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Reverend Brethren,

When after the effects of our calamitous divisions, the rejoicing Nation supposed they had been united, in our King newly restored (by a General and Army which had been fighting against him, invited & strengthened by the City, & many others) Can an Act of Oblivion seemed to have prepared for future amity; some little thought that men were about going further from each other than they were before: But the Malady was evident to such of us as were called to attempt a Cure, and neither the Causes nor the Prognosticks hard to be known. A certain and cheap Remedy was obvious; but no Pleas, no Petitions, could get men to accept it. The Symptomes then threatened far worse than yet hath come to pass, God being more merciful to us than mistaken men. We were then judged criminal for foreseeing and foretelling what Fruit the Seed then sown would bring forth: And since then the Sowers say the Foretellers are the cause of all. We quickly saw, that instead of hoping for any Concord, and healing of the Bones which then were broken, it
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would become our Care and too hard work, to endeavour
to prevent a greater breach. Though we thought Two
Thousand such Ministers as were silenced would be mist,
when others thought it a blessing to be rid of them, we
then feared, and some hoped, that no small number more
would follow them.

It was not you that cast such out; nor is it you that
wish the continuance and increase of the Causes. We agree
with you in all points of the Christian Reformed Religi-
on: and concerning the evil of all the sins which we fear
by Conforming to commit, though we agree not of the
meaning of those Oaths, Promises, Professions, and PRA-
ctiscs, which are the matter feared. We live in unfeign-
ed Love and Communion with those that love Truth, Ho-
liness and Peace, notwithstanding such differences as
these. God hath not laid our Salvation or Communion
upon our agreeing about the meaning of every word or
Sentence in the Bible, much less on our agreeing of the
sense of every word in all the Laws and Canons of men.

Two things we earnestly request of you, for the sake
of the Christian Religion, this trembling Nation, and
your own and others Souls. 1. That you will in your
Parish Relations seriously use your best endeavours to
promote true Godliness and Brotherly Love, and to
heal the sad Divisions of the Churches: We believe that
it must be much by the Parochial Ministers and Assem-
blies, that Piety and Protestant Verity must be kept
up: And what we may not do, we pray that you may
do it who are allowed. 2. That you will join with us
against all Foreign Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical or Civil.

The Party which we dread I have given you some ac-
count of in my Reply to Mr. Dodwell. By their Fruits
you may know them. 1. They are such as labour to make
our Breaches wider, by rendring those that they dissent
from
from odious, which commonly is by false accusations; They call out for Execution by the Sword against those that dare not do as they do, and cry, Go on, abate nothing; they are fa&ious Schismatics, rebellious: They might easily have learnt this Language, without staying long in the Universities, and without all the Brimstone Books that teach it them. An invisible Tutor can soon teach it them without Book. He that hateth his Brother is a murderer, and hath not eternal Life abiding in him. 2. They are for an universal humane Government, with power of Legislation and Judgment over the whole Christian World. How to call it they are not yet agreed, whether Aristocratical, or Monarchical, or mixt. Some of them say that it is in the Collegium Episcoporum, governing per Literas formatas, for fear lest if they say, It is in Councils, they should presently be confuted by the copious Evidence which we produce against them. And yet they may well think that men will ask them [When did all the Bishops on Earth make Laws for all the Christian World, or pass Sentences on Offenders without ever meeting together? And how came they to know each others minds? and which way the major Vote went? And what, and where are those Laws which we must all be governed by, which neither God nor Councils made? The Canons were all made by Councils.

If you say that I describe men so mad, as that I must be thought to wrong them, I now only ask you, whether our Case be not dismal when such men as you call mad, have power to bring us and keep us in our Divisions; or to do much towards it without much contradiction?

