on just, extraordinary occasions, of prayer, preaching, humiliation, and thanksgiving.

3. The holy doctrine, lives, and sufferings of the martyrs and other holy men, hath been so great a mercy to the church, that (for any thing I know) it is lawful to keep anniversary thanksgivings in remembrance of them, and to encourage the weak, and provoke them to constancy and imitation.
4. But to dedicate days or temples to them in any higher sense, as the heathens and idolaters did to their heroes is unlawful; or any way to intimate an attribution of divinity to them, by word or worship.

5. And they that live among such idolaters must take heed of giving them scandalous encouragement.

6. And they that scrupulously fear such sin more than there is cause, should not be forced to sin against their consciences.

7. But yet no Christians should causelessly refuse that which is lawful, nor to join with the churches in holy exercises on the days of thankful commemoration of the apostles, and martyrs, and excellent instruments in the church; much less petulantly to work and set open shops to the offence of others; but rather to persuade all to imitate the holy lives of those saints to whom they give such honours.

Quest. cxxx. How far are the Holy Scriptures a law and perfect rule to us?

Ans. 1. For all thoughts, words, affections, and actions, of Divine faith and obedience; (supposing still God's law of nature). For it is no believing God to believe what he never revealed; nor any trusting God, to trust that he will certainly give us that which he never either directly or indirectly promised; nor any obeying God, to do that which he never commanded.

2. The contents will best shew the extent; whatever is revealed, promised, and commanded in it, for that it is a perfect rule. For certainly it is perfect in its kind and to its proper use.

3. It is a perfect rule for all that is of universal moral necessity: that is, whatever it is necessary that man believe, think, or do, in all ages and places of the world, this is of Divine obligation. Whatever the world is universally bound to (that is, all men in it,) it is certain that God's law in nature, or Scripture, or both, bindeth them to it. For the world hath no universal king or lawgiver but God.

4. God's own laws in nature and Scripture are a perfect
rule for all the duties of the understanding, thoughts, affections, passions, immediately to be exercised on God himself; for no one else is a discerner or judge of such matters.

5. It perfectly containeth all the essential and integral parts of the Christian religion; so that nothing is of itself and directly, any part of the Christian religion which is not there.

6. It instituteth those sacraments perfectly, which are the seals of God's covenant with man, and the delivery of the benefits, and which are the badges or symbols of the disciples and religion of Christ in the world.

7. It determineth what faith, prayer, and obedience shall be his appointed means and conditions of justification, adoption, and salvation. And so what shall be professed and preached in his name to the world.

8. It is a perfect instrument of donation or conveyance of our right to Christ, and of pardon, and justification, and adoption, and the Holy Spirit's assistances, and of glory. As it is God's covenant, promise, or deed of gift.

9. It instituteth certain ministers as his own church-officers, and perfectly describeth their office, as instituted by him.

10. It instituteth the form of his church universal which is called, his body; and also of particular holy societies for his worship; and prescribeth them certain duties, as the common worship there to be performed.

11. It determineth of a weekly day, even the first, to be separated for, and used in this holy worship.

12. It is a perfect general rule for the regulating of those things, which it doth not command or forbid in particular. As that all be done wisely, to edification, in charity, peace, concord, season, order, &c.

13. It giveth to magistrates, pastors, parents, and other superiors, all that power by which they are authorized, to oblige us under God, to any undetermined particulars.

14. It is the perfect rule of Christ's judging, re
warding, and punishing at last, according to which he will proceed.

15. It is the only law that is made by primitive power.

16. And the only law that is made by infallible wisdom.

17. And the only law which is faultless, and hath nothing in it that will do the subject any harm.

18. And the only law which is from absolute power, the rule of all other laws, and from which there is finally no appeal.¹

Thus far the Holy Scripture with the law of nature is our perfect rule. But not in any of the following respects.

1. It is no particular revelation or perfect rule of natural sciences, as physics, metaphysics, &c.

2. It is no rule for the arts, for medicine, music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, grammar, rhetoric, logic; nor for the mechanics, as navigation, architecture; and all the trades and occupations of men; no, not husbandry by which we have our food.

3. It is no particular rule for all the mutable, subordinate duties of any societies. It will not serve instead of all the statutes of this and all other lands, nor tell us, when the terms shall begin and end, nor what work every parent and master shall set his children and servants in his family, &c.

4. It is no full rule in particular for all those political principles which are the ground of human laws; as whether each republic be monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical; what person or of what family shall reign; who shall be his officers and judges, and how diversified; so of his treasury, munition, coin, &c.

5. It is no rule of propriety in particular, by which every man may know which is his own land, or house, or goods, or cattle.

6. It is no particular rule for our natural actions; what meat we shall eat; what clothes we shall wear; so of our rest, labour, &c.

7. It is no particular law or rule for any of all those actions and circumstances about religion or God's own ordi-

¹ Psal. xii. 6. xix. 7—10. cix.
nances, which he hath only commanded in general, and left in specie or particular to be determined by man according to his general laws; but of these next.

Quest. cxxx. What additions or human inventions in or about religion, not commanded in Scripture, are lawful or unlawful?

Answ. 1. These following are unlawful. 1. To feign any new article of faith or doctrine, any precept, promise, threatening, prophecy, or revelation, and falsely to father it upon God, and say, that it is of him, or his special Word.

2. To say that either that is written in the Bible which is not, or that any thing is the sense of a text which is not; and so that any thing is a sin or a duty by Scripture which is not. Or to father apocryphal books, or texts, or words upon the Spirit of Christ.

3. To make any law for the church universal, or as obligatory to all Christians; which is to usurp the sovereignty of Christ; for which treasonable usurpation it is that Protestants call the pope, Antichrist.

4. To add new parts to the Christian religion.

5. To make any law, which it did properly belong to the Universal Sovereign to have made, if it should have been made at all: or which implieth an accusation of ignorance, oversight, error, or omission, in Christ and the Holy Scriptures.

6. To make new laws for men's inward heart-duties towards God.

7. To make new sacraments for the sealing of Christ's covenant and collation of his benefits therein contained, and to be the public 'tesserae,' badges or symbols of Christians and Christianity in the world.

8. To feign new conditions of the covenant of God, and necessary means of our justification, adoption, and salvation.

9. To alter Christ's instituted church-ministry, or add

any that are supra-ordinate, co-ordinate, or derogatory to their office, or that stand on the like pretended ground, and for equal ends.

10. To make new spiritual societies or church-forms which shall be either supra-ordinate, co-ordinate, or derogatory to the forms of Christ's institution.

11. Any impositions upon the churches (be the thing never so lawful) which is made by a pretended power not derived from God and the Redeemer.

12. Any thing that is contrary to the church's good and edification, to justice, charity, piety, order, unity, or peace.

13. Any unnecessary burden imposed on the consciences of Christians; especially as necessary either to their salvation, communion, liberty, or peace.

14. And the exercise of any power, pretended to be either primitive and undervived, or infallible, or impeccable, or absolute.

15. In general, any thing that is contrary to the authority, matter, form, obligation, honour, or ends of the laws of God, in nature or Scripture.

16. Any thing which setteth up those Judaical laws and ceremonies which Christ hath abrogated, in that form and respect in which he abrogated them.

17. Where there is a doubt among sober, conscionable Christians, lest in obeying man they should sin against God and disobey his laws, and the matter doubted of is confessed unnecessary by the imposers: so infinite is the distance between God and man, and so wholly dependent on him are the highest, that they should be exceedingly unwilling to vie with the authority of their Maker in men's consciences, or to do any thing unnecessary which tendeth to compel men to tread down God's authority in their consciences, and to prefer man's. Much more unwilling should they be, to silence the sober preachers of Christ's Gospel upon such accounts.

* Gal. vi. 5.  
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Quest. cxxxii. Is it unlawful to obey in all those cases, where it is unlawful to impose and command? Or in what cases? And how far pastors must be believed and obeyed?

Answ. I must intreat the reader carefully to distinguish here, 1. Between God's law forbidding rulers to do evil; and his law forbidding subjects or private men.

2. Between obedience formally so called; which is, when we therefore obey in conscience, because it is commanded, and the commander's authority is the formal reason and object of our obedience: and obedience material only, which is properly no obedience, but a doing the thing which is commanded upon other reasons, and not at all because it is commanded.

3. Between formal obedience to the office of the ruler in general, and formal obedience to him, as commanding this very matter in particular.

4. Between such authority in the ruler as will warrant his impositions before God for his own justification; and such authority as may make it my duty to obey him. And so I answer,

1. We shall not be judged by those laws of God which made the ruler's duty, but by that which made our own. It is not all one to say, 'Thou shalt not command it,' and to say, 'Thou shalt not do it.'

2. Whatever God absolutely forbiddeth men to do, we must not do whoever command it.

3. There are many of the things forementioned absolutely and always unlawful, as being evil of themselves, which no man may either command or do; and there are some of them, which are only evil by accident, which may not be commanded, but may be done when contrary, weightier accidents do preponderate.

4. Many such things may be done materially on other reasons (as for the church's good, the furtherance of the Gospel, the winning of men to God, the avoiding of scandal, or of hurt to others or ourselves, &c.) when they are not to be done in formal obedience, out of conscience to the authority imposing; (as if it be commanded by one that hath no just power).
5. Our actions may participate of obedience in general, as being actions of subjects, when they are not obedience in the full and perfect formality as to the particular. The last leaf of Rich. Hooker's eighth book of Eccles. Polit. will shew you the reason of this. He that hath not just power to command me this one particular act, yet may be my ruler in the general, and I am bound to honour him in general as my ruler; and to disobey him in a thing lawful for me to do, though not for him to command, may be dishonouring of him, and an appearance of disobedience and denial of his power." A parent is forbidden by God to command his child to speak an idle word, or do a vain and useless action, (much more a hurtful). Yet if a parent should command a child to speak an idle word, or do a vain action, the duty of obedience would make it at that time not to be vain and idle to him; yea, if he bid him throw away a cup of wine, or a piece of bread, which is evil when causeless, the child may be bound to do it: not only because he knoweth not but the parents may have lawful ends and reasons for their command, (as to try and exercise his obedience;) but also if he were sure that it were not so; because he is a subject, and the honouring of a parent is so great a good, and the dishonouring him by that disobedience may have such ill consequences, as will preponderate the evil of the loss of a cup of wine, &c. Yet in this case, the act of obedience is but mixed: it is an act of subjection or honour to a parent, because in general he is a governor: but it is but materially obedience in respect of that particular matter, which we know he had no authority to command.

6. In this respect therefore, a ruler may have so much power as may induce on the subject an obligation to obey, and yet not so much as may justify his commands before God, nor save himself from Divine punishment.

I add this so distinctly, lest any should misapply Mr. Rich. Hooker's doctrine aforesaid, Eccl. Pol. lib. viii. p. 223, 224. 'As for them that. exercise power altogether against order, though the kind of power which they have may be of God, yet is their exercise thereof against God, and therefore not of God, otherwise than by permission as all injustice is.——Usurpers of power, whereby we do not.

mean them that by violence have aspired unto places of highest authority, but them that use more authority than
they did ever receive in form and manner, beforementioned.
——Such usurpers thereof, as in the exercise of their
power, do more than they have been authorized to do, can-
not in conscience bind any man to obedience.'

Lest any should gather hence that they are never bound
in conscience to obey their parents, their king, their pas-
tors, in any point wherein they exercise more power than
God gave them, I thought meet to speak more exactly to
that point, which needed this distinguishing. For the
ground is sure that 'There is no power but of God; and
that God hath given no man power against himself, his laws
and service:' but yet there are many cases in which God
bindeth children and subjects to obey their superiors, in
such matters as they did sinfully command.

7. It greatly concerneth all sober Christians therefore to
be well studied in the law of God, that we may certainly know
what those things are which God hath absolutely forbidden
us to do, whoever command them, and to distinguish them
from things that depend on mutable accidents: that as the
three witnesses and Daniel¹, we may be true to God what-
ever we suffer for it; and yet may obey men in all that is
our duty to them.

Thus the apostles knew that no man had power from
God to silence them, or persecute them for the Gospel.
Therefore they would not obey those that forbade them to
preach: and yet they would appear before any magistrate
that commanded them, and obey their summons; and so we
may do even to an usurper, or a private man.

8. The principal and most notable case, in which we
must obey when a ruler sinfully commandeth, is, when the
matter which he commandeth is not such as is either for-
bidden us by God, or out of the verge of his place and call-
ing at all to meddle with and command, nor yet such as is
destructive of our duty to God; but such as in general be-
longeth to his office to determine of according to God's ge-
neral rules; but he misseth it in the manner and goeth
against those rules; yet not so far as to destroy the duty
we owe to God, or the end of it.

¹ Dan. iii. vi.
For instance, it is not in the ruler's power to determine whether there shall be preaching or none, true doctrine or false, &c. But it is in his power to regulate the circumstances of time, place, &c. (next to be recited.) Now if he do these to order, unity, and edification, I will obey him formally and fully for conscience sake. If he so do it as is destructive to the end, (as is aforesaid,) as to say, you shall meet only at twenty miles distance, or only at midnight, &c. I will obey him no farther than necessity and the common good requireth me. If he do it only with a tolerable inconvenience, (as to say, you shall meet no where but in the open fields, &c.) I will obey for conscience sake, as I am in general a subject bound to honour the magistrate; but not as he nameth an unmeet circumstance, in that respect my obedience shall be but material.

I need not handle it as a distinct question, Whether pastors are to be believed or obeyed any farther than they show a word of God revealing or commanding the particular thing? Divine faith and obedience is one thing, and human is another. 1. If as a preacher he shall say, 'This is God's word, believe it and obey it as such,' you must believe with a human faith that it is more likely that he knoweth what he saith, than you do, (unless, (1.) You see evidence; (2.) Or the consent of more credible persons to be against him, and then you are not to believe him at all). Even as a child believeth his teacher in order to learn the things himself, so you are so far to take his word while you are learning to know whether it be so or not. But not to rest in it as certain, nor to take your belief of him and obedience to him, to be a believing and obeying God formally, though a duty.

**Quest. cxxxIII. What are the additions or inventions of men, which are not forbidden by the Word of God, (whether by rulers or by private men invented)?**

**Answ.** This is handled under the Directions for Worship; to which I refer the reader, as also for part of the answer to the former cases. Yet here I shall trouble you with so much repetition, as to say, that,

1. Such inventions and additions are lawful as God hath
commanded men, (rulers, pastors, parents, or private persons,) to make under the regulation of his general laws.

2. All such additions are lawful as are merely subordinate and subservient to God's laws and orders, and not forbidden by him, among the forementioned prohibited additions.

Instances are many. 1. All such modes of a duty as are necessary 'in genere,' or one way or other to be determined of, but left to human prudence as to particulars. As, 1. Whether I shall (this week or month) publish the Gospel by speaking, or by writing, or by printing. 2. Whether I shall use this method or that, or another method in this sermon. 3. Whether I shall use these phrases and words, or other words. 4. Whether I shall use notes for my memory or not. And whether large ones or short ones. 5. Whether I shall be an hour or two in preaching. 6. Whether I shall preach with a loud voice or a low. 7. Whether I shall at this time more endeavour explication or application, comfort or terror, reprehension or direction, &c. All which are to be varied by man's lawful invention according to God's general rules.

2. It is also lawful and needful, that our own invention or our superior's, according to God's general law, do determine of the particular subjects of our office; which Scripture doth not particularly determine of, viz. 1. Scripture telleth not ministers what country, parish, or church they shall bestow their labours in. 2. Nor to how many they shall be a pastor. 3. Nor what text or subject they shall preach on. 4. Nor what singular persons they shall apply comfort, counsel, or terror to, this or that. 5. Nor whom they shall admit to the sacrament, (but by the general rule or description). 6. Nor whom they should openly rebuke or excommunicate. 7. Nor whom they shall absolve. It telleth them not whom the persons be to whom the Scripture character doth belong, in any of these cases. 8. Nor whether the witnesses say truly or falsely who accuse a man. 9. Nor whether the accused be to be taken as guilty of heresy, scandal, or schism, &c.

3. It is also a lawful invention of man, to find, choose, and use, such natural helps, as are useful to further us in the obedience of God's laws, and the practice of his worship,
and are not forbidden by him. Yea, 'in genere' they are commanded, and yet never particularly determined of in the Scripture; as, 1. What will clear a preacher's voice, to speak audibly. 2. The advantage of a pulpit to be above the people. 3. The use of spectacles to them that need them to read the Scripture. 4. The translating of the Scriptures into our native language. 5. Which translation of many we shall use in the churches. 6. The printing of the Bible. 7. The dividing it into chapters and verses. 8. The printing of good books, to expound and apply the Scripture; commentaries, sermons, &c. 9. The forms of school-exercises, disputations, &c., to prepare students for the ministry; and what books of divinity tutors shall read to their pupils, or every student shall have in his library. 10. The manner and tune of singing psalms in the churches. 11. What version or metre to use, this or that. 12. What form of catechism, (verbal, written, or printed,) to use among many, in the church or family. 13. Whether to pray in the same words often, or in various. 14. Whether to use words of our own composing or invention primarily, or of other men's; and that by direction, persuasion, or command. 15. To use a written or printed form, or neither; to read it on the book, or speak it by memory. 16. To use Scripture forms only, of prayer, praise, psalms and hymns, or those that are of later composure also. 17. To print the Bible and use it with marginal notes, and contents, or without. 18. To baptize in a river, well, pool, or font. 19. To have sponsors or witnesses of the parent's trustiness, and the child's covenant, or not. 20. At how many days old children shall be baptized. 21. Whether they shall be named in baptism, or before, or after. 22. Whether one of the ministers shall be a tutor or teacher to the rest that are younger. 23. How far the rest shall submit their judgments to one that is eldest and ablest, and be ruled by him. 24. Whether there shall be any deaconesses in the church. 25. Whether a church shall have one minister, two, or more. 26. Who shall be the men. 27. What space of ground shall be the church bounds, for the co-habitation of the members. 28. How many neighbour churches shall make a synod; and which be they? 29. How many members a synod shall consist of. 30. Who shall be president. Or
whether any. And who shall gather the votes. 31. Who shall record their acts, as scribe. 32. What messenger shall carry them to the churches. 33. What letters for correspondence and communion shall be written to the churches. 34. When pastors shall remove from one church to another; and to which. 35. Who shall be ordained ministers to preach, baptize, and gather churches. 36. How many the ordainers shall be. 37. Whether there shall be any music by instruments in the church or house, for the praises of God; and what. 38. Who shall lead the psalm. 39. Who shall read. 40. What words the church's profession of faith shall be expressed by. 41. By what signs the church shall signify their consent; whether lifting up the hand, standing up, bowing the head, or by voice, or writing. 42. By what sign or ceremony men shall take an oath; whether lifting up the hand towards heaven, or laying it on a book, or kissing the book, &c. 43. Whether the people at the sacrament sit near the table, or keep farther off. 44. Whether it be put into each person's hand, or they take it themselves. With many more such like.

4. And it is a lawful invention to determine of mere circumstances of time and place which God hath not determined of in Scripture: as, 1. At how many times in the year or week, baptism shall be administered. 2. At what age persons be admitted to the Lord's supper. 3. On what days and hours of the week there shall be lectures, or church-assemblies. 4. How oft and when ministers shall catechise and instruct the people privately. 5. On what hour the church shall assemble on the Lord's days, and receive the sacrament. 6. How long prayer, reading, and sermon shall be. 7. At what hour to end the public exercises. 8. At what hours to pray in families or in secret. 9. How often disciplinary meetings shall be held, for the trial of accused members. 10. How often synods shall meet; and how long continue. Of holy days before.

5. The same is to be said for the places of holy exercises. 1. What edifices the church shall have for such uses? 2. In what places they shall be situate? 3. Where the pulpit shall stand? 4. And where the font? 5. And where the table? 6. Where each of the people shall sit?

6. The same is to be said of all accidental, subordinate officers: as lecturers, clerks, door-keepers, church-wardens and many more before mentioned.

7. The same is to be said of church-utensils: as table, cups, linen, pulpits, fonts, clock, hour-glass, bells, seats, decent habit of clothes, &c.

8. The same may be said of decent gestures, not particularly command: as what gesture to preach in, standing or sitting? What gesture to read in? What gesture to hear in? What gesture to sing psalms in? Whether to be covered or bare-headed? In what gesture to receive the Lord’s supper? (In which Scripture no more regulateth us, than of the room, the hour of communicating, the number of communicants, the place; in all which Christ’s example was not a particular law.)

9. The same may be said of order. 1. Whether the pastor shall begin with prayer, reading, or exhortation? 2. Whether the people shall begin with prayer or ejaculations privately? 3. Whether we shall make but one or two long continued prayers, or many short ones? 4. Whether we shall pray before sermon immediately, and after, in the pulpit or in the reading place? 5. When the psalms shall be said or sung, and how many? 6. How many chapters shall be read? and which and in what order? 7. Whether baptism shall be before, or after, or when? 8. When the catechumens and learners shall be dismissed, and the proper eucharistical church-exercises begin? 9. When collections made, &c.

But, O Lord, have compassion on thy scattered flocks, who are afflicted and divided by the imperiousness of those pastors, who think it not enough for the exercise of their domination, to promote all thine own holy laws and doctrines, and to make their own canons in all these cases, or such like; but they must needs make more work than all this cometh to, for themselves and for their flocks, even unto those distractions, and dissipations, and fierce persecutions and contentions, which many hundred years have exercised the Greek and Latin churches, and many more throughout the world.
Quest. cxxxiv. What are the mischiefs of unlawful additions in religion?

Answ. Alas! many and great. 1. They tend to dethrone Christ from his sovereignty, and legislative prerogative. 2. And to advance man, blind and sinful man into his place. 3. And thereby to debase religion, making it but a human or a mixed thing; (and it can be no more noble than its author is). 4. And thereby they debase also the church of God, and the government of it, while they make it to be but a human policy, and not Divine. 5. They tend to depose God from his authority in men's consciences, and to level or join him there but with man. 6. They tend to men's doubtfulness and uncertainty of their religion; seeing man is fallible, and so may his constitutions be. 7. They tend to drive out all true religion from the world, while man that is so bad is the maker of it; and it may be suspected to be bad, that is made by so bad an author. 8. And it taketh off the fear of God, and his judgment; for it is man that must be feared, so far as man is the maker of the law. And it destroyeth the consolation of believers, which consisteth in the hopes of a reward from God; for he that serveth man, must be rewarded by man; and though they do not exclude God, but join him with themselves, yet this mixture debaseth and destroyeth religion, as the mixture of God and mammon in men's love, and as mixed and debased metals do the sovereign's coin. 9. It hardeneth infidels and hindereth their conversion; for they will reverence no more of our religion than we can prove to be Divine: and when they find one part of it to be human, they suspect the rest to be so too, and contemn it all; even as Protestants do Poverty, for the abundance of human trinkets and toys with which we see them exercise, and delude their silly followers. 10. It is the great engine of dividing all the churches, and breeding and feeding contentions in the Christian world. 11. And because men that will command, will be obeyed, and they that are absolutely subjected to God, will obey none against him, whatever it cost them (as Dan. iii. vi. Heb. xi. Luke xiv. 26. 33. Matt. v. 10—12.) therefore it hath proved the occasion of bloody persecutions in the
churches, by which professed Christians draw the guilt of Christian blood upon themselves. 12. And hereby it hath dolefully hindered the Gospel, while the persecutors have silenced many worthy, conscionable ministers of it. 13. And by this it hath quenched charity in the hearts of both sides, and taught the sufferers and the afflictors to be equally bitter in censuring if not detesting one another. 14. And the infidels seeing these dissensions and bitter passions among Christians, deride, and scorn, and hate them all. 15. Yea, such causes as these in the Latin and Greek churches have engaged not only emperors and princes against their own subjects, so that chronicles and books of martyrs perpetuate their dishonour, as Pilate’s name is in the creed; but also have set them in bloody wars among themselves. These have been the fruits, and this is the tendency of usurping Christ’s prerogative over his religion and worship in his church.

And the greatness of the sin appeareth in these aggravations. 1. It is a mark of pitiful ignorance and pride, when dust shall thus (like Nebuchadnezzar) exalt itself against God, to its certain infamy and abasement.

2. It sheweth that men little know themselves, that think themselves fit to be the makers of a religion for so many others; and that they have base thoughts of all other men, while they think them unfit to worship God any other way, than that of their making; and think that they will all so far deny God as to take up a religion that is made by man.

3. It shews that they are much void of love to others, that can thus use them on so small occasion.

4. And it sheweth how little true sense or reverence of Christian religion they have themselves who can thus debase it, and equal their own inventions with it.

5. And it leaveth men utterly inexcusable, that will not take warning by so many hundred years’ experiences of most of the churches through the world. Even when we see the yet continued divisions of the Eastern and Western churches, and all about a human religion (in the parts most contended about): when they read of the rivers of blood that have been shed in Piedmont, France, Germany, Belgia, Poland, Ireland, and the flames in England, and many other
nations, and all for the human parts of men’s religion! He that will yet go on and take no warning, may go read the eighteenth and nineteenth of the Revelation, and see what joy will be in heaven and earth, when God shall do justice upon such.

But remember that I speak all this of no other than those expressly here described.

Ques. cxxv. What are the mischiefs of men’s error on the other extreme, who pretend that Scripture is a rule where it is not, and deny the aforesaid lawful things, on pretence that Scripture is a perfect rule (say some, for all things)?

Answ. 1. They fill their own minds with a multitude of causeless scruples, which on their principles can never be resolved, and so will give themselves no rest.

2. They make themselves a religion of their own, and superstition is their daily devotion; which being erroneous, will not hang together, but is full of contradictions in itself; and which being human and bad, can never give true stability to the soul.

3. Hereby they spend their days much in melancholy troubles, and unsettled, distracting doubts and fears; instead of the joys of solid faith, and hope, and love.

4. And if they escape this, their religion is contentious, wrangling, censorious, and factious, and their zeal flieth out against those that differ from their peculiar superstitions and conceits.

5. And hereupon they are usually mutable and unsettled in their religion; this year for one, and the next for another; because there is no certainty in their own inventions and conceits.

6. And hereupon they still fall into manifold parties, because each man maketh a religion to himself, by his misinterpretation of God’s Word; so that there is no end of their divisions.

7. And they do a great deal of hurt in the church, by putting the same distracting and dividing conceits into the heads of others. And young Christians, and women, and ignorant, well meaning people, that are not able to know who is in the right, do often turn to that party which they
think most strict and godly, (though it be such as our Quakers). And the very good conceit of the people whom they take it from, doth settle so strong a prejudice in their mind, as no argument or evidence scarcely can work out; and so education, converse, and human estimation, breedeth a succession of dividers, and troubleth of the churches.

8. They sin against God by calling good evil, and light darkness, and honouring superstition, which is the work of satan, with holy names.

9. They sin by adding to the Word of God; while they say of abundance of lawful things, 'This is unlawful, and that is against the Word of God,' and pretend that their 'Touch not, taste not, handle not,' is in the Scriptures. For while they make it a rule for every circumstance in particular, they must squeeze, and force, and wrest it, to find out all those circumstances in it which were never there; and so by false expositions make the Scriptures another thing.

10. And how great a sin is it to father satan's works on God, and to say that all these and these things are forbidden or commanded in the Scripture, and so to belie the Lord and the Word of truth.

11. It engageth all subjects against their ruler's laws and government, and involveth them in the sin of denying them just obedience; while all the statute book must be found in the Scriptures, or else condemned as unlawful.

12. It maintaineth disobedience in churches, and causeth schisms and confusions unavoidably; for they that will neither obey the pastors, nor join with the churches, till they can shew Scriptures particularly for every translation, method, metre, tune, and all that is done, must join with no churches in the world.

13. It bringeth rebellion and confusion into families, while children and servants must learn no catechism, hear no minister, give no account, observe no hours of prayer, nay, nor do any work, but what there is a particular Scripture for.

14. It sets men on enthusiastic expectations, and irrational, scandalous worshipping of God, while all men must avoid all those methods, phrases, books, helps, which are not expressly or particularly in Scripture, and men must
not use their own inventions, or prudence in the right ordering of the works of religion.

15. It destroyeth Christian love and concord, while men are taught to censure all others, that use any thing in God's worship which is not particularly in Scripture, and so to censure all true worshippers in the world.

16. Yea, it will tempt men at last to be weary of their own religion, because they will find it an unsatisfactory, uncomfortable, tiresome thing, to do their own superstitious work.

17. And they will tempt all that they draw into this opinion, to be weary of religion also. And truly had not God's part, which is wise, and good, and pleasant, prevailed against the hurtfulness of men's superstition, which is foolish, bad, and unpleasant, religion had ere this been cast off as a wearisome, distracting thing; or, which is as bad, been used but to delude men.

18. Yea, it will tempt men at last to infidelity; for Satan will quickly teach them to argue, that if Scripture be a perfect, particular rule, for forty things that were never there, then it is defective, and is not of God, but an undertaking of that which is not performed, and therefore is but a deceit.

19. And the notoriousness and ridiculousness of this error, will tempt the profane to make religious people a scorn.

20. Lastly, and rulers will be tempted in church and state, to take such persons for intolerable in all societies, and such whose principles are inconsistent with government. And no thanks to this opinion, if they be not tempted to dislike the Scripture itself, and instead of it to fly to the Papists' traditions, and the church's legislative sovereignty or worse.

But here also remember that I charge none with all this, but those before described.

Quest. cxxxvi. How shall we know what parts of Scripture precept or example, were intended for universal, constant obligations, and what were but for the time and persons that they were then directed to?
It is not to be denied, but some things in Scripture, even in the New Testament, are not laws, much less universal and perpetual. And the difference is to be found in the Scripture itself. As,

1. All that is certainly of universal and perpetual obligation, which is but a transcript of the universal and perpetual law of nature.

2. And all that which hath the express characters of universality and perpetuity upon it; and such are all the substantial parts of the Gospel; as, “Except ye repent, ye shall all perish.” “Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.” “He that believeth in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life.” “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned.” “Without holiness none shall see God.” “Go, preach the gospel to all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you.” Abundance such texts have the express characters of universality and perpetuity (which many call morality).

3. And with these we may number those which were given to all the churches, with commands to keep them, and propagate them to posterity.

4. And those that have a plain and necessary connexion to those before mentioned.

5. And those which plainly have a full parity of reason with them; and where it is evident that the command was given to those particular times and persons, upon no reasons proper to them alone, but such as were common to all others. I deny not but (as Amesius noteth after others) many ceremonial and temporary laws, are urged (when they are made) with natural and perpetual motives: but the reasons of making them were narrower, whatever the reasons of obeying them may be.

On the other side, narrow and temporary precepts and examples, 1. Are void of all these foresaid characters. 2. They are about materials of temporary use. 3. Or they are but the ordering of such customs as were there before, and were proper to those countries. 4. And many speeches are
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plainly appropriated to the time and persons. 5. And many actions were manifestly occasional, without any intimation of reason or purpose of obliging others to imitation.

For instance, 1. Christ's preaching sometimes on a mountain, sometimes in a ship, sometimes in a house, and sometimes in the synagogues, doth shew that all these are lawful in season on the like occasion: but he purposed not to oblige men to any one of them alone.

2. So Christ's giving the sacrament of his body and blood, in an upper room, in a private house after supper, to none but ministers, and none but his family, and but to twelve, and on the fifth day of the week only, and in the gesture of a recumbent, leaning, sitting; all these are plainly occasional, and not intended as obliging to imitation: for that which he made a law of, he separated in his speeches, and commanded them to do it in remembrance of him till his coming. And Paul expoundeth the distinction, 1 Cor. xi. in his practice.

So the promise of the spirit of revelation and miracles is expounded by the event, as the seal of the Gospel and Scripture, proper to those times in the main.

So the primitive Christians selling their estates, and distributing to the poor, or laying it down at the apostles' feet, was plainly appropriated to that time, or the like occasions, by the reason of it; which was suddenly to shew the world what the belief of heaven through the promises of Christ, could make them all, and how much their love was to Christ and one another, and how little to the world; and also by the cessation of it, when the persecutions abated, and the churches came to any settlement; yea, and at first it was not a thing commanded to all, but only voluntarily done.

So the women's veil, and the custom of kissing each other as a token of love, and men's not wearing long hair, were the customs of the country there ordered and improved by the apostles about sacred things; but not introduced into other countries that had no such custom.

So also anointing was in those countries taken for salubrious, and refreshing to the body, and a ceremony of initiation into places of great honour: whereupon it was used about the sick, and God's giving the gift healing in those
times was frequently conjunct with this means. So that hence the anointing of the sick came up; and the ancient Christians turned it into an initiating ceremony, because we are kings and priests to God. Now these occasions extend not to those countries where anointing neither was of such use, or value, or signification.

So also Paul's becoming a Jew to the Jews, and being shaved, and purifying himself, and circumcising Timothy, are evidently temporary compliances in a thing then lawful, for the avoiding of offence, and for the furtherance of the Gospel, and no obligatory, perpetual law to us. And so most divines think the eating of things strangled, and blood, were forbidden for a time to them only that conversed with the Jews, Acts xv. Though Beckman have many reasons for the perpetuity, not contemptible.

So the office of deaconesses (and some think of deacons) seemeth to be fitted to that time, and state, and condition of Christians. And where the reasons and case are the same, the obligations will be the same. In a word, the text itself will one way or other shew us, when a command or example is universally and durably obligatory, and when not.

Quest. cxxvii. How much of the Scripture is necessary to salvation, to be believed, and understood?

Answ. This question is the more worthy consideration, that we may withal understand the use of catechisms, confessions and creeds (of which after), and the great and tender mercies of God to the weak, and may be able to answer the cavils of the Papists against the Scriptures, as insufficient to be the rule of faith and life, because much of it is hard to be understood.

1. He that believeth God to be true, and the Scripture to be his Word, must needs believe all to be true, which he believeth to be his Word.

2. All the Scripture is profitable to our knowledge, love and practice; and none of it to be neglected, but all to be loved, reverenced and studied, in due time and order, by them that have time and capacity to do it.

3. All the Holy Scriptures, either as to matter or words, are not so necessary, as that no man can be saved, who doth
not either believe or understand them; but some parts of it are more necessary than others.

4. It is not of necessity to salvation to believe every book or verse in Scripture, to be canonical, or written by the Spirit of God. For as the Papists' canon is larger than that which the Protestants own; so if our canon should prove defective of any one book, it would not follow that we could not be saved for want of a sufficient faith. The churches immediately after the apostles' time, had not each one all their writings, but they were brought together in time, and received by degrees, as they had proof of their being written by authorized, inspired persons. The second of Peter, James, Jude, Hebrews and Revelations were received in many churches since the rest. And if some book be lost, (as Enoch's prophecy, or Paul's epistle to the Laodiceans, or any other of his epistles not named in the rest) or if any hereafter should be lost or doubted of, as the Canticles, or the second or third epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, &c., it would not follow, that all true faith and hope of salvation were lost with it.

It is a controversy whether 1 John v. 7. and some other particular verses be canonical or not, because some Greek copies have them, and some are without them: but whoever erreth in that only, may be saved.

5. There are many hundred or thousand texts of Scripture, which a man may possibly be ignorant of the meaning of, and yet have a saving faith, and be in a state of salvation. For no man living understandeth it all.

6. The Holy Scripture is an entire comely body, which containeth not only the essential parts of the true religion, but also the integral parts, and the ornaments and many accidents; which must be distinguished, and not all taken to be equal.

7. So much as containeth the essentials of true religion, must be understood and believed of necessity to salvation; and so much as containeth the integrals of religion doth greatly conduce to our salvation, both that we may be the sweeter and the better Christians, as having greater helps to both.

The very adjuncts also have their use to make us the

* Rom. xiv. 17, 18. xlii. 8—10. 1 Cor. xv. 2—6. Mark xvi. 16.
more adorned Christians, and to promote our knowledge of greater things.

Quest. cxxxviii. How may we know the fundamentals, essentials, or what parts are necessary to salvation? And is the Papists' way allowable that (some of them) deny that distinction, and make the difference to be only in the degrees of men's opportunities of knowledge?

Answ. 1. Those Papists' perverseness can mean no better than that Christianity itself is not necessary to salvation, to those that have not opportunity to know it (as Johnson's Rejoinder to me, and Sancta Clara and many others plainly intimate) and were that never so true and certain, it were nothing to the question between them and us, which is, What are the essentials of Christianity? And what is necessary to salvation, where Christianity is necessary? or where the Christian religion is made known, and men may come to the knowledge of it, if they will do their best? This is the true state of our controversy with them. And whereas they would make all the parts of Christian faith and practice equally necessary, where men have a capacity and ability to know, believe and practice them, it is a gross deceit, unworthy of men pretending to a mediocrity of knowledge in the nature of religion; and thereby they make all sins and errors as equal as all duties and truths. Whereas, 1. There is no man that hath not some error and some sin. 2. There is no man that doth all that ever he was able to do, to understand all the truth. 3. Therefore there is no man whose errors themselves are not (many of them at least) culpable or sinful. 4. And they that distinguish between mortal and venial sins, and yet will not distinguish between mortal and venial errors, are either blind, or would keep others blind. As it is not so damning a sin for a man to think a vain thought, or to speak a vain word, as not to love God, or holiness, (no, though he was more able to have forborne that idle word, than to have loved God;) so it is not so mortal a sin, (that is, inconsistent with a justified state) to mistake in a small matter, (as who was the father of Arphaxad, or what year the world was drowned in, &c.) as to blaspheme the Holy Ghost, or deny Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of
the world, or to deny that there is a God, or everlasting life, or a difference between good and evil. All sins are not equal in magnitude or danger. Therefore all errors are not equal in magnitude, sinfulness or danger.