But others who know that such palpable darkness will not serve their cause, do openly say, that it is General Councils which are the Legislative and judging Gover-
nours to the whole Church on Earth, as one Political Body. For they know that we have no other Laws besides Gods and theirs, pretended to be made for all the World. But when the Cases opened by me in the Second part of my Key for Catholicks, and else where, do silence them, this Fort also is deserted by them. Even Albert. Pighius hath rendered it ridiculous. 1. If this be the specifying or unifying Head, or summa Potestas of the Universal Church, then it is not monarchical but Aristocratical. 2. Then the Church is no Church, when for hundreds of Years there are no General Councils, an essential part being wanting. And they that own but the 4 or 6 first General Councils, make the Church no Church, or to have been without its essentiating Government these Thousand Years. And by what proof, besides their incredible Word, can they tell the Church, that they are subject to the six first General Councils, and yet not to the seventh, eighth, ninth, or any since? 3. I have oft (against Johnson, and elsewhere,) proved that there never was an universal Council of all the Churches, but only of part of those in the Roman Empire; Were there no proof but from the recorded Names of the Callers of Councils, and all the Subscribers, it is unanswerable. 4. Who knows not that the Church is now divided into about Twelve Sects, all condemning one another? And that they are under the Power of various Princes, and many Enemies to Christianity, who will never agree to give them leave to travel to General Councils? And who shall call them, or how long time will you give the Bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, the Jacobites, Abassines, Nestorians, Armenians, Muscovites, and all the rest, to learn so much of each others Languages, as to debate intelligibly matters of such moment, as Laws for all the World must be. Twenty more such absurdities, make this
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this Aristocracy over all the World, as mad a conceit as
that forementioned: And when we know already what
the Christian Parties hold, and that the said Jacobites,
Nestorians, Armenians, Circassians, Mengrelians, Greeks,
Muscovites, &c. are far more than either Protestants or
Papists, do we not know that in Councils if they have free
Votes they will judge accordingly against both.

But this sort of men are well aware, that the Church
is always, but Councils are rare, and it's, at least, uncertain whether ever there will be more; and the Articles of the Church of England say, They may not be called without the Will of Princes; and the Church is now under so many contrary Princes as are never like to agree hereto. And they know that somebody must call them, and somebody must preside, &c. Therefore they are forced to speak out, and say, that the Pope is St. Peter's Successor, the prime Patriarch, and principium Unitatis, and must call Councils, and as President moderate and difference the lawful from the unlawful: And that in the Intervals of Councils he as Patriarch is to govern at least the West, and that every Diocesane being ex Officio, the Representer of his Diocess, and every Metropolitane of his Province, and every Patriarch of his Patriarchate, what these do all the Bishops on Earth do. And so the Riddle of a Collegium Pastorum is opened, and all cometh but to this, that the Italians are Papists, who would have the Pope rule Arbitrarily, as above Councils; but the French are no Papists, who would have the Pope rule only by the Canons or Church Parliaments, and to be singulis Major, at universis Minor. This is the true Reformation of Church-Government, in which the English should (by them) agree. And now you know what I am warning you to beware of.

We are for a twist & conjunction of the civil Power
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and the Ecclesiastical, and for Christian Kingdoms, and Churches, so far national as to be ruled and protected by Christian Kings, in the greatest Love and Concord that can be well obtained: And for Councils necessary to such ends: But we are not for setting up a Foreign Jurisdiction over King and Kingdom, Church and Souls, upon the false claim of incapable Usurpers. One of your selves in a small Book called, The whole Duty of Nations, and another, Dr. Isaac Barrow against Papal and all Foreign Jurisdiction, (published by Dr. Tillotson) have spoken our thoughts so fully, as that we only intreat you to take those for our sense, and concurr with us therein for our common Peace and Safety.

We reverence all Councils so far as they have done good; we are even for the Advice and Concord of Foreigners; but not their Jurisdiction.

If you know the difference between an Assembly of Princes consulting for Peace and Concord, and a Senate to govern all those Princes as their Subjects, you will know the difference between our Reverence to Foreign Councils, and the Obedience to them now challenged as the only way to avoid Schism. I hope you will join with us in being called Schismatics both to Italian and French Papists.