2. And what priest is able to know whom to take for a Christian, and baptizable upon such terms as these? Who knoweth just what opportunities of knowledge other men have had, and what impediments? And will they indeed baptize a man that is a heathen, because he had not opportunity to come to the knowledge of Christianity? I think they will not: or will they deny baptism to one that knoweth and believeth only all the articles of the creed, and the chief points of religion, because he knoweth not as much more, as he had opportunity to know? I think not. Do not these men perceive how they condemn themselves? For do they not say themselves, that baptism to the due receiver washeth away sin, and puts the person in a state of life? O when will God deliver his poor church from factious deceivers?

3. Either Christianity is something, and discernible, or nothing, and undiscernible. If the latter, then Christians are not to be distinguished from heathens and infidels. If the former, then Christianity hath its constitutive parts, by which it is what it is. And then it hath essential parts distinguishable from the rest.

4. The word 'fundamentals' being but a metaphor, hath given room to deceivers and contenders to make a controversy, and raise a dust about it. Therefore I purposely use the word 'essentials' which is not so liable to men's cavils.

5. Those are the essentials of Christianity, which are necessary to the baptism of the adult. Know but that, and you answer all the prattlings of the Papists, that bawl out for a list of fundamentals. And sure it is not this day unknown in the Christian world, either what a Christian is, or who is to be baptized: do not the priests know it, who baptize all that are christened in the world? And why is baptism called our christening, if it make us not Christians? And why hath Christ promised, that "he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved"; if that so much faith as is ne-

'T Mark xvi. 16.
cessary to baptism, will not also serve to a man's state of salvation?

6. The baptismal covenant of grace therefore is the essential part of the Gospel, and of the Christian religion; and all the rest are integrals, and accidents or adjuncts.

7. This covenant containeth,

I. Objectively, 1. Things true as such, 2. Things good as such; 3. Things practicable or to be done, as such: the 'Credenda, Diligenda, (et Eligenda) et Agenda;' as the objects of man's intellect, will, and practical power.

The 'Credenda' or things to be known and believed are, 1. God as God, and our God and Father, 2. Christ as the Saviour, and our Saviour, 3. The Holy Ghost as such, and as the Sanctifier and our Sanctifier (as to the offer of these relations in the covenant).

The 'Diligenda' are the same three persons in these three relations as good in themselves and unto us, which includeth the grand benefits of reconciliation and adoption, justification, and sanctification, and salvation.

The 'Agenda' in the time of baptism that make us Christians, are 1. The actual dedication, resignation or dedication of ourselves, to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in these relations. 2. A promise or vow to endeavour faithfully to live according to our undertaken relations (though not in perfection); that is, as creatures to their Creator, and their reconciled God and Father; as Christians to their Redeemer, their Teacher, their Ruler, and their Saviour; and as willing receivers of the sanctifying and comforting operations of the Holy Spirit.

II. The objects tell you what the acts must be on our part; 1. With the understanding, to know and believe; 2. With the will to love, choose, desire, and resolve; and 3. Practically to deliver up ourselves for the present, and to promise for the time to come. These are the essentials of the Christian religion.

8. The creed is a larger explication of the 'credenda,' and the Lord's prayer of the 'diligenda,' or things to be willed, desired, and hoped for; and the decalogue of the natural part of the 'agenda.'

9. Suffer not your own ignorance, or the Papists' cheats to confound the question, about fundamentals, as to the
matter, and as to the expressing words. It is one thing to ask, What is the matter essential to Christianity? And another, What words, symbols, or sentences are essential to it? To the first, I have now answered you. To the second I say, 1. Taking the Christian religion as it is, an extrinsic doctrine ‘in signis,’ so the essence of it is, words and signs expressive or significant of the material essence. That they be such in specie is all that is essential. And if they say, ‘But which be those words?’ I answer, 2. That no particular words in the world are essential to the Christian religion. For, (1.) No one language is essential to it. It is not necessary to salvation that you be baptized, or learn the creed or Scriptures, in Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin, or English, so you learn it in any language understood. (2.) It is not necessary to salvation that you use the same words in the same language, as long as it hath more words than one to express the same thing by. (3.) It is not necessary to salvation, that we use the same (or any one single) form, method, or order of words, as they are in the creeds without alteration. And therefore while the ancients did tenaciously cleave to the same symbol or creed, yet they used various words to express it by:\footnote{As may be seen in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Ruffin elsewhere cited by me, so that it is plain, that by the same symbol they meant the same matter, though expressed in some variety of words.) Though they avoided such variety as might introduce variety of sense and matter.} 10. Words being needful, 1. To make a learner understand; 2. To tell another what he understandeth; it followeth that the great variety of men’s capacities maketh a great variation in the necessity of words or forms. An Englishman must have them in English, and a Frenchman in French. An understanding man may receive all the essentials in a few words: but an ignorant man must have many words to make him understand the matter. To him that understandeth them, the words of the baptismal covenant express all the essentials of Christianity: but to him that understands them not, the creed is necessary for the explanation: and to him that understandeth not that, a catechism, or larger exposition is necessary. This is the plain

\footnote{See the Appendix to my Reformed Pastor.}
explication of this question, which many Papists seem loath to understand.

Quest. cxxxix. What is the use and authority of the creed? And is it of the apostles' framing or not? And is it the Word of God, or not?

Answ. 1. The use of the creed is, to be a plain explication of the faith professed in the baptismal covenant. 1. For the fuller instruction of the duller sort, and those that had not preparatory knowledge, and could not sufficiently understand the meaning of the three articles of the covenant, what it is to believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost without more words. 2. And for the satisfaction of the church, that indeed men understood what they did in baptism, and professed to believe.

2. The creed is the Word of God, as to all the doctrine or matter of it, whatever it be as to the order and composition of words.

3. That is oft by the ancients called the apostles', which containeth the matter derived by the apostles, though not in a form of words compiled by them.

4. It is certain that all the words now in our creed, were not put in by the apostles, 1. Because some of them were not in, till long after their days. 2. Because the ancient 'formulas' agree not in words among themselves.

5. It is not to be doubted of, but that apostles did appoint and use a creed commonly in their days. And that it is the same with that which is now called the apostles' and the Nicene in the main; but not just the same composure of words, nor had they any such precise composure as can be proved. But this much is easily provable;—

(1.) That Christ composed a creed when he made his covenant, and instituted baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19.

(2.) That in the Jewish church, where men were educated in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and expectation of the Messiah, it was supposed that the people had so much preparatory knowledge, as made them the more capable of baptism, as soon as they did but seriously profess to be—

* Vid. Usher and Vossianum de Symbolis.*
lieve, and consent to the terms of the covenant; and therefore they were presently baptized, Acts ii. 38—40.

(3.) That this could not be rationally supposed among the Gentiles, and common, ignorant people of the world. And 'ignorantis non est consensus.' He doth not covenant who understandeth not the covenant, as to what is promised him, and what he promiseth.

(4.) That the apostles baptized, and caused others to baptize many thousands, and settle many churches, before any part of the New Testament was written, even many and many years.

(5.) That the apostles did their work as well and better than any that succeeded them.

(6.) That their successors in the common ministry, did as far as any church history leadeth us up, instruct and catechise men in the meaning of the baptismal covenant, (which is the Christian faith,) before they baptized them: yea, they kept them long in the state of catechumens usually, before they would baptize them. And after baptized but twice a year, at Easter and Whitsuntide, (as our liturgy noteth). And they received an account of their tolerable understanding of religion, before they would receive them into the church.

(7.) No doubt then but the apostles did cause the baptizable to understand the three articles of Christ's own creed and covenant, and to give some account of it before they baptized them, ordinarily among the Gentiles.

(8.) No doubt therefore but they used many more expiatory words, to cause them to understand those few.

(9.) There is neither proof nor probability, that they used a composition of just the same words, and no more or less: because they had to do with persons of several capacities, some knowing, who needed fewer words, and some ignorant and dull, who needed more: nor is any such composition come down to our hands.

(10.) But it is more than probable, that the matter opened by them to all the catechumens was still the same, when the words were not the same. For God's promises and man's conditions are still the same, (where the Gospel cometh). Though since by the occasion of heresies, some few

\[\text{Heb. v. 11, 12. vi. 1—3.}\]
material clauses are inserted. For all Christians had one Christianity, and must go one way to heaven.

(11.) It is also more than probable, that they did not needlessly vary the words, lest it should teach men to vary the matter: but that all Christians before baptism, did make the same profession of faith as to the sense, and very much the same as to the very words; using necessary caution, and yet avoiding unnecessary preciseness of formality: but so as to obviate damnable heresies, that the Christian profession might attain its ends.

(12.) Lastly, no doubt but this practice of the apostles was exemplary, and imitated by the churches, and that thus the essentials of religion were, by the tradition of the creed and baptism, delivered by themselves, as far as Christianity went, long before any book of the New Testament was written: and every Christian was an impress, or transcript, or specimen of it. And that the following churches using the same creed, (wholly in sense, and mostly in words,) might so far well call it the apostles' creed: as they did both the Western and the Nicene.

Quest. cxl. What is the use of catechisms?

Answ. To be a more familiar explication of the essentials of Christianity, and the principal integrals, in a larger manner than the creed, Lord's prayer, and decalogue do; that the ignorant may the more easily understand it. Every man cannot gather out of the Scripture the greatest matters in the true method, as distinct from all the rest: and therefore it is part of the work of the church's teachers, to do it to the hands and use of the ignorant.

Quest. cxli. Could any of us have known by the Scriptures alone, the essentials of religion from the rest, if tradition had not given them to us in the creed, as from apostolical collection?

Answ. Yes: for the Scripture itself telleth us what is necessary to salvation: it describeth to us the covenant of grace, both promises and conditions: and it were strange if

1 2 Tim. i. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3, 7. Heb. viii. 10. x. 16.
so large a volume, should not as plainly tell us what is necessary to salvation, as fewer words! The Scripture hath not less than the creed, but more.

Quest. cxliii. *What is the best method of a true catechism or sum of theology?*

Answ. God willing I shall tell the church my opinion of that at large, in a peculiar Latin treatise, called, "Methodus Theologiae," which here I cannot do. Only I shall say, that among all the great variety of methods used in these times, I think none cometh nearer the order of the matter, (which is the true commendation of a method,) than those which open theology, 1. In the breviate of the baptismal covenant. 2. In the three explicatory sums, the creed, Lord’s prayer, and decalogue, with the added Gospel precepts. 3. In the largest form, which is the whole Scripture. And that our common English catechism, and Pareus or Ursine, and many such who use that common easy method, are more truly methodical, than most that pretend to greater accurateness; (though I much commend the great industry of such as Dudley, Feaner, Gomarus, and especially George Sohnus.)

Quest. cxliii. *What is the use of various church-confessions or articles of faith?*

Answ. I will pass by the very ill use that is made of them in too many countries, where unnecessary opinions or uncertain are put in, and they that can get into favour with the secular power, take advantage under pretence of orthodoxy and uniformity, truth and peace, to set up their opinions and judgments to be the common rule for all to bow to, though wiser than themselves: and to silence all ministers, and scatter and divide the flocks that will not say or swear as they do, that is, that they are wise men, and are in the right.

The true and commendable use of various church professions, or confessions of faith is, 1. To be an instruction to the more ignorant how to understand the Scriptures in most of the most weighty points. 2. To be an enumera-
tion of those doctrines, against which no minister shall be allowed to preach, and according to which he is to instruct the people. 3. To be a testimony to all neighbour and foreign churches in an heterodox, contentious, and suspicious age, how we understand the Scriptures, for the confuting of scandals and unjust suspicions, and the maintaining communion in faith, and charity, and doctrine.

Quest. cxliv. May not the subscribing of the whole Scriptures serve turn for all the aforesaid ends, without creeds, catechisms, or confessions?

Answ. 1. By subscribing to the Scriptures you mean either, generally and implicitly that all in them is true and good, (though perhaps you know not what is in it). Or else particularly and explicitly, that every point in it is by you both understood and believed to be true.

In the first sense, it is not sufficient to salvation: for this implicit faith hath really no act in it, but a belief that all that God saith is true; which is only the formal object of faith, and is no more than to believe that there is a God, (for a liar is not a God). And this he may do, who never believed in Christ, or a word of Scripture, as not taking it to be God's word; yea, that will not believe that God forbideth his beastly life. Infidels ordinarily go thus far.

In the second sense (of an explicit, or particular actual belief), the belief of the whole Scripture is enough indeed, and more than any man living can attain to. No man understandeth all the Scripture. Therefore that which no man hath, is not to be exacted of all men, or any man in order to ministration or communion. While, 1. No man can subscribe to any one translation of the Bible, that it is not faulty, being the work of defectible man. 2. And few have such acquaintance with the Hebrew, and Chaldee, and Greek, as to be able to say that they understand the original languages perfectly. 3. And no man that understands the words, doth perfectly understand the matter. It followeth that no man is to be forced or urged to subscribe to all things in the Scriptures, as particularly understood by him, with an explicit faith. And an implicit is not half enough.

2. The true mean therefore is the ancient way, 1. To
select the essentials for all Christians, to be believed particularly and explicitly. 2. To collect certain of the most needful integrals, which teachers shall not preach against. 3. And for all men moreover to profess in general that they implicitly believe all which they can discern to be the holy canonical Scripture, and that all is true, which is the Word of God; forbearing each other even about the number of canonical books and texts.

And it is the great wisdom and mercy of God, which hath so ordered it, that the Scripture shall have enough to exercise the strongest, and yet that the weakest may be ignorant of the meaning of a thousand sentences, without danger of damnation, so they do but understand the marrow or essentials, and labour faithfully to increase in the knowledge of the rest.

Quest. cxlv. May not a man be saved that believeth all the essentials of religion, as coming to him by verbal tradition, and not as contained in the Holy Scriptures, which perhaps he never knew?

Answ. 1. He that believeth shall be saved, which way ever he cometh by his belief; so be it it be sound as to the object and act; that is, if it contain all the essentials, and they be predominantly believed, loved, and practised.

2. The Scriptures being the records of Christ's doctrine delivered by himself, his Spirit, and his apostles, it is the office of ministers, and the duty of all instructors to open these Scriptures to those they teach, and to deliver particulars upon the authority of these inspired, sealed records which contain them.

3. They that thus receive particular truths, from a teacher explaining the Scripture to them, do receive them in a subordination to the Scripture, materially, and as to the teacher's part; though not formally, and as to their own part: and though the Scripture authority being not understood by them, be not the formal object of their faith, but only God's authority in general.

4. They that are ignorant of the being of the Scripture, have a great disadvantage to their faith.

k 1 Cor. viii. 1—5. xiii. 1—4. Rom. viii. 28.
Yet we cannot say, but it may be the case of thousands to be saved by the Gospel delivered by tradition, without resolving their faith into the authority of the Scriptures. For,

1. This was the case of all the Christians (as to the New Testament) who lived before it was written; and there are several articles of the Creed now necessary, which the Old Testament doth not reveal.

2. This may be the case of thousands in ignorant countries, where, the Bible being rare, is to most unknown.

3. This may be the case of thousands of children who are taught their creed and catechism, before they understand what the Bible is.

4. This may be the case of thousands among the Papists, where some perverse priests do keep not only the reading, but the knowledge of the Scriptures from the people, for fear lest they should be taught to resolve their faith into it; and do teach them only the articles of faith and catechism, as known by the church's tradition alone.

Quest. CXLVI. Is the Scripture fit for all Christians to read, being so obscure?

Answ. 1. The essentials and points necessary to salvation are plain.

2. We are frequently and vehemently commanded to delight in it, and meditate in it day and night; to search it; to teach it our very children, speaking of it at home and abroad, lying down and rising up, and to write it on the posts of our houses, and on our doors, &c.

3. It is suited to the necessity and understanding of the meanest, to give light to the simple, and to make the very foolish wise.

4. The ancient fathers and Christians were all of this mind.

5. All the Christian churches of the world, have been

---

1 Matt. xvi. 16.  
2 Rom. x. 9, 10. 13—15.  
used to read it openly to all, even to the simplest; and if they may hear it, they may read the same words which they hear.

6. God blessed the ignorant Ethiopian eunuch when he found him reading the Scriptures, though he knew not the sense of what he read, and sent him Philip to instruct him and convert him.

7. Timothy was educated in the knowledge of the Scriptures in his childhood.

8. That which is written to and for all men, may be read by all that can: but the Scripture was written to and for all; —— &c.

Object. 'But there are many things in it hard to be understood.'

Answ. 1. And there are many things easy to be understood. 2. We never said that men should not use the help of their teachers, and all that they can to understand it. 3. Were not those teachers once ignorant? And yet they did read it by the help of teachers; and so may others. 4. As the king for concord commandeth all the schoolmasters to teach one grammar; so God maketh it the minister's office to instruct people in the Scriptures. And were it not a question unworthy of a schoolmaster, to dispute, 'Whether the scholars must learn by their book, or by their master?' Yea, to conclude that it must be by their master, and not by their book: or that they must never open their book, but when their master is just at hand to teach them. The doctrine of the Papists who tell us that the Scriptures should not be read by the vulgar, it being the rise of all heresies, is so inhuman and impious, as savoureth of gross enmity to Scriptures, and to knowledge, that were there no other, it would make the lovers of religion and men's souls, to pray earnestly to Christ to save his flocks from such seducers, who so Jewishly use the key of knowledge.

Object. 'But many wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction, and what heresy is not defended as by their authority?'

Answ. 1. And many thousands receive saving knowledge and grace by them. The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. All Scripture is profitable to instruction,

° 2 Pet. iii. 16. Psal. xix. 3. 8—10. 2 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. i. 23.
&c., to make the man of God perfect. It is the incorruptible seed by which we are born again, and the sincere milk, by which we are nourished.

2. And is it not as true, 1. That the law of the land is abused by every false pretender, lawyer, and corrupt judge? What title so bad, that is not defended in Westminster Hall sometimes, under pretence of law? And what action so bad, that some pretend not law for? What then? Must the law be forbidden the common people for this?

2. Nay, what is so much abused to unrighteousness and sin as reason itself? What heresy or crime do not men plead reason for? Must reason therefore be forbidden the vulgar?

3. Yea, contrarily, this signifieth that law and reason are so far from being things to be forbidden men, that they are indeed those things by which nature and necessity have taught all the world to try and discern right from wrong, good from bad; otherwise good and bad men would not all thus agree in pretending to them, and appealing to their decisions.

4. If many men are poisoned or killed in eating or drinking; if many men's eye-sight is abused to mislead them into sin, &c., the way is not, to eat nothing but what is put into our mouths; nor to put out our eyes, or wink, and be led only by a priest; but to use both the more cautiously, with the best advice and help that we can get.

5. And do not these deceivers see, that their reason pleadeth as strongly that priests and prelates themselves should never read the Scripture, (and consequently that it should be banished out of the world)? For who that is awake in the world can be ignorant, that it is priests and prelates, who have been the leaders of almost all heresies and sects; who differ in their expositions and opinions? and lead the vulgar into all the heresies which they fall into? Who then should be forbidden to read the Scripture, but priests and prelates, who wrest them to their own and other men's destruction?

Quest. cxlvii. How far is tradition, and men's words and ministry to be used or trusted in, in the exercise of faith?
Answ. 1. The churches and ministers received the Gospel in Scripture from the apostles, and the creed as the summary of faith; and they delivered it down to others, and they to us.

2. The ministers by office are the instructors of the people in the meaning of it: and the keepers of the Scriptures, as lawyers are of the laws of the land.

Quest. cxlvi. How know we the true canon of Scripture from apocrypha?

Answ. By these means set together: 1. There is for the most part, a special venerable excellency in the books themselves, which helpeth us in the distinct reception of them.

2. The tradition of infallible church-history telleth us, which books they are which were written by men inspired by the Holy Ghost, and who sealed their doctrine with miracles in those times; it being but matter of fact (which books such men wrote whom God bare witness to) infallible church-history (such as we have to know which are the statutes of the land, and which are counterfeit) is a sufficient notification and proof.

3. The sanctifying Spirit still in all ages and Christians, attesteth the Divinity and truth of the doctrine of the main body of the Bible, especially the Gospel; and then if we should err about the authority of a particular book, it would not overthrow our faith. It is not necessary to salvation to believe this particular text to be Divine, but it is sin and folly to doubt causelessly of the parts, when the Spirit attesteth the doctrine and the body of the book. I pass these things briefly, because I have more largely handled them elsewhere.

Quest. cxlxi. Is the public reading of the Scripture the proper work of a minister? or may a layman ordinarily do it? or another officer?

Answ. In such cases as I before shewed that a layman

1 Heb. ii. 3, 4. 8 Pet. i. 17—21. 2 John i. 1—6. 4 iv. 6. 2 Tim. ii. 2. Titus i. 5.
may preach, he may also read the Scriptures. Of which look back.

2. No doubt but it is a work well beseeming the ordained ministers or pastors, and an integral part of their office; and should not be put off by them when they can do it.

3. When they need help, the deacons are ordained ministers, authorized to help them in such work, and most fit to do it.

4. Whether in a case of necessity a layman may not ordinarily read the Scripture to the congregation, is a case that I am loath to determine, being loath to suppose such a necessity. But if the minister cannot, and there be no deacon, I cannot prove it unlawful for a layman to do it under the direction of the pastor. I lived some time under an old minister of about eighty years of age (who never preached himself), whose eye-sight failing him, and having not maintenance to keep an assistant, he did by memory say the Common-prayer himself, and got a tailor one year, and a thresher or poor day-labourer another year to read all the Scriptures. Whether that were not better than nothing, I leave to consideration.

And I think it is commonly agreed on, that where there is no minister, it is better for the people to meet and hear a layman read the Scriptures and some good books, than to have no public helps and worship.

Quest. ci. Is it lawful to read the apocrypha, or any good books besides the Scriptures to the church? As homilies, &c.?

Answ. 1. It is not lawful to read them as God's Word, or to pretend them to be the Holy Scriptures, for that is a falsehood, and an addition to God's Word.

2. It is not lawful to read them scandalously, in a title and manner tending to draw the people to believe that they are God's Word, or without a sufficient distinguishing of them from the Holy Scriptures.

3. If any one of the apocryphal books, (as Judith, Tobit, Bel and the Dragon, &c.) be as fabulous, false, and bad as our Protestant writers (Reignoldus, Amesius, Whitakers,
Chamier, and abundance more) affirm them to be, it is not lawful ordinarily to read them, in that honourable way as chapters called lessons are usually read in the assemblies. Nor is it lawful so to read heretical, fabulous, or erroneous books.

But it is lawful to read publicly, apocryphal and human writings, homilies, or edifying sermons, on these conditions following.

1. So be it they be indeed sound doctrine, holy, and fitted to the people's edification.

2. So be it they be not read scandalously without sufficient differing them from God's Book.

3. So they be not read to exclude or hinder the reading of the Scriptures, or any other necessary church-duty.

4. So they be not read to keep up an ignorant, lazy ministry that can or will do no better; nor to exercise the minister's sloth, and hinder him from preaching.

5. And especially if authority command it, and the church's agreement require it, as a signification what doctrine it is which they profess.

6. Or if the church's necessities require it; as if they have no minister, or no one that can do so much to their edification any other way.

7. Therefore the use of catechisms is confessed lawful in the church, by almost all.

Quest. cl. May church-assemblies be held where there is no minister? Or what public worship may be so performed by laymen? (As among infidels, or Papists, where persecution hath killed, imprisoned, or expelled the ministers.)

Ans. 1. Such an assembly as hath no pastor, or minister of Christ, is not a church, in a political sense, as the word signifieth a society consisting of pastor and flock; but it may be a church in a larger sense, as the word signifieth only a community or association of private Christians for mutual help in holy things.

2. Such an assembly ought on the Lord's days, and at other fit times to meet together for mutual help, and the
public worshipping of God, as they may, rather than not to meet at all.

3. In those meetings they may do all that followeth. 1. They may pray together; a layman being the speaker. 2. They may sing psalms. 3. They may read the Scriptures. 4. They may read some holy, edifying writings of Divines, or repeat some minister's sermons. 5. Some that are most able may speak to the instruction and exhortation of the rest, as a master may do in his family, or neighbours to stir up God's graces in each other, as was opened before. And some such may catechize the younger and more ignorant. 6. They may by mutual conferences open their cases to each other, and communicate what knowledge and experience they have, to the praise of God and each other's edification. 7. They may make a solemn profession of their faith, covenant, and subjection to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and all this is better than nothing at all.

But, 1. None of them may do any of this as a pastor, ruler, priest, or office-teacher of the church. 2. Nor may they baptize. 3. Nor administer the Lord's supper. 4. Nor excommunicate by sentence, (but only executively agree to avoid the notoriously impenitent). 5. Nor absolve ministerially, or as by authority; nor exercise any of the power of the keys, that is, of government. 6. And they must do their best to get a pastor as soon as they are able.

Quest. cliii. Is it lawful to subscribe or profess full assent and consent to any religious books besides the Scripture, seeing all are fallible?

Answ. 1. It is not lawful to profess or subscribe that any book is more true or better than it is; or that there is no fault in any that is faulty; or to profess that we believe any mortal man to be totally infallible in all that he shall write or say, or impeccable in all that he shall do.

2. Because all men are fallible, and so are we in judging, it is not lawful to say of any large and dubious books, in which we know no fault, that there is no fault or error in them; we being uncertain, and it being usual for the best men even in their best writings, prayers, or works to be
faulty, as the consequent or effect of our common, culpable imperfection. But we may say, that we know no fault or error in it, if indeed we do not know of any.

3. It is lawful to profess or subscribe our assent and consent to any human writing which we judge to be true and good, according to the measure of its truth and goodness; as if church-confessions that are sound be offered us for our consent, we may say or subscribe, 'I hold all the doctrine in this book to be true and good.' And by so doing I do not assert the infallibility of the authors, but only the verity of the writing. I do not say that he cannot err, or that he never erreth; but that he erreth not in this, as far as I am able to discern.

Quest. cliii. May we lawfully swear obedience in all things lawful and honest, either to usurpers, or to our lawful pastors?

Answ. 1. If the question were of imposing such oaths, I would say, that it was many a hundred years before the churches of Christ (either under persecution, or in their prosperity and glory) did ever know of any such practice, as the people or the presbyters swearing obedience to the bishops. And when it came up, the magistracy, princes, and emperors fell under the feet of the pope; and the clergy grew to what we see it in the Roman kingdom, called a church. And far should I be from desiring such oaths to be imposed.

2. But the question being only of the taking such oaths, and not the imposing of them, I say, that (1.) It is not lawful to swear obedience to an usurper, civil or ecclesiastical, 'in licitis et honestis;' because it is a subjecting ourselves to him, and an acknowledging that authority which he hath not; for we can swear no further to obey the king himself but in things lawful and honest; and to do so by an usurper is an injury to the king, and unto Christ.

(2.) But if the king himself shall command us to swear obedience to a subordinate civil usurper, he thereby ceaseth to be an usurper, and receiveth authority, and it becometh our duty. And if he that was an ecclesiastical usurper, 'quoad personam,' that had no true call to a lawful office,
shall after have a call, or if any thing fall out, which shall make it our duty to consent and call him, then the impediment from his usurpation is removed.

(3.) It is not lawful, though the civil magistrate command us to swear obedience even ́in licitis et honestis,´ to such an usurper, whose office itself is unlawful, or forbidden by Christ, as he is such an officer. No Protestant thinketh it lawful to swear obedience to the pope as pope; nor do any that take lay-elders to be an unlawful office, think it lawful to swear obedience to them as such.

(4.) If one that is in an unlawful ecclesiastical office, be also at once in another that is lawful, we may swear obedience to him in respect of the lawful office. So it is lawful to swear obedience to the pope in Italy, as a temporal prince in his own dominions; and to a cardinal, (as Richelieu, Mazarine, Ximenes, &c.) as the king’s ministers, exercising a power derived from him: so it is lawful for a tenant, where law and custom requireth it, to swear fidelity to a lay-elder, as his landlord or temporal lord and master. And so the old nonconformists, who thought the English prelacy an unlawful office, yet maintained that it is lawful to take the oath of canonical obedience, because they thought it was imposed by the king and laws, and that we swear to them not as officers claiming a Divine right in the spiritual government, but as ordinaries, or officers made by the king to exercise so much of ecclesiastical jurisdiction under him, as he can delegate; according to the oath of supremacy, in which we all acknowledge the king to be supreme in all ecclesiastical causes; that is, not the supreme pastor, bishop, or spiritual key-bearer or ruler, but the supreme civil ruler of the church, who hath the power of the sword, and of determining all things extrinsic to the pastoral office; and so of the coercive government of all pastors and churches, as well as of other subjects. And if prelacy were proved never so unlawful, no doubt but by the king’s command we may swear or perform formal obedience to a prelate, as he is the king’s officer. Of the nonconformists’ judgment in this, read Bradshaw against Canna, &c.

(5.) But in such a case no oath to inferiors is lawful without the consent of the sovereign power, or at least against his will.
(6.) Though it be a duty for the flock to obey every presbyter, yet if they would make all the people swear obedience to them, all wise and conscionable Christians should dissent from the introduction of such a custom, and deny such oaths as far as lawfully they may: that is,

1. If the king be against it, we must refuse it.
2. If he be neutral or merely passive in it, we must refuse, unless some apparent necessity for the church’s good require it.
   1. Because it savoureth of pride in such presbyters.
   2. Because it is a new custom in the church, and contrary to the ancient practice.
   3. It is not only without any authority given them by Christ, that they exact such oaths, but also contrary to the great humility, lowliness, and condescension, in which he describeth his ministers, who must be great, by being the servants of all.
   4. And it tendeth to corrupt the clergy for the future.
   5. And such new impositions give just reason to princes and to the people to suspect that the presbyters are aspiring after some inordinate exaltation, or have some ill project for the advancement of themselves.

(7.) But yet if it be not only their own ambition which imposeth it, but either the king and laws command it, or necessity require it for the avoidance of a greater evil, it may be lawful and a duty to take an oath of obedience to a lawful presbyter or bishop; because, 1. It is a duty to obey them. 2. And it is not forbidden us by Christ to promise or swear to do our duty, (even when they may sin in demanding such an oath).

(8.) If an office be lawful in the essential parts, and yet have unlawful integrals, or adjuncts, or be abused in exercise, it will not by such additions or abuses be made unlawful to swear obedience to the officer as such.

(9.) If one presbyter or bishop would make another presbyter or bishop to swear obedience to him without authority, the case is the same as of the usurpers before mentioned.

Quest. cliv. Must all our preaching be upon a text of Scripture?

Answ. 1. In many cases it may be lawful to preach without a text; to make sacred orations like Gregory Nazianzen’s, and homilies like Macarius’s, Ephrem Syrus’s, and many other ancients, and like our own church-homilies.

2. But ordinarily it is the fittest way to preach upon a text of Scripture. 1. Because it is our very office to teach the people the Scripture. The prophets brought a new word or message from God; but the priests did but keep, interpret, and preach the law already received: and we are not successors of the inspired prophets, but as the priests were, teachers of God’s received Word. And this practice will help the people to understand our office. 2. And it will preserve the due esteem and reverence of the Holy Scriptures, which the contrary practice may diminish.

Quest. clv. Is not the law of Moses abrogated, and the whole Old Testament out of date, and therefore not to be read publicly and preached on?

Answ. 1. The covenant of innocency is ceased ‘cessante subditorum capacitate,’ as a covenant or promise. And so are the positive laws proper to Adam, in that state, and to many particular persons since.

2. The covenant mixt of grace and works, proper to the Jews, with all the Jewish law as such, was never made to us, or to the rest of the world; and to the Jews it is ceased by the coming and more perfect laws and covenant of Christ.

3. The prophecies and types of Christ, and the promises made to Adam, Abraham, and others of his coming in the flesh, are all fulfilled, and therefore not useful to all the ends of their first making: and the many prophecies of particular things and persons past and gone are accomplished.

4. But the law of nature is still Christ’s law: and that law is much expounded to us in the Old Testament: and if God once, for another use, did say, ‘this is the law of na-

ture,' the truth of these words as a Divine doctrine and exposition of the law of nature is still the same.

5. The covenant of grace made with Adam and Noah for all mankind, is still in force as to the great benefits and main condition, that is, as to pardon given by it to true penitent believers, with a right to everlasting life, and as to the obligation to sincere obedience for salvation: though not as to the yet future coming of Christ in the flesh. And this law of grace was never yet repealed any further than Christ's coming did fulfil it and perfect it: therefore to the rest of the world who never can have the Gospel or more perfect testament as Christians have, the former law of grace is yet in force. And that is the law, conjoined with the law of nature, which now the world without the church is under: under, I say, as to the force of the law, and a former promulgation made to Adam and Noah, and some common intimations of it in merciful forbearances, pardons, and benefits; though how many are under it as to the knowledge, reception, and belief, and obedience of it, and consequently are saved by it, is more than I or any man knoweth.

6. There are many prophecies of Christ and the Christian church in the Old Testament yet to be fulfilled, and therefore are still God's Word for us.

7. There are many precepts of God to the Jews and to particular persons, given them on reasons common to them with us; where parity of reason will help thence to gather our own duty now.

8. There are many holy expressions (as in the Psalms), which are fitted to persons in our condition, and came from the Spirit of God; and therefore as such are fit for us now.

9. Even the fulfilled promises, types, and prophecies, are still God's words, that is, his Word given to their several proper uses: and though much of their use be changed or ceased, so is not all: they are yet useful to us, to confirm our faith, while we see their accomplishment, and see how much God still led his church to happiness in one and the same way.

10. On all these accounts therefore we may still read
the Old Testament, and preach upon it in the public churches a.

Quest. clvi. Must we believe that Moses's law did ever bind other nations; or that any other parts of the Scripture bound them, or belong to them? or that the Jews were all God's visible church on earth?

Answ. I conjoin these three questions for dispatch.

I. 1. Some of the matter of Moses's law did bind all nations; that is, the law of nature as such.

2. Those that had the knowledge of the Jewish law, were bound collaterally to believe and obey all the expositions of the law of nature in it, and all the laws which were given upon reasons common to all the world; (as about degrees of marriage, particular rules of justice, &c.) As if I heard God from heaven tell another that standeth by me, 'Thou shalt not marry thy father's widow; for it is abominable,' I ought to apply that to me, being his subject which is spoken to another on a common reason b.

3. All those Gentiles that would be proselytes, and join with the Jews in their policy, and dwell among them, were bound to be observers of their laws. But, 1. The law of nature as Mosaicical, did not formally and directly bind other nations. 2. Nor were they bound to the laws of their peculiar policy, civil or ecclesiastical, which were positives. The reason is, (1.) Because they were all one body of political laws, given peculiarly to one political body. Even the decalogue itself was to them a political law. (2.) Because Moses was not authorized or sent to be the mediator or deliverer of that law to any nation but the Jews. And being never in the enacting or promulgation sent or directed to the rest of the world, it could not bind them.

II. As to the second question, Though the Scripture as a writing bound not all the world, yet, 1. The law of nature as such which is recorded in Scripture did bind all. 2. The


covenant of grace was made with all mankind in Adam and Noah: and they were bound to promulgate it by tradition to all their offspring. And no doubt so they did; whether by word, (as all did,) or by writing also, (as it is likely some did, as Enoch's prophecies were it is likely delivered, as else they had not in terms been preserved till Jude's time). 3. And God himself as aforesaid by actual providences, pardoning, and benefits given to them that deserved hell, did in part promulgate it himself. 4. The neighbour nations might learn much by God's doctrine and dealing with the Jews.

III. To the third question, I answer, 1. The Jews were a people chosen by God out of all the nations of the earth, to be a holy nation, and his peculiar treasure, having a peculiar Divine law and covenant, and many great privileges, to which the rest of the world were strangers; so that they were advanced above all other kingdoms of the world, though not in wealth, nor worldly power, nor largeness of dominion, yet in a special dearness unto God.

2. But they were not the only people to whom God made a covenant of grace in Adam and Noah, as distinct from the law or covenant of innocency.

3. Nor were they the only people that professed to worship the true God; neither was holiness and salvation confined to them; but were found in other nations. Therefore though we have but little notice of the state of other kingdoms in their times, and scarcely know what national churches, (that is, whole nations professing saving faith,) there were, yet we may well conclude that there were other visible churches besides the Jews. For, 1. No Scripture denieth it; and charity then must hope the best. 2. The Scriptures of the Old Testament give us small account of other countries, but of the Jews alone, with some of their neighbours. 3. Shem was alive in Abraham's days, (yea, about 34 years after Abraham's death, and within 12 years of Ishmael's death, viz. till about An. Mundi 2158.) And so great and blessed a man as Shem, cannot be thought to be

---

less than a king, and to have a kingdom governed according to his holiness; and so that there was with him not only a church, but a national church, or holy kingdom. 4. And Melchizedec was a holy king and priest; and therefore had a kingdom holily governed; and therefore not only a visible but also a national church; (supposing that he was not Shem, as the Jews and Broughton, &c. think; for the situation of his country doth make many desert that opinion). 5. And Job and his friends shew that there were churches then besides the Jews. 6. And it is not to be thought that all Ishmael's posterity suddenly apostatized. 7. Nor that Esau's posterity had no church state: (for both retained circumcision). 8. Nor is it like that Abraham's offspring by Keturah were all apostates, being once in-churched. For though the special promise was made to Isaac's seed, as the peculiar holy nation, &c. yet not as the only children of God, or persons in a state of salvation. 9. And the passages in Jonah about Nineveh give us some such intimations also. 10. And Japhet and his seed being under a special blessing, it is not like that they all proved apostates. And what was in all other kingdoms of the world is little known to us.