The great Instrument of such mens Design being to over-extol Councils called General, and to hide their Miscarriages, and so by false History to deceive their credulous party who cannot have while to search after the truth, I took it to be my Duty to tell such men the truth out of the most credible Historians, especially out of the Councils themselves as written by our greatest Adversaries; that they may truly know what such Bishops and Councils have done. Among others this exasperated a Writer, (by fame called Mr. Morrice,) who would make men believe that I have wronged Councils and Bishops, and
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and falsified History: and divers other accusations he brings, to which I have tendered you mine Answer. I have heard men reverence the English Synods, who yet thought that the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th Excommunicating Canons and the late Engines to cast out 2000 Ministers, proved them such to England as I will not denominate. I have heard men reverence the present Ministry and Universities, who yet have said, that they fear more hurt from the worse part of them to England, than they should do from an Army of Foreign Enemies whom we might resist.

I write much, and in great weakness and haste, and have not time for due perusal: And my judgment is rather to do it when I think it necessary, as I can, than not at all. And Mr. M. would make his Readers believe, when he hath found a word of Theodorens hastily mistaken, and Calami translated Quils, and such matter for a few trifling cavils, that he hath vindicated the Councils and Bishops, and proved me a false Historian.

And can we have a harder censure of General Councils than his own Reverend Lords and Patrons pass upon them, who tell us that there is but six of all the multitude to be owned. If all the rest are to be rejected, I think the faults of those six may be made known, against their Designs who would bring us under a Foreign Jurisdiction, by the art of over-magnifying General Councils.

I confess these men have great advantage against all that such as I can say; for they have got a sort of Followers who will take their words, and are far from having will or wit impartially themselves to read the Histories and try the case; but will swear that we are all Rogues and Schismaticks, and unfit to be suffered: And they have got young Reverend Priests, who can cry, away with them, execute the Laws; being conscious how much
less able they are to confute us, than the Gaoler is: But
this is but a Dream: The morning is near, when we shall
all awake. Perhaps you remember the jeasting story with
which Sagitarius begins the Preface to his Met-
aphysics: Indeed the hysterical suffocating Vapours do
ordinarily so work, that in a place of Perfumes or sweet-
ness the Women faint and swoon away as dead; and Ca-
story or Aa Pætida, called Stercus Diaboli, or such like
link, reviveth them like a Cordial. And worse vapours
affect the men we speak of: Motions of Love they can-
not bear; but reviling and false accusing Books and
Speeches are Food and Medicine to them.

One of my chief Controversies with Mr. M. is about
the Acts and Effects of the Councils of Ephefus and Cal-
cedon, about the Nestorian and Eutychian and Mono-
thelite Controversies. That the issue was most doleful Di-
visions of the Christian World, unhealed to this day, is
past the denial of sober men. Whether this was long of
the Bishops and Councils is the question. I have fully
proved that Nestorius, Cyril, and Dioscorus were all of
the same Faith and differed but in wording the same
sense: And if so, judge how much the World is beholden
to these Councils of Bishops: But this Mr. M. taketh for
a false Report.

Because it is our most important difference, I will here
give the Reader an account of the Effect of these Coun-
cils even to our times, in the great Empire of Habassia,
out of the much praised History of Job Ludolphus.

Lib. 3. c. 8. In order to declare the Religion of the Ha-
bassines be first declareth the Success of the Council of
Caledon, thus:— [Damnatus Dioscorus Patriarcha
Alexandrinus tanquam Eutychis Defensor & Hæresiar-
cha, verberibus quoque mulctatus & in exilium ejeaus
fuit, alio Patriarcha Catholico in locum ejus suffeeto—
Atrox
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Atrox exinde in Ecclesia Alexandrina Schisma, exinde & sanguine continuatum, in causa fuit, ut non solum multo maxima pars Ecclesiae Alexand. & reliqua Ecclesia Catholica avelleretur, sed & Aegyptus ipsa, attritis incolarum viribus, in Saracenorum poteslatem veniret; qui discordiæ Christianorum, utrosque oppresserunt; ut exiguum, proh dolor! vestigium Christianæ Religionis nunc in Aegypto supersit. Hæc atque alia talia Scriptores nostri.

And the loss of Egypt and the South, so strengthened the Enemies of Christianity, that this breach let in Destruction to the whole Christian Empire: But the loss of the whole Empire and Introduction of Mahometanism, in the Eyes of our fiery Canoneers, is no dishonour to these Councils: It is but saying, It was all long of Dioscorus, and the Hereticks: And were not these Hereticks also Prelates and Prelatical?

But he procedeth, ["But the Aethiopians thus report it, that Dioscorus and his Successors, and their followers did greatly complain of the Injury done them; for he neither followed Eutyches, nor ever denied or confounded the Divinity or Humanity really existing in Christ, but only was unwilling to acknowledg the word [Nature] to be common to the Divinity and Humanity of Christ; and only avoided this, left contrary to the mind of the Catholick Church, and the Decrees of the General Council at Ephesus, two persons of Christ should be asserted: For that would follow, if we admit Two Natures, and two Wills in Christ. And the word [quos] [Nature] signifying somewhat born or created, no way fitteth the Divinity: Nor can the mind conceive of two Wills, in two Natures united in one person, without Division, Separation, or Distance: And the Humane Nature exalted into the state of Glory, doth not will, do, or suffer the [ a 2 ] same"]
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"fame which it willed, did and suffered in the state of
"Examination; and so in the present state of Glory,
"the humanity doth neither will nor judge any thing
"but what the Divinity at once willeth and judgeth.
"And this being our known Judgment, the question
"seemeth idle, and a meer strife of Words, for which
"Christians should not have hated one another. At Cal-
"cedon they proceeded from Words to Blows, and
"fought more than they disputed: And Dioscorus was
"condemned absent, neither heard nor well understood,
"as obstinate and guilty of Hereusie in Hatred and En-
"vy rather than by right."

This is the Habassines Opinion of the Council and Con-
troversie, false no doubt in our Canoneers Judgment, (for
alas they are unlearned men;) but indeed much truer
and wiser than their Adversaries.

He proceedeth, 'Primo reperi omni dubio carere, quod
Habessini rejiciunt consilium Chalcedonense-- 2. Ob-
servavi eos in hoc errore esse, quasi Patres Concilii Calce-
ced. Hypostasin Christi dividere, & contra præcedens
Concilium Ephesinum ex una duas personas facere vo-
luerint-- Hanc ob causam damnant Leonem Papam, &
in coelum extollunt suum Dioscorum tanquam Ortho-
doxæ fidei hyperaspisten qui justo zelo diploma Leonis
ad fe datum dilaceravit; eumque Martyri assimilant, ob
accepta verbera, excuscos dentes & evulsum barbam.]
(But it eased the Spleen of the Bps. at present, and then
all the following los's seems tolerable.) He addeth, [4.Con-
stat ex multis locis, quod utrumque abstræctum, Divi-
nitatem & Humanitatem, conjunctim in Christo aperte
confiteantur. Quid autem hoc aliud est, quam agnosce-
re duas simul naturas in Christo. 5. Tellezius ex Rela-
tione Patrum societatis testatur [utrumque naturam]
reperiri in corum libris. 6. He shews that the Habassines
words
words have various signification, and by two natures, they mean two Persons.--Which (faith Ludolphus) when I read and consider, I find all to be confused and perplexed. There is no certain state of the question, and the words are out of measure equivocal. Perhaps Eutyches himself could not tell what sort of Nature was made of two, and what was its name, and what was its qualities: But that he was such a fool as to think that the Natures in Christ were so confused as Water is with Wine, and that in so absurd an Opinion he had most wise men agreeing with him; this almost exceedeth all belief: Certainly the Ethiopians are not guilty of so gross a Heresie. Wherefore I confess I cannot understand what those frequent Disputations were, which the Jesuits had with the Habassines, of two Natures in Christ, in which they say they had still the worse, being convicted by their own Books, which I easily believe, seeing they most willingly confess Christ's Divinity and Humanity. To me it seemeth likely only that they could not agree in words. Do but explain to them that by Natures in Christ we mean his Divinity and Humanity, & then ask them which Nature is it that faileth in Christ. Most certainly they will answer that neither the Divinity nor Humanity failed, but both continue eternally. And so it's plain, that they take the word Nature in a far other sense than we, and that the true state of the question with them is, whether and by what common Name the two abstracts are to be denominated, which they undoubtedly confess.