We must therefore take heed of concluding (as the proud Jews were at last apt to do of themselves,) that because they were a chosen nation privileged above all others, that therefore the Redeemer under the law of grace made to Adam, had no other churches in the world, and that there were none saved but the Jews and proselytes.

Quest. clvii. Must we think accordingly of the Christian churches now, that they are only advanced above the rest of the world as the Jews were, but not the only people that are saved?

Answ. This question being fitter for another place, what hope there is of the salvation of the people that are not Christians, I have purposely handled in another treatise (in my "Method. Theologis"), and shall only say now, 1. That those that receive not Christ and the Gospel revealed and

* It is this Jewish pride of their own prerogatives which Paul so much laboureth in all his epistles to pull down.
offered to them cannot be saved. 2. That all those shall be saved (if such there be) who never had sufficient means to know Christ incarnate, and yet do faithfully perform the common conditions of the covenant of grace as it was made with Adam and Noah; and particularly all that are truly sanctified, who truly hate all known sin, and love God as God above all, as their merciful, reconciled, pardoning Father, and lay up all their hopes in heaven, in the everlasting fruition of him in glory, and set their hearts there, and for those hopes deny the interest of the flesh, and all things of this world.

3. But how many or who doth this abroad in all the kingdoms of the world, who have not the distinct knowledge of the articles of the Christian faith, it is not possible for us to know.

4. But (as Aquinas and the schoolmen ordinarily conclude this question) we are sure that the church hath this prerogative above all others, that salvation is incomparably more common to Christians, than to any others, as their light, and helps, and means are more. The opinions of Justin, and Clem. Alexandr., Origen, and many other ancients, of the heathens' salvation I suppose is known. In short:

1. It seems plain to me, that all the world that are no Christians, and have not the Gospel, are not by Christ's incarnation put into a worse condition than they were in before; but may be saved on the same terms that they might have been saved on before.

2. That Christ's apostles were in a state of salvation before they believed the articles of Christ's dying for sin, his resurrection, ascension, the giving of the Holy Ghost, and Christ's coming to judgment, as they are now to be believed.

3. That all the faithful before Christ's coming were saved by a more general faith than the apostles had, as not being terminated in this person, Jesus, as the Messiah, but only expected the Messiah to come.

b Mark xvi. 16. John iii. 16—20. i. 11, 12.
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' Mal. iii. 1, 2. John iv. 25.
4. That as more articles are necessary to those that have the Gospel, than to those that have it not, and to those since Christ's incarnation that hear of him, than to the Jews before, so before, there were more things necessary even to those Jews (that had a shorter creed than that which the apostles believed before the resurrection) than was to the rest of the world that had not promises, prophecies, types and laws, so particular, distinct and full as they had.

5. That the promises, covenant or law of grace was made to all lapsed mankind in Adam and Noah.

6. That this law or covenant is still of the same tenor, and not repealed.

7. That this covenant giveth pardoning mercy, and salvation, and promiseth victory over Satan, to and by the holy seed.

8. That the condition on man's part, is repentance, and faith in God as a merciful God thus pardoning sin, and saving the penitent believer. But just how particular or distinct their belief of the incarnation of Christ was to be, is hard to determine.

9. But after Christ's incarnation, even they that know it not, yet are not by the first covenant bound to believe that the Messiah is yet to be incarnate, or the Word made flesh; for they are not bound to believe an untruth, and that as the condition of salvation.

10. Men were saved by Christ about four thousand years before he was man, and had suffered, satisfied or merited as man.

11. The whole course of God's actual providence since the fall, hath so filled the world with mercies contrary to man's demerit, that it is an actual universal proclamation of the pardoning law of grace; which is thereby now become even the law of nature, that is, of lapsed, pardoned nature, as the first was the natural law of innocence.

---
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12. Christ giveth a great deal of mercy to them that never heard of him or know him: and he giveth far more mercy to believers, than they have a particular knowledge or belief of.

13. There is no salvation but by Christ the Saviour of the world; though there be more mercy from Christ, than there is faith in Christ.

14. No man could ever be saved without believing in God as a merciful, pardoning, saving God, though many have been saved who knew not the person of Christ, determinately. For he that cometh to God must believe that God is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; who is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.

15. All nations on earth that have not the Gospel, are obliged by God to the use of certain means, and improvement of certain mercies, in order or tendency to their salvation. And it is their sin if they use them not.

16. God hath appointed no means in vain, which men must either not use, or use desparingly. But his command to use any means for any end, containeth (though not an explicit promise, yet) great and comfortable encouragement to use that means in hope.

17. Therefore the world is now in comparison of the Catholic church, much like what it was before Christ's incarnation in comparison of the Jews' church; who yet had many ways great advantage, though God was not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles, who had a law written on their hearts, and an accusing or exoucing conscience.

18. Those over-doing divines who pretend to be certain, that all the world are damned that are not Christians, do add to God's Word, and are great agents for satan to tempt men to infidelity, and to atheism itself, and to dissuade man.

* Psal. clv. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 10. Rom. x. 20.
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kind from discerning the infinite goodness of God; and occasion many to deny the immortality of the soul, rather than they will believe, that five parts in six of the world now, and almost all before Christ's incarnation, have immortal souls purposely created in them, to be damned without any profounded means and possibility—natural of remedy; and as I know they will pour out their bitter censure on these lines (which I could avoid if I regarded it more than truth) so with what measure they mete, it shall be measured to them: and others will damn them as confidently as they damn almost all the world: and I will be bold to censure that they are Undoers of the church by Over-doing. See more in my "Vindication of God's Goodness."

Quest. clviii. Should not Christians take up with Scripture-wisdom only, without studying philosophy and other heathens' human learning?

Answ. I have already proved the usefulness of common knowledge called human learning, by twenty reasons in my book called "The Unreasonableness of Infidelity," Part ii. sect. 23. p. 163. to which I refer the reader: and only say now, 1. Grace presupposeth nature; we are men in order of nature at least before we are saints, and reason is before supernatural revelation. 2. Common knowledge therefore is subservient unto faith: we must know the Creator and his works; and the Redeemer restoreth us to the due knowledge of the Creator: human learning in the sense in question is also Divine, God is the author of the light of nature, as well as of grace. We have more than heathens, but must not therefore have less, and cast away the good that is common to them and us; else we must not have souls, bodies, reason, health, time, meat, drink, clothes, &c., because heathens have them. God's works are honourable, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein; and physical philosophy is nothing but the knowledge of God's works. 3. And the knowledge of languages is necessary both for human converse, and for the understanding the Scriptures themselves. The Scriptures contain not a Greek and Hebrew grammar to understand the languages in which they are written, but suppose us otherwise taught those tongues
that we may interpret them. 4. The use of the Gospel is not to teach us all things needful to be known, but to teach us, on supposition of our common knowledge, how to advance higher to supernatural saving knowledge, faith, love and practice. Scripture telleth us not how to build a house, to plough, sow, weave, or make our works of art. Every one that learneth his country tongue of his parents hath human learning of the same sort with the learning of Greek and Hebrew: he that learneth not to read, cannot read the Bible. And he that understandeth it not in the original tongues, must trust other men's words that have human learning, or else remain a stranger to it.

But though none but proud fools will deny the need of that human learning which improveth nature, and is subservient to our knowledge of supernatural revelations, yet well doth Paul admonish us, to take heed that none deceive us by vain philosophy, and saith that the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God, and that the knowledge of Christ crucified is the true Christian philosophy or wisdom. For indeed the dark philosophers groping after the knowledge of God, did frequently stumble, and did introduce abundance of logical and physical vanities, uncertainties and falsities, under the name of philosophy, by mere niceties and high pretensions, seeking for the glory of wisdom to themselves; when as it is one thing to know God's works and God in them, and another thing to compose a system of physics and metaphysics containing abundance of errors and confusion, and jumbling a few certainties with a great many uncertainties and untruths, and every sect pulling down what others asserted, and all of them disproving the methods and assertions of others, and none proving their own. And the truth is, after all latter discoveries, there is yet so much error, darkness, uncertainty and confusion in the philosophy of every pretending sect, (the Peripatetics, the Stoics, the Pythagoreans and Platonists, much more the Epicureans, the Lullianists, the Cartesian, Telesius,

Campanella, Patricius, Gassendus, &c.) that it is a wonder that any that ever thoroughly tried them, can be so weak as to glory much of the certainties and methods of any, which hitherto are so palpably uncertain, and full of certain errors. We may therefore make use of all true human learning, real and organical, (and he is the happy scholar who fasteneth upon the Certain and Useful parts well distinguished from the rest, and truly useth them to their great and proper ends): but niceties and fooleries which some spend their lives in for mere ostentation, and also uncertain presumptions, should be much neglected; and the great, certain, necessary, saving verities of morality and the Gospel must be dearly loved, and thankfully embraced, and studiously learned, and faithfully practised, by all that would prove wise men at last.

Quest. clix. If we think that Scripture and the law of nature do in any point contradict each other, which may be the standard by which the other must be tried?

Answ. 1. It is certain that they never do contradict each other: 2. The law of nature is either that which is very clear by natural evidence, or that which is dark (as degrees of consanguinity unfit for marriage, the evil of officious lies, &c.). 3. The Scriptures also have their plain and their obscurer parts. 4. A dark Scripture is not to be expounded contrary to a plain, natural verity. 5. A dark and doubtful point in nature is not to be expounded contrary to a plain and certain Scripture. 6. To suppose that there be an apparent contradiction in cases of equal clearness or doubtfulness, is a case not to be supposed; but he that should have such a dream, must do as he would do if he thought two texts to be contradictory, that is, he must better study till he doth see his error; still remembering that natural evidence hath this advantage, that it is, 1. First in order,
2. And most common and received by all; but supernatural evidence hath this advantage, that it is for the most part the most clear and satisfactory.

Quest. CLX. May we not look that God should yet give us more revelations of his will, than there are already made in Scripture?

Ans. You must distinguish between, 1. New laws or covenants to mankind, and new predictions or informations of a particular person. 2. Between what may possibly be, and what we may expect as certain or probable. And so I conclude,

1. That it is certain that God will make no other covenant, testament or universal law, for the government of mankind or the church as a rule of duty and of judgment. Because he hath oft told us, that this covenant and law is perfect, and shall be in force as our rule till the end of the world.

Object. ‘So it was said of the law of Moses, that it was to stand for ever, yea, of many ceremonies in it.’

Ans. 1. It is in the original only, ‘for ages and ages;’ or ‘to generations and generations,’ which we translate ‘for ever,’ when it signifieth but ‘to many generations.’ 2. It is nowhere said, of Moses’s law as such, that it should continue either till the end of the world, or till the day of judgment, as it is said of the Gospel. And 3. It is not said that he will add no more to the former testament, but contrarily, that he will make a new covenant with them, &c. But here in the Gospel he peremptorily resolveth against all innovations and additions.

2. It is certain that God will make no new Scripture or inspired Word as an infallible, universal rule for the exposition of the Word already written. For, 1. This were an addition which he hath disclaimed, and 2. It would imply such an insufficiency in the Gospel to its ends (as being not intelligible) as is contrary to its asserted perfection, and 3.
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It would be contrary to that established way for the understanding of the Scripture, which God hath already settled and appointed for us till the end.*

3. It is certain that God will give all his servants in their several measures, the help and illumination of his Spirit, for the understanding and applying of the Gospel.

4. It is possible that God may make new revelations to particular persons about their particular duties, events or matters of fact, in subordination to the Scripture, either by inspiration, vision, or apparition, or voice; for he hath not told us that he will never do such a thing. As to tell them, what shall befall them or others; or to say, 'Go to such a place, or, Dwell in such a place, or, Do such a thing,' which is not contrary to the Scripture, nor co-ordinate, but only a subordinate determination of some undetermined case, or the circumstantiating of an action.

5. Though such revelation and prophecy be possible, there is no certainty of it in general, nor any probability of it to any one individual person, much less a promise. And therefore to expect it, or pray for it, is but a presumptuous tempting of God b.

6. And all sober Christians should be the more cautious of being deceived by their own imaginations, because certain experience telleth us, that most in our age that have pretended to prophecy, or to inspirations, or revelations, have been melancholy cracked-brained persons, near to madness, who have proved deluded in the end; and that such crazed persons are still prone to such imaginations.

7. Therefore also all sober Christians must take heed of rash believing every prophet or pretended spirit, lest they be led away from the sacred rule, and before they are aware, be lost in vain expectations and conceits.

Quest. clxi. Is not a third rule of the Holy Ghost, or more perfect kingdom of love to be expected, as different from the reign of the Creator and Redeemer?

Answ. 1. The works 'ad extra' and the reign of the Father, Word and Spirit are undivided. But yet some things

* Eph. i. 18, 19.
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are more eminently attributed to one person in the Trinity, and some to another.

2. By the law and covenant of innocency, the Creator eminently ruled omnipotently. And the Son ruled eminently sapientially, initially under the covenant of promise or grace from Adam till his incarnation and the descent of the Holy Ghost, and more fully and perfectly afterward by the Holy Ghost. And the Holy Ghost ever since doth rule in the saints as the Paraclete, Advocate or Agent of Christ, and Christ by him, eminently by holy love; which is yet but initially: but the same Holy Ghost by perfect love shall perfectly rule in glory for ever; even as the Spirit of the Father and the Son. We have already the initial kingdom of love by the Spirit, and shall have the perfect kingdom in heaven; and besides the initial and the perfect there is no other. Nor is the perfect kingdom to be expected before the day of judgment, or our removal unto heaven; for our kingdom is not of this world. And they that sell all and follow Christ, do make the exchange for a reward in heaven; and they that suffer persecution for his sake, must rejoice because their reward in heaven is great: and they that relieve a prophet or righteous man for the sake of Christ, and that lose any thing for him, shall have indeed an hundred fold (in value) in this life, but in the world to come eternal life. We shall be taken up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord: and those are the words with which we must comfort one another, and not Jewishly with the hopes of an earthly kingdom. And yet "we look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, according to his promise." But who shall be the inhabitants, and how that heaven and earth shall differ, and what we shall then have to do with earth, whether to be overseers of that righteous earth (and so to judge or rule the world) as the angels are now over us in this world, are things which yet I understand not.

b John v. 22. 25. Prov. i. 20, 21.

1 Cor. xii. 2, 3. v. 1. 3. 8. Matt. xviii. 10. 1 Thess. iv 17, 18. Mark xii. 25.
2 Pet. iii. 11—13. 1 Pet. i. 4. Heb. x. 34. xii. 13. Col. i. 5. Phil. iii. 20, 21.
Quest. clxii. May we not look for miracles hereafter?

Answ. 1. The answer to Quest. clx. may serve to this. 1. God may work miracles if he please, and hath not told us that he never will.

2. But he hath not promised to us that he will, and therefore we cannot believe such a promise, nor expect them as a certain thing. Nor may any pray for the gift of miracles.

3. But if there be any probability of them, it will be to those that are converting infidel nations, when they may be partly of such use as they were at first.

4. Yet it is certain, that God still sometimes worketh miracles: but arbitrarily and rarely, which may not put any individual person in expectation of them.

Object. 'Is not the promise the same to us as to the apostles and primitive Christians, if we could but believe as they did?'

Answ. 1. The promise to be believed goeth before the faith that believeth it, and not that faith before the promise.

2. The promise of the Holy Ghost was for perpetuity, to sanctify all believers: but the promise of that special gift of miracles, was for a time, because it was for a special use; that is, to be a standing seal to the truth of the Gospel, which all after ages may be convinced of in point of fact, and so may still have the use and benefit of. And providence (ceasing miracles), thus expoundeth the promise. And if miracles must be common to all persons and ages, they would be as no miracles. And we have seen those that most confidently believed they should work them, all fail.

But I have written so largely of this point in my Treatise called "The Unreasonableness of Infidelity," fully proving those first miracles satisfactory and obligatory to all following ages, that I must thither now refer the reader.

Quest. clxiii. Is the Scripture to be tried by the Spirit, or the Spirit by the Scripture, and which of them is to be preferred?

Answer. I put the question thus confusedly, for the sake of those that use to do so, to shew them how to get out of their own confusion. You must distinguish, 1. Between the Spirit in itself considered, and the Scripture in itself. 2. Between the several operations of the Spirit. 3. Between the several persons that have the Spirit. And so you must conclude,

1. That the Spirit in itself is infinitely more excellent than the Scripture. For the Spirit is God, and the Scripture is but the work of God.

2. The operation of the Spirit in the apostles was more excellent than the operation of the same Spirit now in us; as producing more excellent effects, and more infallible.

3. Therefore the Holy Scriptures which were the infallible dictates of the Spirit in the apostles, are more perfect than any of our apprehensions which come by the same Spirit (which we have not in so great a measure).

4. Therefore we must not try the Scriptures by our most spiritual apprehensions, but our apprehensions by the Scriptures: that is, we must prefer the Spirit's inspiring the apostles to indite the Scripture, before the Spirit's illuminating of us to understand them, or before any present inspirations, the former being the more perfect; because Christ gave the apostles the Spirit to deliver us infallibly his own commands, and to indite a rule for following ages; but he giveth us the Spirit but to understand and use that rule aright.

5. This trying the Spirit by the Scriptures, is not a setting of the Scripture above the Spirit itself; but is only a trying the Spirit by the Spirit: that is, the Spirit's operations in ourselves and his revelations to any pretenders now, by the Spirit's operations in the apostles, and by their revelations recorded for our use. For they and not we are called foundations of the church.

---

1 John iv. 1, 2, 6. John xviii. 37. xii. 47.  
Rev. ii. 2. Jude 17. 2 Pet. iii. 2. Ephes. iv. 11, 12. 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29.  
Ephes. ii. 20.
Quest. clxiv. How is a pretended prophet or revelation to be tried?

Answ. 1. If it be contrary to the Scripture it is to be rejected as a deceit. 1

2. If it be the same thing which is in the Scripture, we have it more certainly revealed already; therefore the revelation can be nothing but an assistance of the person’s faith, or a call to obedience, or a reproof of some sin; which every man is to believe according as there is true evidence that indeed it is a Divine revelation or vision; which if it be not, the same thing is still sure to us in the Scripture.

3. If it be something that is only besides the Scripture (as about events and facts, or prophecies of what will befall particular places or persons) we must first see whether the evidence of a Divine revelation be clear in it or not; and that is known, 1. To the person himself, by the self-attesting and convincing power of a Divine revelation, which no man knoweth but he that hath it; (and we must be very cautious lest we take false conceptions to be such). 2. But to himself and others it is known, (1.) At present by clear, uncontrolled miracles, which are God’s attestations; which if men shew, we are bound (in this case) to believe them. (2.) For the future, by the event, when things so plainly come to pass, as prove the prediction to be of God. He therefore that giveth you not by certain miracles uncontrolled, a just proof that he is sent of God, is to be heard with a suspended belief; you must stay till the event shew whether he say true or not; and not act any thing in the mean time upon an unproved presumption either of the truth or falsehood of his words. k

4. If you are in doubt whether that which he speaketh be contrary to God’s Word or not, you must hear him with a proportionable suspicion, and give no credit to him till you have tried whether it be so or not.