Now good Mr. Morrice, (with your Lords) you must pardon me, (or choose) for thinking that it is not necessary to Salvation, or to keep the Church from utter confusion, to be such Criticks in Grammar or Metaphysics, as to resolve the questions about the sense of Nature,
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ture, and Unity, or Duality, which you no better resolve your selves; I say, it is not necessary by Gods Law, but by the Councils: And if I be a Schismatick for holding that Christ's Universal Law is so sufficient for his Church, as that a Legislative Power in Councils to make such Laws as shall tear all to pieces the Churches for 1300 Tears, and teach our Holy Fathers to damn Millions of the Innocent, is not either necessary or desirable; a Schismatick I will continue.

Ludolphus proceeding to open the ambiguity of the words, addeth, [ A famous Country-man of ours, who 'anno 1634. dwelling in Egypt, read the Books of the 'Cophties (Pet. Heylin of Lubeck.) judged that [the 'Dissent of the Parties was more in their fear of the Se- 'quele, than in the matter itself: For the Greeks would 'obviate the Hereticks who confound Christs Divinity 'and Humanity: And the Cophties those who feign two 'Persons in Christ.] And it indeed this be the case, that 'the Fight either of old was, or still is only about the 'sense of words; verily no kind of Tears can be so sharp, as 'to suffice to weep for this unhappy Word-War; NoBreast 'can be so hard which would not mourn for the unhappy 'Contentions of them, to whom Christ by his own ex- 'ample solicitously commended the strictest Bond of Cha- 'rity: No mind can be so cruel, which for the name of ' [Nature] would loose the knot of Concord between 'those whose Nature the eternal Word assumeth into 'his most sacred Hypostasis.]

Fie, Mr. Ludolphus, can you so well describe Ethiopia, and no better know your Neighbours? Come into England and you may soon know the Reverend and Right Reverend, who will not only defend this Councils Acts, and condemn those that be not of their mind, but are ready to do the like themselves, and triumph over the thousands silenced
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Silenced, as they judge, for lesser things; yea, and make that Councils Canons such a Law to the Universal Church, as that all are Schismatics that obey it not.

But Ludolphus yet considering, addeth, But such is the Infirmity of our most corrupt Nature, that where once Ambition hath begun, and from Ambition Emulation, and from Emulation Envy, and from Envy Hatred, the mind possessed with (such) affections, no more perceiveth Truth, but as with Ears and Eyes shut up, neither heareth nor seeth, how or with what mind any thing is spoken or written by the other side.

O Sir, now I perceive you understand more than you seemed to do.

But yet the History is behind. The Pope hath long had a great desire to be the Church Governour of Habaffia, but could never come to know it, much less to bear Rule over it. At last the Portugals getting possession of some Maritime parts, whence with much difficulty it was possible to come to them, the Pope got them to help the Habaffines in a dangerous War which they had against their Neighbour Mahometanes and Heathens, on condition that the Habaffines would receive a Patriarch and Jesuits from Rome. The Portugals Guns, (which that Country had not) and their own necessity, made the Habaffines consent: The Roman Patriarch and Jesuits came over. The custom of Habaffia had long been to receive a Metropolitan called their Abuna, from the Patriarch of Alexandria, who being a poor unlearned Subject, and almost Slave to the Turk, made Abunas and Priests as unlearned as himself: when the Jesuits came furnished with Arts and Sciences, the matter came to long Disputes; for the People, especially the Monks and the Rulers, were both to change their old accustomed Religion, called the Alexandrian, for that called the Rome.
The King would needs have it done by hearing both parties speak: But the learned Jesuites were still too hard for the unlearned Abassines: One King seemed to like the Romanes, but his Son (Claudius) stiffly resisted them: Others afterward again needed help, and received them, and by their Disputes seemed really to be for them, seeing how much the Jesuites excelled their Priests; specially K. Zadengelus, being taken with the Jesuits Preaching, when all his own Clergy only read Liturgies & Homilies, & never preach'd: He set up the Roman Patriarch & power, & K. Sulincus after him swore Obedience to the Pope, and resolutely established Popery: Disputes brought him to it: And the Jesuites knowing that it must be something which seemed to be of Weight, which must make the Empire submit to a Change of their Religion, accuse the Abassines as erring with the Eutychians, in rejecting the Council of Calcedon, and denying two Natures and Wills in Christ. This was chosen as the main Subject of the great Disputes: The Emperor was convinced of their Heresy, and became a resolute Proselite to Rome: And Popery Eight Years had the upper ruling hand.

But all this while the Empire was in discontent: The Royal Family and the Sub-Governours oft broke out into Rebellion. To be short, many bloody battels were fought. The Emperor usually had the Victory: But when one field of blood was dried up, a new Rebellion still Sprung up. The Papists still told the K. that God gave him the Victory for owning his Church and Cause. His Rulers, Priests, and Monks told him he killed his Subjects, and in the end would lose his Empire for nothing but bare words. After many fights in the last about Eight Thousand of his Subjects called his Enemies were killed: The Kings own adherents being no friends to the Roman Change, desired the King to view the dead, and made to him presently this
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This Speech: 'These were not Heathens nor Mahometanes, in whose death we might justly rejoice: They were Christians; they were formerly your Subjects, our Countrymen. and near in Body some of them to you, and some to us: How much better might so many valiant Breasts have been set against the deadly Enemies of your Kingdom. It's no victory which is got upon Citizens; with the Sword by which you kill them, you stab yourself. Those whom we persecute with so terrible a War do not hate us, but only are against that Worship which we force them to: How many have we already killed for the changing of Religion (Sacrorum?) How many more are there yet to be killed? What end will there be of Fighting? Give over we beseech you, to drive them to your new Religious things (nova sacra,) lest they give over to obey you, else there will never be a safe peace.'

Ye, the King's eldest Son and his Brother got the Gallans (Heathens,) that had been Soldiers for the King, to tell him they would fight against his Dissenting Christians no more. The K. growing weary of War, and seeing and hearing all this, changed his mind, and called a Council, in which it was agreed, [That the Alexandrian Religion should be restored: And to effect this they declared, that indeed the Roman Religion was the very same: Both said that Christ is true God and true Man: And to say, There is one Nature, or there are two, are words of small moment, and not worthy the ruining of the Empire.] And thus the King was brought to give Liberty of Religion to the Dissenters.

The Romane Patriarch understanding all this, goeth with the Bishop and Jesuits to the King, and made this Speech to him, ['I thought we had been lately Conquerors, but behold we are conquered: The Rebels that were conquered have obtained that which they desired:']
Before the Fight was the time of Vowing and Promising, but now is the time of Performing: The Catholick and Portugal Soldiers got the Victory, God prospering the Catholick Religion: But now what thanks is given him? When it is decreed the other day, that the Alexandrine Religion shall be freely permitted. And here you consult not with the Bps. and Religious men, but the dull Vulgar, and Gallanes and Mahometanes, yea and Women pass Sentence of Religion: Bethink you how many Victories you have won against the Rebels since you followed the Romane Religion. Remember that it was not as constrained by Arms or Fear, but induced by free Will, that you embraced it as the truer. Nor did we come to you of our own accord, but were sent by the Pope of Rome, the highest Prelate, and the King of Portugal, and this at your Request. Nor did they ever intend any thing (against you) but only to join your Kingdom to the Church of Rome. Take heed therefore lest you provoke them to just Indignation: They are far off you, but God is near you, and will demand the satisfaction which is due to them, you will inure an indelible Blot on the Lyon of the tribe of Judah, with whom your Ensigns shine; and will imprint a stain on your Glory and your Nation: In a word, you will cause so many sins by your Apostafie, as, that I may not see them, nor the Vengeance of God, which hangeth over you, I desire you to command that my Head may be presently cut off.] Thus lay the Parriarch, Bp. and Jesuits at the Kings feet in tears.