5. It is a dangerous snare and sin to believe any one’s prophecies or revelations merely because they are very holy persons, and do most confidently aver or swear it. For

1 Acts xvii. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. John x. 35. xix. 24. 28. 36, 37.


xxiv. 34. xxi. 4.
they may be deceived themselves. As also to take hysterical, or melancholy delirations or conceptions for the revelations of the Spirit of God, and so to father falsehood upon God.

Quest. clxv. May one be saved who believeth that the Scripture hath any mistake or error, and believeth it not all?

Answ. The chief part of the answer to this must be fetched from what is said before about fundamentals. 1. No man can be saved who believeth not that God is no liar, and that all his Word is true; because indeed he believeth not that there is a God. 2. No man can be saved who believeth not the points that are essential to true godliness; nor any man that heareth the Word, who believeth not all essential to Christianity, or the Christian covenant and religion.

3. A man may be saved who believeth not some books of Scripture, (as Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Revelations,) to be canonical, or the Word of God; so he heartily believe the rest, or the essentials.

4. He that thinketh that the prophets, sacred historians, evangelists, and apostles, were guided to an infallible delivery and recording of all the great, substantial, necessary points of the Gospel, but not to an infallibility in every by-expression, phrase, citation, or circumstance, doth disadvantage his own faith as to all the rest; but yet may be saved, if he believe the substance with a sound and practical belief.

Quest. clxvi. Who be they that give too little to the Scripture, and who too much; and what is the danger of each extreme?

Answ. 1. It is not easy to enumerate all the errors on either extreme; but only to give some instances of each. 1. They give too little to the Scripture who deny it to be indited by inspiration of the infallible Spirit of God, and to be

---
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wholly true. 2. And they that detract from some parts or books of it while they believe the rest. 3. And they that think it is not given as a law of God, and as a rule of faith and life. 4. And they that think it is not an universal law and rule for all the world, but for some parts only (supposing the predication of it). 5. And they that think it an imperfect law and rule, which must be made up with the supplement of traditions or revelations. 6. And they that think it was adapted only to the time it was written in, and not to our’s, as not foreseeing what would be. 7. And they that think it is culpably defective in method. 8. And they that think it culpably defective in phrase, aptness, or elegance of style. 9. And they that think that it containeth not all that was necessary or fit for universal determination, of that kind of things which it doth at all universally determine of; as e. g. that it made two sacraments, but not all of that kind that are fit to be made, but hath left men to invent and make more of the same nature and use. 10. And those that think that it is fitted only to the learned, or only to the unlearned, only to princes, or only to subjects, &c. 11. And those that think that it is but for a time, and then by alteration to be perfected as Moses’s law was. 12. And those that think that the pope, princes, or prelates, or any men may change or alter it.

II. Those give too much (in bulk, but too little in virtue) to Scripture, 1. Who would set them up instead of the whole law and light of nature, as excluding this as useless where the Scripture is.

2. And they that feign it to be instead of all grammars, logic, philosophy, and all other arts and sciences, and to be a perfect, particular rule for every ruler, lawyer, physician, mariner, architect, husbandman, and tradesman, to do his work by.

3. And they that feign it to be fully sufficient to all men to prove its own authority and truth, without the subsidiary use of that church-history and tradition which telleth us the supposed matters of fact, and must help us to know what books are canonical and what not; and without historical evidence, that these are the true books which the prophets

and apostles wrote, and the miracles and providences which have attested them o.

4. And those that think that it is sufficient for its own promulgation, or the people's instruction, without the ministry of man to preserve, deliver, translate, expound, and preach it to the people.

5. And those that think it sufficient to sanctify men, without the concourse of the Spirit's illumination, vivification and inward operation to that end p.

6. And they that say that no man can be saved by the knowledge, belief, love, and practice of all the substantial parts of Christianity brought to him by tradition, parents, or preachers, who tell him nothing of the Scriptures, but deliver him the doctrines as attested by miracles and the Spirit without any notice of the book.

7. And those that say that Scripture alone must be made use of as to all the history of Scripture times, and that it is unlawful to make use of any other historians, (as Josephus and such others).

8. And they that say, no other books of divinity but Scripture are useful, yea or lawful to be read of Christians; or at least in the church.

9. And they that say that the Scriptures are so Divine, not only in matter, but in method and style, as that there is nothing of human (inculpable) imperfection or weakness in them.

10. And those that say that the logical method, and the phrase is as perfect as God was able to make them.

11. And they that say that all passages in Scripture, historically related, are moral truths; and so make the devil's words to Eve, of Job, to Christ, &c., to be all true.

12. And they that say that all passages in the Scripture were equally obligatory to all other places and ages, as to those that first received them, (as the kiss of peace, the veils of women, washing feet, anointing the sick, deaconnesses, &c.).

13. And they that make Scripture so perfect a rule to our belief, that nothing is to be taken for certain, that

---


cometh to us any other way, (as natural knowledge, or historical).

14. And those that think men may not translate the Scripture, turn the psalms into metre, tune them, divide the Scripture into chapters and verses, &c., as being derogatory alterations of the perfect Word.

15. And those that think it so perfect a particular rule of all the circumstances, modes, adjuncts, and external expressions of and in God's worship, as that no such may be invented or added by man, that is not there prescribed; as time, place, vesture, gesture, utensils, methods, words, and many other things mentioned before.

16. And those that Jewishly feign a multitude of unproved mysteries to lie in the letters, order, numbers, and proper names in Scripture, (though I deny not that there is much mystery which we little observe).

17. They that say that the Scripture is all so plain, that there are no obscure or difficult passages in them, which men are in danger of wresting to their own destruction.

18. And they that say that all in the Scripture is so necessary to salvation (even the darkest prophecies), that they cannot be saved that understand them not at all: or at least endeavour not studiously and particularly to understand them.

19. And they that say that every book and text must of necessity to salvation be believed to be canonical and true.

20. And those that say that God hath so preserved the Scripture, as that there are no various readings and doubtful texts thereupon, and that no written or printed copies have been corrupted, (when Dr. Heylin tells us, that the king's printer printed the seventh commandment, 'Thou shalt commit adultery.') All these err in overdoing.

III. The dangers of the former detracting from the Scripture are these. 1. It injureth the Spirit who is the author of the Scriptures. 2. It striketh at the foundation of our faith, by weakening the records which are left us to believe; and emboldeneth men to sin, by diminishing the authority of

9 1 Cor. xiv. 35. 40. 26. 1 Heb. v. 10—12. 9 Of which see Lud. Capellus Crit. Sacr.
God's law; and weakeneth our hopes, by weakening the promises. 3. It shaketh the universal government of Christ, by shaking the authority or perfection of the laws by which he governeth. 4. It maketh way for human usurpations, and traditions, as supplements to the Holy Scriptures; and leaveth men to contrive to amend God's Word and worship, and make co-ordinate laws and doctrines of their own. 5. It hindereth the conviction and conversion of sinners, and hardeneth them in unbelief, by questioning or weakening the means that should convince and turn them. 6. It is a tempting men to the cursed adding to God's Word.

IV. The dangers of overdoing here are these; 1. It leadeth to downright infidelity; for when men find that the Scripture is imperfect or wanting in that which they fancy to be part of its perfection, and to be really insufficient, e.g. to teach men physics, logic, medicine, languages, &c., they will be apt to say, 'It is not of God, because it hath not that which it pretends to have.' 2. God is made the author of defects and imperfections. 3. The Scripture is exposed to the scorn and contumation of infidels. 4. Papists are assisted in proving its imperfection. But I must stop, having spoke to this point before in Quest. 35. and partly Quest. 30. 31. 33. more at large.

Quest. CLXVII. How far do good men now preach and pray by the Spirit?

Ans. 1. Not by such inspiration of new matter from God as the prophets and apostles had which indited the Scriptures.

2. Not so as to exclude the exercise of reason, memory, or diligence: which must be as much and more than about any common things.

3. Not so as to exclude the use and need of Scripture, ministry, sermons, books, conference, examples, use, or other means and helps.

But 1. The Spirit indited that doctrine and Scripture which is our rule for prayer and for preaching.

2. The Spirit's miracles and works in and by the
apostles seal that doctrine to us, and confirm our faith in it.

3. The Spirit in our faithful pastors and teachers teacheth us by them to pray and preach.

4. The Spirit by illumination, quickening, and sanctification, giveth us an habitual acquaintance with our sins, our wants, with the Word of precept and promise, with God, with Christ, with grace, with heaven. And it giveth us a habit of holy love to God, and goodness and thankfulness for mercy and faith in Christ, and the life to come, and desires of perfection, and hatred of sin; and he that hath all these, hath a constant habit of prayer in him; for prayer is nothing but the expression with the tongue of these graces in the heart; so that the Spirit of sanctification is thereby a Spirit of adoption and of supplication. And he that hath freedom of utterance can speak that which God's Spirit hath put into his very heart, and made him esteem his greatest and nearest concernment, and the most necessary and excellent thing in all the world. This is the Spirit's principal help.

5. The same Spirit doth incline our hearts to the diligent use of all those means, by which his abilities may be increased; as to read, and hear, and confer, and to use ourselves to prayer, and to meditation, self-examination, &c.

6. The same Spirit helpeth us in the use of all these means, to profit by them, and to make them all effectual on our hearts.

7. The same Spirit concurreth with means, habits, reason, and our own endeavours, to help us in the very act of praying and preaching: 1. By illuminating our minds to know what to desire and say. 2. By actuating our wills to love, and holy desire, and other affections. 3. By quickening and exciting us to a liveliness and fervency in all. And so bringing our former habits into acts, the grace of prayer is the heart and soul of gifts; and thus the Spirit teacheth us to pray.

---

1 Heb. ii. 3, 4. 1 Pet. i. 2. 22.  2 Thess. i. 11.
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2 Cor. iv. 13. Gal. v. 16—18. 25. Ephes. iii. 16. v. 9, 18. vi. 18. 1 These. v. 19.
Yea, the same Spirit thus by common helps assisteth even bad men in praying and preaching, giving them common habits and acts that are short of special saving grace. Whereas men left to themselves without God's Spirit, have none of all these aforementioned helps. And so the Spirit is said to intercede for us by exciting our unexpressible groans; and to help our infirmities when we know not what to ask as we ought.

**Quest. clxviii.** Are not our own reasons, studies, memory, strainings, books, forms, methods, and ministry needless, yes, a hurtful quenching or preventing of the Spirit, and setting up our own, instead of the Spirit's operation?

**Answ.** 1. Yes: if we do it in a conceit of the sufficiency of ourselves, our reason, memory, studies, books, forms, &c. without the Spirit: or if we ascribe any thing to any of these which is proper to Christ or to his Spirit. For such proud self-sufficient despisers of the Spirit, cannot reasonably expect his help: I doubt among men counted learned and rational there are too many such, that know not man's insufficiency or corruption, nor the necessity and use of that Holy Ghost into whose name they were baptized, and in whom they take on them to believe. But think that all that pretend to the Spirit are but fanatics and enthusiasts, and self-conceited people; when yet the Spirit himself saith, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his." And "Because we are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, whereby we cry Abba, Father." 2. But if we give to reason, memory, study, books, methods, forms, &c. but their proper place in subordination to Christ and to his Spirit, they are so far from being quenchers of the Spirit, that they are necessary in their places, and such means as we must use, if ever we will expect the Spirit's help. For the Spirit is not given to a brute to make him a man, or rational; nor to a proud despiser, or idle neg-

---

*b* John xv. 1. 3—5. 7. 
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lector of God's appointed means, to be instead of means; nor to be a patron to the vice of pride or idleness, which he cometh chiefly to destroy; but to bless men in their laborious use of the means which God appointed him: read but Prov. i. 20, &c. ii. iii. v. vi. viii., and you will see that knowledge must be laboured for, and instruction heard; and he that will lie idle till the Spirit move him, and will not stir up himself to seek God, or strive to enter in at the strait gate, nor give all diligence to make his calling and election sure*, may find that the spirit of sloth hath destroyed him, when he thought the Spirit of Christ had been saving him. He that hath but two articles in his creed must make this the second; for he that "cometh to God must believe that God is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

Quest. clxix. How doth the Holy Ghost set bishops over the churches?

Answ. 1. By making the office itself, so far as the apostles had any hand in it, Christ himself having made their office.

2. The Holy Ghost in the electors and ordainers directeth them to discern the fitness of the persons elected and ordained, and so to call such as God approveth of, and calleth by the Holy Ghost in them: which was done, 1. By the extraordinary gift of discerning in the apostles. 2. By the ordinary help of God's Spirit in the wise and faithful electors and ordainers ever since.

3. The Holy Ghost doth qualify them for the work, by due life, light and love, knowledge, willingness and active ability; and so both inclining them to it, and marking out the persons by his gifts whom he would have elected and ordained to it: which was done, 1. At first by extraordinary gifts. 2. And ever since by ordinary. (1.) Special and saving in some. (2.) Common, and only fitted to the church's instruction in others. So that whoever is not competently qualified, is not called by the Holy Ghost;

---
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when Christ ascended, he gave "gifts to men, some apostles, prophets, and evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the edifying of his body," &c.

Quest. CLXX. Are temples, fonts, utensils, church-lands, much more the ministers, holy? And what reverence is due to them as holy?

Answ. The question is either 'de nomine' whether it be fit to call them holy; or 'de re,' whether they have that which is called holiness.

1. The word 'holy' signifieth in God, essential transcendent perfection; and so it cometh not into our question. In creatures it signifieth, 1. A Divine nature in the rational creature (angels and men) by which it is made like God, and disposed to him and his service, by knowledge, love and holy vivacity; which is commonly called real saving holiness as distinct from mere relative. 2. It is taken for the relation of any thing to God as his own peculiar appropriated to him; so infinite is the distance between God and us, that whatever is his in a special sense, or separated to his use, is called holy; and that is, 1. Persons. 2. Things. 1. Persons are either, (1.) In general devoted to his love and service. (2.) Or specially devoted to him in some special office; which is, (1.) Ecclesiastical. (2.) Economical. (3.) Political. Those devoted to this general service are, (1.) Either heartily and sincerely so devoted, (who are ever sanctified in the first real sense also). (2.) Or only by word or outward profession. 2. Things devoted to God are, 1. Some by his own immediate choice, designation, and command. 2. Or by general directions to man to do it. And these are, 1. Some things more nearly. 2. Some things more remotely separated to him. None of these must be confounded; and so we must conclude,

1. All that shall be saved are really holy by a Divine inclination and nature, and actual exercise thereof; and relatively holy in a special sense, as thus devoted and separated to God.

2. All the baptized and professors (not apostate) are

1 Ephes. iv. 7-10. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 15. 28, 29.
relatively holy, as verbally devoted and separated to God.

3. All that are ordained to the sacred ministry are relatively holy, as devoted and separated to that office. And the well qualified are also really holy, as their qualifications are either special or common.

4. All that are duly called of God to the place of kings, and judges, and rulers of families, are relatively sacred, as their offices and they are of God and for him, and devoted to him.

5. Temples and other utensils designed by God himself, are holy, as related to him by that designation.

6. Temples, utensils, lands, &c., devoted and lawfully separated by man, for holy uses, are holy, as justly related to God by that lawful separation. To say as some do, that 'They are indeed consecrated and separated, but not holy,' is to be ridiculously wise by self-contradiction, and the masterly use of the word 'holy' contrary to custom and themselves.

7. Ministers are more holy than temples, lands, or utensils, as being more nearly related to holy things. And things separated by God himself are more holy than those justly separated by man. And so of days.

8. Things remotely devoted to God, are holy in their distant place and measure; as the meat, drink, house, lands, labours of every godly man, who with himself devoteth all to God; but this being more distant, is yet a remoter degree of holiness.

II. Every thing should be reverenced according to the measure of its holiness; and this expressed by such signs, gestures, actions, as are most fit to honour God, to whom they are related; and so to be uncovered in church, and use reverent carriage and gestures there, doth tend to preserve due reverence to God and to his worship.


1 1 Cor. xvi. 20.
Quest. clxxi. What is sacrilege, and what not?

Answ. I. Sacrilege is robbing God by the unjust alienation of holy things. And it is measured according as things are diversified in holiness; as,

1. The greatest sacrilege is a profane, unholy alienating a person to the flesh and the world, from God, and his love, and his service, who by baptism was devoted to him. And so all wicked Christians are grossly sacrilegious.

2. The next is alienating consecrated persons from the sacred work and office, by deposing kings, or by unjust silencing or suspending true ministers, or their casting off God's work themselves. This is far greater sacrilege than alienating lands or utensils.

3. The next is the unjust alienating of temples, utensils, lands, days, which were separated by God himself.

4. And next such as were justly consecrated by man; as is aforesaid in the degrees of holiness.

II. It is not sacrilege, 1. To cease from the ministry or other holy service, when sickness, disability of body, or violence utterly disable us.

2. Nor to alienate temples, lands, goods, or utensils, when providence maketh it needful to the church's good; so the fire in London hath caused a diminution of the number of churches: so some bishops of old, sold the church plate to relieve the poor: and some princes have sold some church-lands to save the church and state in the necessities of a lawful war.

3. It is not sacrilege to alienate that which man devoted, but God accepted not, nor owned as appropriate to him (which his prohibition of such a dedication is a proof of). As if a man devote his wife to chastity, or his son to the ministry against their wills: or if a man vow himself to the ministry that is unable and hath no call: or if so much lands or goods be consecrated, as is superfluous, useless, and injurious to the common welfare and the state. Alienation in these cases is no sin.

Quest. clxxii. Are all religious and private meetings, forbidden by rulers, unlawful conventicles? Or are any such necessary?

Answ. Though both such meetings and our prisons tell us how greatly we now differ about this point, in the application of it to persons and our present case, yet I know no difference in the doctrinal resolution of it among most sober Christians at all: (which makes our case strange.)

For aught I know, we are agreed,

I. 1. That it is more to the honour of the church, and of religion, and of God, and more to our safety and edification, to have God's worship performed solemnly, publicly, and in great assemblies, than in a corner, secretly, and with few.

2. That it is a great mercy therefore where the rulers allow the church such public worship.

3. That 'cæteris paribus' all Christians should prefer such public worship before private; and no private meetings should be kept up, which are opposite or prejudicial to such public meetings.

4. And therefore if such meetings (or any that are unnecessary to the ends of the ministry, the service of God and good of souls,) be forbidden by lawful rulers, they must be forborne.

II. But we are also agreed, 1. That it is not the place but the presence of the true pastors and people that make the church.

2. That God may be acceptably worshipped in all places when it is our duty.

3. That the ancient churches and Christians in times of persecutions, ordinarily met in secret against the ruler's will, and their meetings were called coæventicles, (and slandered, which occasioned Pliny's examination, and the right he did them).

4. That no minister must forsake and give over his work while there is need, and he can do it?

---

5. That where there are many thousands of ignorant and ungodly persons, and the public ministers, either through their paucity, (proportioned to the people,) or their disability, unwillingness, or negligence, or all, are insufficient for all that public and private ministerial work, which God hath appointed for the instruction, persuasion, and salvation of such necessitous souls, there is need of more ministerial help.

6. That in cases of real (not counterfeit) necessity, they that are hindered from exercising their ministerial office publicly, should do it privately, if they have true ordination, and the call of the people's necessity, desire, and of opportunity; so be it they do it in that peaceable, orderly, and quiet manner, as may truly promote the interest of religion, and detract not from the lawful public ministry and work.

7. That they that are forbidden to worship God publicly, unless they will commit some certain sin, are so prohibited as that they ought not to do it on such terms.

8. That the private meetings which are held on these forementioned terms, in such cases of necessity, are not to be forsaken, though prohibited: though still the honour of the magistrate is to be preserved, and obedience given him in all lawful things. And such meetings are not sinful nor dishonourable (to the assemblers;) for as Tertullian (and Dr. Heylin after him) saith, 'Cum pii, cum boni coeunt, non factio dicenda est, sed curia.' 'When pious, and good people meet, (especially as aforesaid,) it is not to be called a faction, but a court.' Thus far I think we all agree.

And that the church of England is really of this mind is certain; 1. In that they did congregate in private themselves, in the time of Cromwell's usurpation, towards the end when he began to restrain the use of the Common Prayer. 2. In that they wrote for it: see Dr. Hide "Of the Church," in the beginning. 3. Because both in the reign of former princes, since the reformation, and to this day, many laborious conforming ministers, have still used to repeat their sermons in their houses, where many of the people came to hear them. 4. Because the liturgy alloweth private baptism, and restraineth not any number from being pre-

---

1 Tim. ii. 8. Acts viii. 4. 1 John iii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 1—S. Heb. x. 25.
See much of this case handled before Quest. 109, 110.
sent, nor the minister from instructing them in the use of baptism, (which is the sum of Christianity). 5. Because the liturgy commandeth the visitation of the sick, and alloweth the minister there to pray and instruct the person according to his own ability, about repentance, faith in Christ, and preparation for death and the life to come, and forbideth not the friends and neighbours of the sick to be present. 6. Because the liturgy and canons allow private communion with the sick, lame, or aged that cannot come to the assembly; where the nature of that holy work is to be opened, and the eucharistical work to be performed; and some must be present, and the number not limited. 7. And as these are express testimonies, that all private meetings are not disallowed by the church of England, so there are other instances of such natural necessity as they are not to be supposed to be against. As, (1.) For a captain to pray, and read Scripture or good books, and sing psalms with his soldiers, and with mariners at sea, when they have no minister. (2.) There are many thousands and hundred thousands in England, that some live so far from the church, and some are so weak that they can seldom go, and some churches have not room for a quarter of the parish; and none of the thousands now meant can read, and so neither can help themselves, nor have a minister that will do it; and thousands that when they have heard a sermon cannot remember it, but lose it presently. If these that cannot read or remember, nor teach their own families, nor go to church, do take their families, many of them, to some one neighbour's house where the sermon is repeated, or the Bible or liturgy read, methinks the church should not be against it.

But it must be still remembered, that, 1. Rulers that are infidels, Papists, heretics, or persecutors, that restrain church-meetings to the injury of men's souls, must be distinguished from pious princes that only restrain heretics and real schismatics for the church's good. 2. And that times of heresy and schism may make private meetings more dangerous than quiet times. And so even the Scottish church forbad private meetings in the Separatists' days of late. And when they do more hurt than good, and are justly forbidden, no doubt in that case, it is a duty to obey and to forbear them, as is aforesaid.
Quest. clxxiii. What particular directions for order of studies, and books should be observed by young students?

Because disorder is so great a disadvantage to young students, and because many have importuned me to name them some few of the best books, because they have no time to read, nor money to buy many, I shall here answer these two demands.

I. The order of their studies is such as respecteth their whole lives, or such as respecteth every day. It is the first which I now intend.

Direct. 1. The knowledge of so much of theology as is necessary to your own duty and salvation, is the first thing which you are to learn, (when you have learnt to speak). Children have souls to save; and their reason is given them to use for their Creator's service and their salvation. 1. They can never begin to learn that too soon which they were made and redeemed to learn, and which their whole lives must be employed in practising. 2. And that which absolute necessity requireth, and without which there is no salvation. 3. And that which must tell a man the only ultimate end which he must intend, in all the moral actions of his life. For the right intention of our end is antecedent to all right use of means; and till this be done, a man hath not well begun to live, nor to use his reason; nor hath he any other work for his reason, till this be first done. He liveth but in a continual sin, that doth not make God and the public good, and his salvation his end. Therefore they that would not have children begin with divinity, would have them serve the devil and the flesh. God must be our first and last, and all.

Not that any exact or full body or method of divinity is to be learnt so early. But 1. The baptismal covenant must be well opened betime, and frequently urged upon their hearts. 2. Therefore the creed, the Lord's prayer, and decalogue, must be opened to such betime; that is, they must be wisely catechised. 3. They must be taught the Scripture history, especially Genesis and the Gospel of Christ. 4. They must with the other Scriptures, read the most plain and suitable books of practical divines (after named). 5. They must be kept in the company of suitable, wise, and
exemplary Christians, whose whole conversation will help them to the sense and love of holiness; and must be kept strictly from perverting, wicked company. 6. They must be frequently, lovingly, familiarly, yet seriously, treated with about the state of their own souls, and made to know their need of Christ and of his Holy Spirit, of justification and renovation. 7. They must be trained up in the practice of godliness, in prayer, pious speeches, and obedience to God and man. 8. They must be kept under the most powerful and profitable ministers of Christ that can be had. 9. They must be much urged to the study of their own hearts; to know themselves; what it is to be a man, to have reason, freewill, and an immortal soul: what it is to be a child of lapsed Adam, and an unregenerate, unpardoned sinner: what it is to be a redeemed, and a sanctified, justified person, and an adopted heir of life eternal. And by close examination to know which of these conditions is their own; to know what is their daily duty; and what their danger, and what their temptations and impediments, and how to escape.

For if once the soul be truly sanctified, then, 1. Their salvation is much secured, and the main work of their lives is happily begun, and they are ready to die safely whenever God shall call them hence. 2. It will possess them with a right end, in all the studies and labours of their lives; which is an unspeakable advantage, both for their pleasing of God and profiting of themselves and others; without which they will but profane God's name and Word, and turn the ministry into a worldly, fleshly life, and study and preach for riches, preferment, or applause, and live as he, Luke xii. 18, 19. "Soul, take thy ease, eat, drink, and be merry;" and they will make theology the way to hell, and study and preach their own condemnation. 3. A holy heart will be always under the greatest motives; and therefore will be constantly and powerfully impelled (as well in secret as before others) to diligence in studies and all good endeavours. 4. And it will make all sweet and easy to them, as being a noble work, and relishing of God's love, and the endless glory to which it tendeth. A holy soul will all the year long be employed in sacred studies and works, as a good stomach at a feast, with constant pleasure! And then O how happily will all
go on! When a carnal person with a dull, unwilling, weary mind, taketh now and then a little, when his carnal interest itself doth prevail against his more slothful, sensual inclinations; but he never followeth it with hearty affections, and therefore seldom with good success. 4. And a holy soul will be a continual treasury and fountain of holy matter, to pour out to others, when they come to the sacred ministry; so that such a one can say more from the feeling and experience of his soul, than another can in a long time gather from his books. 5. And that which he saith will come warm to the hearers, in a more lively, experimental manner, than usual carnal preachers speak. 6. And it is more likely to be attended by a greater blessing from God. 7. And there are many controversies in the church, which an experienced, holy person, ('ceteris paribus') hath great advantage in, above all others, to know the right, and be preserved from errors.

Direct. ii. ‘Let young men’s time (till about eighteen, nineteen, or twenty,) be spent in the improvement of their memories, rather than in studies that require much judgment.’ Therefore let them take that time to get organical knowledge; such as are the Latin and Greek tongues first and chiefly, and then the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic; with the exactest acquaintance with the true precepts of logic: and let them learn some epitome of logic without book. In this time also let them be much conversant in history, both civil, scholastical, (of philosophers, orators, poets, &c.) and ecclesiastical. And then take in as much of the mathematics as their more necessary studies will allow them time for; (still valuing knowledge according to the various degrees of usefulness).

Direct. iii. When you come to seek after more abstruse and real wisdom, join together the study of physics and theology; and take not your physics as separated from or independent on theology, but as the study of God in his works, and of his works as leading to himself. Otherwise you will be but like a scrivener or printer, who maketh his letters well, but knoweth not what they signify.

Direct. iv. Unite all ‘οντολογία’ or knowledge of real entities into one science; both spirits and bodies; God be-
ing taken in as the first and last, the original, director and end of all: and study not the doctrine of bodies alone, as separated from spirits; for it is but an imaginary separation, and a delusion to men’s minds. Or if you will call them by the name of several sciences, be sure you so link those severals together that the due dependance of bodies on spirits, and of the passive natures on the active may still be kept discernible; and then they will be one while you call them divers.

Direct. v. When you study only to know what is true, you must begin at the ‘Primum cognoscibile,’ and so rise ‘in ordine cognoscendi:’ but when you would come to see things in their proper order, by a more perfect, satisfying knowledge, you must draw up a synthetical scheme, ‘juxta ordinem essendi,’ where God must be the first and last; the first efficient Governor and End of all.

Direct. vi. Your first study of philosophy therefore should be, of yourselves; to know a man. And the knowledge of man’s soul is a part so necessary, so near, so useful, that it should take up both the first and largest room in all your physics, or knowledge of God’s works: labour therefore to be accurate in this.

Direct. vii. With the knowledge of yourselves join the knowledge of the rest of the works of God; but according to the usefulness of each part to your moral duty; and as all are related to God and you.

Direct. viii. Be sure in all your progress that you keep a distinct knowledge of things certain and things uncertain, searchable and unsearchable, revealed and unrevealed; and lay the first as your foundation, yea, rather keep the knowledge of them as your science of physics by itself, and let no obscurity in the rest cause you to question certain things; nor ever be so perverse as to try things known, by things unknown, and to argue ‘à minus notis.’ Lay no stress on small or doubtful things.

Direct. ix. Metaphysics as now taken is a mixture of organical and real knowledge; and part of it belongeth to logic (the organical part), and the rest is theology, and pneumatology, and the highest parts of ontology, or real science.

Direct. x. In studying philosophy, I. See that you nei-
ther neglect any helps of those that have gone before you, under pretence of taking nothing upon trust, and of studying the naked things themselves; (for if every man must begin all anew, as if he had been the first philosopher, knowledge will make but small proficiency). 2. Nor yet stick in the bare belief of any writer whatsoever, but study all things in their naked natures and proper evidences, though by the helps that are afforded you by others. For it is not science, but human belief, else, whoever you take it from.

Direct. x1. So certain are the numerous errors of philosophers, so uncertain a multitude of their assertions, so various their sects, and so easy is it for any to pull down much which the rest have built, and so hard to set up any comely structure that others in like manner may not cast down; that I cannot persuade you to fall in with any one sort or sect, who yet have published their sentiments to the world. The Platonists made very noble attempts in their inquiries after spiritual beings; but they run into many unproved fanaticisms, and into divers errors, and want the desirable helps of true method. The wit of Aristotle was wonderful for subtility and solidity; his knowledge vast; his method (oft) accurate; but many prevarious, yea, erroneous conceptions and assertions, are so placed by him, as to have a troubling and corrupting influence into all the rest: the Epicureans or Democratists, were still and justly the contempt of all the sober sects; and our late Somatists that follow them, yea, and Gassendus, and many that call themselves Cartesians, yea, Cartesius himself, much more Berigardus, Regius and Hobbes, do give so much more to mere matter and motion, than is truly due, and know or say so much too little of spirits, active natures, vital powers, which are the true principles of motion, that they differ as much from true philosophers, as a carcase or a clock from a living man. The Stoics had noble ethical principles, and they (and the Platonists with the Cynics,) were of the best lives; but their writings are most lost, and little of their physics fully known to us, and that also hath its errors. Patricius is but a Platonist so taken with the nature of light, as insisting on that in fanatical terms, to leave out a
great deal more that must be conjoined. Telesius doth the like by heat and cold, heaven and earth, and among many observable things, hath much that is unsound and of ill consequence. Campanella hath improved him, and hath many hints of better principles (especially in his primalies) than all the rest: but he fanatically runs them up into so many unproved and vain, yea, and mistaken superstructures, as that no true body of physics can be gathered out of all his works. The attempt that pious Commenius hath made in his small manual hath much that is of worth; but far short of accurateness. The Hermetical philosophers have no true method of philosophy among them; and to make their three or five principles to be so many elements, or simple bodies, constituting all compounds, and form up a system of philosophy on their suppositions, will be but a trifle and not to satisfy judicious minds; especially considering how defective their philosophy is made by their omissions. Lullius and his followers fit not their method to the true order of the matter. Scaliger, Scheggius, Wendeline and Sennertus (especially in his Hypomnemata) were great men, and have many excellent things; but too much of Aristotle's goeth for current with them. My worthy, learned and truly pious friend Mr. Sam. Gott in his new book on Gen. i. hath many excellent notions, and much that is scarce elsewhere to be met with: but the tedious paragraphs, the defect of method, and several unproveable particulars, make it like all human works imperfect.

Therefore if I must direct you according to my judgment, I must advise you, 1. To suppose that philosophers are all still in very great darkness, and there is much confusion, defectiveness, error and division, and uncertainty among them. 2. Therefore addict not yourselves absolutely to any sect of them. 3. Let your first studies of them all leave room for the changing of your judgment, and do not too hastily fix on any of their sentiments as sure, till you have heard what others say, and with ripened understandings have deeply and long studied the things themselves. 4. Choose out so much of the certainties and useful parts of physics as you can reach to, and make them know their places in subserviency to your holy principles and ends;
and rather be well content with so much, than to lose too much time in a vain fatiguing of your brains for more.

I have made some attempt to draw out so much, especially 'de mundo et de homine,' in my "Methodus Theologicæ," though I expect it should no more satisfy others, than any of their's have satisfied me.

Direct. xi. When you have well stated your ontology or real science, then review your logic and organical part of metaphysics; and see that 'verba rebus aptentur;' fetch then your words and organical notions from the nature of the things. Abundance are confounded by taking up logical notions first which are unsuitable to true physical beings.

Direct. xii. Somewhat of ethics may be well learned of philosophers, but it is nothing to the Scripture's Christian ethics.

Direct. xiii. Somewhat of artificial rhetoric and oratory should be known: but the oratory which is most natural, from the evidence of things, well managed by a good understanding and elocution, which hath least of appearing art or affectation, is ever the most effectual, and of best esteem.

Direct. xiv. The doctrine of politics, especially of the nature of government and laws in general, is of great use to all that will ever understand the nature of God's government and laws, that is, of religion. Though there be no necessity of knowing the government and laws of the land or of other countries, any further than is necessary to our obedience or our outward concerns, yet so much of government and laws as nature and Scripture make common to all particular forms and countries, must be known by him that will understand morality or divinity, or will ever study the laws of the land. And it is a preposterous course, and the way of ignorance and error, for a divine to study God's laws, and a lawyer man's laws, before either of them know in general what a law, or what government is, as nature notifieth it to us.

Direct. xv. When you come to divinity, I am not for their way that would have you begin with the fathers, and
thence form a body of divinity to yourselves: if every young student must be put on such a task, we may have many religions quickly, but shall certainly have much ignorance and error. We must not be so blind or unthankful to God as to deny that later times have brought forth abundance of theological writings, incomparably more methodical, judicious, full, clear, and excellently fitted also by application, to the good of souls, than any that are known to us since the writing of the sacred Scriptures. Reverence of antiquity hath its proper place and use, but is not to make men fools, non-proficients, or contempters of God's greater mercies.

My advice therefore is, that you begin with a conjunction of English catechisms, and the confessions of all the churches, and the practical holy writings of our English divines: and that you never separate these asunder. These practical books do commonly themselves contain the principles, and do press them in so warm a working manner as is likest to bring them to the heart; and till they are there, they are not received according to their use, but kept as in the porch. Get then six or seven of the most judicious catechisms and compare them well together, and compare all the confessions of the churches, (where you may be sure that they put those which they account the weightiest and surest truths). And with them read daily the most spiritual heart-moving treatises, of regeneration, and our covenant with God in Christ, of repentance, faith, love, obedience, hope, and of a heavenly mind and life; as also of prayer and other particular duties, and of temptations and particular sins.

And when you have gone through the catechisms, read over three or four of the soundest systems of divinity. And after that proceed to some larger theses, and then to the study of the clearest and exactest methodists; and think not that you well understand divinity, till, 1. You know it as methodized and jointed in a due scheme, and the several parts of it in their several schemes, seeing you know not the beauty or the true sense of things, if you know them not in

* I mention not your reading the Scripture, as supposing it must be your constant work.
their proper places, where they stand in their several respects to other points: and, 2. Till it be wrought into your very hearts, and digested into a holy nature; for when all is done, it is only a holy and heavenly life, that will prove you wiser and make you happy, and give you solid peace and comfort.

Direct. xvi. When you have gone so far, set yourselves to read the ancients: 1. And take them in order as they lived. 2. Observe most the historical part, what doctrines, and practices 'de facto' did then obtain. 3. Some must be read wholly, and some but in part. 4. Councils and church-history here have a chief place.

Direct. xvii. With them read the best commentators on the Scriptures, old and new.

Direct. xviii. And then set yourselves to the study of church-controversies (though those that the times make necessary must be sooner looked into). Look first and most into those which your own consciences and practice require your acquaintance with: and above all here, read well those writings that confute atheists and infidels, and most solidly prove the truth of the Christian religion: and then those that defend the greatest points. And think not much to bestow some time and labour in reading some of the old school divines.

Direct. xix. When you come to form up your belief of certainties in religion, take in nothing as sure and necessary, which the ancient churches did not receive. Many other things may be taken for truths; and in perspicuity and method the late times much excel them; but Christian religion is still the same thing, and therefore we must have no other religion in the great and necessary parts than they had.

Direct. xx. Still remember, that men's various capacities do occasion a great variety of duties: some men have clear and strong understandings by nature; these should study things as much as books; for possibly they may excel and correct their authors. Some are naturally of duller or less judicious heads, that with no study of things can reach half so high, as they may do by studying the writings of those who are wiser than ever they are like to be. These must
take more on trust from their authors, and confess their weakness.

Direct. xxi. After or with all controversies, be well versed in the writings of those reconcilers, who pretend to narrow or end the differences. For usually they are such as know more than the contenders.

I proceed now to give you some names of books.

Quest. clxxiv. What books, especially of theology, should one choose, who for want of money or time, can read but few?

Answ. General. The truth is, 1. It is not the reading of many books which is necessary to make a man wise or good; but the well reading of a few, could he be sure to have the best. 2. And it is not possible to read over very many on the same subjects, without a great deal of loss of precious time; 3. And yet the reading of as many as is possible tendeth much to the increase of knowledge, and were the best way, if greater matters were not that way unavoidably to be omitted: life therefore being short, and work great, and knowledge being for love and practice, and no man having leisure to learn all things, a wise man must be sure to lay hold on that which is most useful and necessary. 4. But some considerable acquaintance with many books is now become by accident necessary to a divine. 1. Because unhappily a young student knoweth not which are the best, till he hath tried them; and when he should take another man's word, he knoweth not whose word it is that he should take: for among grave men, accounted great scholars, it is few that are truly judicious and wise, and he that is not wise himself cannot know who else are so indeed: and every man will commend the authors that are of his own opinion. And if I commend to you some authors above others, what do I but commend my own judgment to you, even as if I commended my own books, and persuaded you to read them; when another man of a different judgment will commend to you books of a different sort. And how knoweth a raw student which of us is in the right? 2. Because no man is so full and perfect as to say all that is said by all others; but though one man excel in one or many respects,
another may excel him in some particulars, and say that which he omitteth, or mistaketh in. 3. But especially because many errors and adversaries have made many books necessary to some, for to know what they say, and to know how to confute them, especially the Papists, whose way is upon pretence of antiquity and universality, to carry every controversy into a wood of church-history, and ancient writers, that there you may first be lost, and then they may have the finding of you: and if you cannot answer every corrupted or abused citation of their's out of councils and fathers, they triumph as if they had justified their church-tyranny. 4. And the very subjects that are to be understood are numerous, and few men write of all. 5. And on the same subject men have several modes of writing; as one excelleth in accurate method, and another in clear, convincing argumentation, and another in an affectionate, taking style: and the same book that doth one, cannot well do the other, because the same style will not do it.

Object. 'But the ancient fathers used not so many books as we do, no, not one for our hundreds: and yet we honour them above the Neotorics: they lived before these libraries had a being. Yea, they exhort divines to be learned in the Holy Scriptures, and the fourth council of Carthage forbad the reading of the heathens' books: and many heretics are accused by the fathers and historians, as being studied in logic, and curious in common sciences; and Paul saith, that the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation.'

Answ. 1. And yet the New Testament was written (or most of it) after the Scriptures which Paul is commonly supposed to mean, and some of it, after he said so, which sheweth that he meant not to exclude more writing.

2. The Scriptures are sufficient for their proper use, which is to be a law of faith and life, if they be understood. But 1. They are not sufficient for that which they were never intended for: 2. And we may by other books be greatly helped in understanding them.

3. If other books were not needful, teachers were not needful; for writing is but the most advantageous way of teaching by fixed characters, which fly not from our memory as transient words do. And who is it that understandeth the Scriptures that never had a teacher? And why said the
eunuch, "How should I (understand what I read) unless some man guide me?" And why did Christ set teachers in his church to the end, till it be perfected, if they must not teach the church unto the end? Therefore they may write unto the end.

4. Reverence to antiquity must not make us blind or unthankful. Abundance of the fathers were unlearned men, and of far less knowledge than ordinary divines have now; and the chief of them were far short in knowledge of the chiefest that God of late hath given us. And how should it be otherwise, when their helps were so much less than ours?

5. Knowledge hath abundantly increased since printing was invented; therefore books have been a means to it.

6. The fathers then wrote voluminously; therefore they were not against more writing.

7. Most of the bishops and councils that cried down common learning, had little of it themselves, and therefore knew not how to judge of it; no more than good men now that want it.

8. They lived among heathens that gloried so in their own learning, as to oppose it to the Word of God, (as may be seen in Julian, and Porphyry, and Celsus): therefore Christians opposed it, and contemned it; and were afraid while it was set in competition with the Scriptures, lest it should draw men to infidelity, if overvalued.

9. And finally, the truth is, that the sacred Scriptures are now too much undervalued, and philosophy much overvalued by many both as to evidence and usefulness; and a few plain, certain truths which all our catechisms contain, well pressed and practised, would make a better church and Christians, than is now to be found among us all. And I am one, that after all that I have written, do heartily wish that this were the ordinary state of our churches. But yet by accident much more is needful, as is proved; 1. For the fuller understanding of these principles: 2. For the defending of them (especially by those that are called to that work): 3. To keep a minister from that contempt which may else frustrate his labours: 4. And to be ornamental and subservient to the substantial truths.

1 Acts viii. 31.  
2 Eph. iv. 11—13.
I. I will name you the poorest or smallest library that is tolerable.

II. The poorer (though not the poorest); where a competent addition is made.

III. The poor man’s library, which yet addeth somewhat to the former, but cometh short of a rich and sumptuous library.

I. The poorest library is, 1. The Sacred Bible. 2. A Concordance (Downname’s the least, or Newman’s the best). 3. A sound Commentary or Annotations, either Diodates, the English Annotations, or the Dutch. 4. Some English catechisms, (the Assemblies’ two, Mr. Gouge’s, Mr. Crook’s Guide,) Amesius’s Medulla Theologiae, et Casus Conscientiae (which are both in Latin and English), and his Bellarminus Enervatus. 5. Some of the soundest English books which open the doctrine of grace, justification, and free-will and duty; as Mr. Truman’s Great Propitiation, Mr. Bradshaw of Justification, Mr. Gibbon’s Sermon of Justification, in the Morning Exercises at St. Giles in the Fields, Mr. Hotchkis of Forgiveness of Sin. 6. As many affectionate practical English writers as you can get; especially Mr. Richard Allen’s Works, Mr. Gurnall’s, Dr. Preston, Dr. Sibbs, Mr. Robert Bolton, Mr. Whateley, Mr. Reyner, Mr. Scudder, Mr. T. Ford, Mr. Howe of Blessedness, Mr. Swinnock, Mr. Gouge’s, The Practice of Piety, The Whole Duty of Man, Dr. Hammond’s Practical Catechism, Dr. Pearson on the Creed, Dr. Downname on the Lord’s Prayer, Mr. Dod on the Commandments, Bishop Andrews on the Commandments, Mr. Joseph Brinsley’s True Watch, Mr. Greenham’s Works, Mr. Hildersham’s Works, Mr. Anthony Burgess’s Works, Mr. Perkin’s Works, Dr. Harris’s Works, Mr. Burrough’s, Mr. Thomas Hooker, Mr. Pinke’s Sermons, J. Downname’s Christian Warfare, Richard Rogers, John Rogers of Faith and Love, Dr. Stoughton, Dr. Thomas Tailor, Mr. Elton, Mr. Daniel Dike, Jeremy Dike, Mr. J. Ball of Faith, of the Covenant, &c., Culverwell of Faith, Mr. Ranew, Mr. Teate, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Rawlet, Mr. Janeway, Mr. Vincent, Mr. Doelittle, Mr. Samuel Ward’s Sermons, Mr. W. Fenner, Mr. Rutherford’s Letters, Mr. Jos. Allein’s

II. When you can get more, the next rank must have all the former with these additions following.

I. For lexicons: 1. For Latin besides Goldman, or Ho- lyoke, or rather Hutton's Morellius, or Cowper, get Mar- tinii Onomasticon: 2. For Greek, Scapula, Pasor, Simpson and Henricpetri Lexicon. 3. For Hebrew, Buxtorf, Schind- ler, Leigh.

II. For logic: 1. Fasciculus Logicus, or Smith, Keck- erman, Burgersdicius. 2. Of the moderate Ramists, that take in both, Henry Gutherleth.


IV. More particularly, De Anima: Tolet, Melancthon, with Vives and Amerbachius (they are printed together in one book), Sennerti Hypomnemata, Scaliger's Exercita- tiones.
V. De Corpore Humano: Galen, Fernelius, Bartholine, Harvy de Generatione Animalium.
VI. De Motu: Mousnerius, Dr. Wallis.
VII. Of astronomy: Gassendus, Riolanus.
VIII. Of geography: Cluverius, or Abbot, Orcelius, Mercator, Heylin, the globe or map Geogr. Nubiens.
IX. Of mathematics in general: Euclid, Barrow, Rami Schol. cum prolegem., Snellii, Bettinus, Herigone.
X. Arithmetic in particular: Record, Wingate, &c.
XI. Geometry: Ramus cum comment. Snellii, and Schoneri, Metii, Dr. Wallis, &c.
XIV. Particular history is endless: among so many I scarce know what to say more, than read as many as you can; especially,
1. The Roman historians, (which are joined together).
2. The Greek historians.
3. Diog. Laertius and Eunapius de vitis Philosoph.
6. Of France, Thuanus, (who also taketh in most of the European history of his time) Commines, Serres.
8. Of Germany, the Collections of Pistorius, Ruberus and Freherus.
9. Of Italy, Guicciardine.
11. Of Abassia, Godignus, and Damianus a Goes.
12. Of Judea, George Sandys's Travels, and Brocardus.
13. Of Armenia and Tartary, Haitho Armenius, and the rest in the Novus Orbis, especially Paulus Venetus there.
14. Of Africa and India, Leo Afer, and Ludovicus Romanus.
16. Of Indostan, Terry.
17. Of Muscovy, Sigismundus.
18. Of Sweden, Olaus Magnus (but fabulous).


XVI. Of medicine, study no more than such as Horstius de Sanitate Studiosorum Tuenda, or Follinus, or Graterrulus, or an Herbal, except you can go quite through with it; lest by a half skill you kill yourself or others: but take 1. Sufficient exercise ‘ad sudorem, (aliquando lariorem, in habitu seroso vel pituitoso).’ 2. Temperance. 3. A pleased and contented mind. 4. Warmth, and avoiding inward and outward cold: 5. And experience for your best physic; and meddle with no more without necessity, and the advice of a very able, experienced man.

XVII. Of politics, and civil law, and ethics, read Besoldus, Willius, Danæus, Fragoso de Reg. Rep., Mr. Lawson’s Theological Works, Angelius, Dr. Zouch, Grotius de Jure Belli, Mnysynger’s Institut., Wesembecius, Calvin’s Lexicon, Eustachius’s Ethics and Pemble’s.

XVIII. For methods of divinity, read Pæsus’s edition of Ursine, Trelcatius, Amesii Medulla, Musculi Locci Communies, Dr. Tully, Georg. Sohnies, Tzegedine’s Tables, Cal-
vin's Institutions, or Colonius's abbreviation of him, Lawson's Theopolitica, Wollebius, Cluto's Idea Theolog.


XX. Commentators (besides the forenamed Annotations), Beza, and Piscator, Junii et Tremellii Annot., Dr. Hammond, Grotius in Evang., Calvin, especially in Nov. Test., or Marlorate's Collection on Gen. Psal. Isa. and N. Test., which containeth Calvin, with others, Mr. Pool's Critics, Ainsworth, Mollerus, Willet, Paræus, Musculus, Lyra, Estius, Jansenius, Chemnitius Harm., Mr. Cradock's Harm., Maldonate, Lorinus, Dixon, Hutchinson, Drusius, Picherelli Opuscula.


XXII. Helps to understand the Scriptures: Broughton's Consent of Scripture, Usher of the Septuagint, &c.


XXV. Councils: Lydias Caranza, Crab, Binnius, Spelman, Justellus, Synod. Dordr.


XXVIII. Helps to know and understand the Fathers: Sculteti Medulla Patrum, Cocu's Censura Patrum, Rivet's


XXX. Controversies, (besides the forementioned against heathens and infidels).


4. Of justification, enow are named before, xviii., spe- cially Le Blanc, also Pemble, Bishop Downname, Warren.

5. The Antinomian and Libertine controversies: pro. Dr. Crisp, Maccovius in quibusdam, Saltmarsh, Crandon, Paul Hobson, Den, Town, Eaton.

Contr. Gataker, Ball of the Covenant, Anth. Burgess; all the writers of justification before praised, xviii.; Weld's History of Antinomians.


Pro. Church, Marshall, Whiston, Blake.

Pro. Dr. Young, Eaton, Cawdrey, and Palmar, Dr. Twisse, Hughes, Sprint, Dr. Owen, Mr. George Abbot, Shephard.


Pro. Petavius, Saravia, George Downname, Bilson, Hooker, Whitgift, Dr. Hammond.


Contr. Cartwright, Parker of the Cross, Bradshaw's Twelve Arguments, &c., Amesius against Morton, and his Fresh Suit against Burgess, Nicols, the Savoy Prop.

Against the new additions, little is said yet, through the restraint of the law, except by Mr. Daniel Cawdrey, and a Latin Apology, and Mr. Crofton, and Dr. Collins of the Covenant, and some things thrust out secretly, which contain but little of the true state of the case.


Contr. Beza, Gillespie's Aaron's Rod, and Nihil Respondes, Hammond of the Keys.

11. Of separation: pro. Johnson, Canne, Ainsworth; and for semi-separation, (from liturgy and sacraments, but not from sermons,) Robinson.


Contr. J. Ball, Rutherfurd, the Assembly's Reply, the London Ministers' Jus Divinum Presbyterii, Cawdrey against Dr. Owen, &c., Ben. Camfield against Dr. Owen's Catechism.
XXXI. Conciliators. 1. Between discordant Christians in general; Jacobi Acontii Stratagemata Satanæ, Usher in Eph. iv. 3., old Vincentius Lirinensis, Ruperti Meldenii Parænensis; a Socinian Veritas Pacifica, (and many such of theirs proposing ill terms.)


III. I have gone so far in this second rank, that I must add but a few more for the third, lest I go above a poor man's library.

1. Add when you can to your lexicons, Morellius or Cowper, Beckman de Orig. Verb., Phavorinus and Hesychius, and Dr. Castle's Oriental Lexicon.

II. To logicians, Downname, Dietericus, Lublin, Smiggletius, with Aristotle, Claubergerius.
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VI. Of metaphysics: Scheibler, Suarez, Timpler, Burgersdicius, Senguerdibus, Jacchæus, Gorlæus, Ritschel, Campanela, Meurisse.


IX. Medicine. Herbals; Matthiolus, Johnson, Gerard, Parkinson, Langham, Monardus. Dispensatories; London Physicians’, Schroderus. Anatomists befolemamed, and Knoblochius. Practitioners; Hippocrates, Galen, Cel-

But the chief treatises of medicine are those that treat of particular diseases or kinds; as Carolus Piso de Morbis Serosis, Egaalenus, Martinius, Sennertus, &c. de Scorbuto, Dr. Sidenham de Febribus, Dr. Glisson de Rachitide, Wil- lis de Fermentatione et de Febribus, Cattierus de Rheuma- tismo, Marcucciis, &c. de Melancholia, Schmuzen, &c. de Calculo, Capellutus de Bubon., Guarencier's de Tabe Anglica. It is too long to name all.


To ethics, Buridane, More, Wendeline, Danæus, Gataker's Antonine, Seneca, Plutarch's Morals.


XII. Choice treatises: Parker de Descensu ad inferos, Garbut of the Resurrection of Christ, Bullinger de Orig. Errorum, Martinius de Symbol. et alia., Olevian de fœdere, Sanderson de Juram., Pemble's Works, all Mede's Works, Rivet's Select Disputations, Zanchii Opera, Dr. Field, all Dallæus, and Blondel, Turretine de Satisfactione.

XIII. Commentators: Davenant in Colos., Martyr in Rom. and Cor., Pelargus in Matt., Fayus, Scultetus, Crocius in Eph., Luther in Galat., Sclater in Thess., Cartwright and Fulke on the Rhemists' Notes, Arth. Jackson's Annot.,
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XVI. Cases of Conscience more: Filiiucius, Tolet de Sacerdot., Reginald, Cajetan, Navarrus. See Montaltus against the Jesuits’ casuists, and the Jesuits’ morals. Downe’s and Whateley’s Tables on the Commandments, Sanderson de Juramento, and Fragoso aforesamed.


XVIII. More of the fathers I need not name; if you can get and read them, you may find their names, e. g. in Bellarmin. de Script. Eccles. Get the Bibliothec. Patrum of de la Bigne, and Macarius Hom., Ephrem Syrus, (plain honest things,) Theodoret, Cyril Hieros., Cyril Alexand., Isidore Pelusiota, Theophylact and Oecumenius, Sedulius and Primasius, Remigius, Beda, &c. But many of them are very weak and dry. The chief use of the fathers is to know historically what doctrine was then taught.

XIX. Schoolmen more: Bonaventure, Alensis, Cajetan, Bannez, Biel, Cameracensis, Franc. Mayro, Capreolus, R. Armachanus; Bradwardine, Faber Fwantimus, Hervæus, John and Fr. Pici Mirandula, Fr. Victoria, Suarez, Vasquez, Albertinus in Thom. Aquila Scottellus: Ripalda nameth more if you would have more.


Note 1. That these may seem too many, though they are few to a full and rich library.

2. That it is not my advice that you read over all these, or half; for that would but make them a snare for sinning, and waste of time: but a minister of the Gospel should have more books by him than he can read over, for particular uses, and to see the author's judgment occasionally, and to try other men's citations.

3. That a minister must neither study the matter without the help of other men's studies by reading much; nor yet read much without studying the thing itself.

1 He that would have more books may see Voetius Bibliothec. and many other catalogues.
4. That though a man must not speak or write before he knoweth what and how, yet thus exercising the knowledge that we have doth greatly increase it. And no minister must be studying, when he should be preaching, praying, catechizing, or visiting, or instructing his flock.

5. It is but few men that are born with an acumen fit for writings and controversies: those few must read the more to be fit for it: the rest may take up with such preparations as they have use for, and exercise them, viz. in the pastoral oversight of the flocks, and propagating plain and necessary truths. And therefore though I am one that have been thought to burden men's understandings with methods, distinctions, directions, and controversies, it is but few that I persuade to use them; and am as much as any for most men's adhering to plain fundamentals, and truths of daily use, and honour those that go no further, and are faithful in this work; so be it they have not the pride to think that they know more than they do, and to wrangle against that which they understand not, and set not the church on fire as ancient ignorance did, by accusing those of heresy that knew more than themselves, when they got but the throne or the major vote.

6. That though I chiefly commend systems of theology, I know not one whose method satisfieth me, as well agreeing with Scripture, and the matter, (else I had not troubled myself so much to seek a right method, and propose what I found). And I think no common method more genuine, than theirs that expound the creed, Lord's prayer, and decalogue, and the sacraments, as the sum of all.

7. I mention none of my own writings, for it will seem vanity: but, as many as they are, I wrote none which I thought needless at the time of writing them.

8. Though none should have so great fitness for the holy education of children and government of families as ministers, yet so great is the work of overseeing the flock, requiring more time and parts than all that we have, and so great are the matters of our studies and labours, requiring our total and most serious thoughts that I earnestly advise all that can possibly, to live single and without a family, lest
they mar their work by a divided mind: For 'nunquam bene fit, quod fit præoccupato animo,' saith Hierom truly.

The whole man and whole time is all too little in so great a work.

END OF THE THIRD PART, AND OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.