Readers, Left you think that I have mistranslated, to fit the matter to our times, I intreat the learned to try it by the Original: You see that the things that are, have been, and that sin so blindeth and hardeneth sinners, that one Age and Country will take no warning by many others.
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You see here that the Name and Interest of God and Religion, and the Church may be pleaded by a blind ambitious Clergy, for the murdering of Thousands for a bare difference of Names and Words, and Gods Judgments threatened against those that will not go on in killing and destroying, and making Kingdoms desolate by Cruelty: And that the hurt Satan doth by Witches and Highway Robbers, is a Flea-biting in comparison of what he doth by ambitious Prelates and valiant Soldiers. The dismallest Story of the success of Witches is that of the Swedes Witches, by Mr. Hornick translated; But what is the killing of now and then one, to the Murder of so many Thousands, the Ruine of so many Kingdoms, the Silencing of so many Thousand faithful Preachers, the Persecuting of so many Thousand godly Christians, and the engaging the Christian World in Hatred and War, as the Popish Prelates have been guilty of?

But you'd expect the Answer of King Susheus to the Patriarch.

Ludolphus thus proceedeth, (li. 3. c. 12.) ["The King 'unmoved briefly answereth, that he had done as much 'as he was able, but could do no more. And that the bu-'ness was not about the total change of Religion, but 'only about the grant or (Liberty) of certain Rites (or 'Ceremonies.)

(O Sir, you had been happier if you had known that sooner!)

"The Patriarch answered, that he himself had indul-ged some things, and was about to indulge more, which 'concern not the substance of Faith, (you are for Tole-ration till the Fires are kindled,) so be it another Edict might be proclaimed, that there might be no other change. The King gave him no other Answer, but that the next day he would send some to treat with the Fathers.

[ b 2 ] They
They that were for the Alexandrian Religion go to the Emperour, and by Abba Athanasius request, that by a publick Edict he would allow his Subjects to embrace the Religion of their Ancestors, else the Kingdom would be ruined. The King consented, and sent some to the Patriarch, to acquaint him with it. These upbraided him with the many defections of the People. "Ælius, Caabrael, Tecla-George, Sertzax, with many Myriades slain: And that the Lastenses yet fought for the old Religion, and all ran to them. But the King was deserted, all the Habaffines desiring their old Religion. But that they that would might follow the Roman Religion, &c.

The Papists seeing that they could get no better but a Toleration, sent to the King this Answer by Emanuel d’ Almeyda, That [‘the Patriarch understood, that both Religions were tolerated in his Kingdom, and now he loved Ethiopia equally with his own Country Portugal, and would presently grant as much as might stand with the purity of Doctrine, (viz. of the two Natures) But there must be difference made between those who had not yet received the Roman Religion, and with them they might agree; but those that had given up themselves to it, and had used the sacred Confession and Communion, might not be suffered to return to the Alexandrian Religion without grievous Sin.] By this temperament the Patriarch would have kept the King and all his Court; for these had professed the Roman Religion. But the King weakened with Age and Sickness gave them no other Answer but, [‘But how can that be done, for I have not now the Power of the Kingdom?] Home went the Prelates and Jesuits: And presently the Trumpets and Drums sounded, and the Crier proclaimed, [‘Oyes, Oyes, (Hear ye) We first proposed to you the
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...the Romane Religion, taking it for good; but an innumerable multitude of men perished, with Elius, Cæbrall, Tecla-George, Sertzaxo, and with the Country Lastenses; Wherefore we now grant you the Religion of your Ancestors: It shall be lawful hereafter for the Alexandrian Clergy to frequent their Churches, and to have their Arculae for the Eucharist, and to read their Liturgy in the old manner: So farewell, and Rejoice.

It is incredible with what joy this Edict was received by the People, and how the whole Camps applauded and rejoiced, as if they had been delivered from an invading Enemy, specially the Monks and Clergy having felt the Fathers greatest hatred, did lift up to Heaven their joyful voices: The Vulgar Men and Women danced, the Soldiers prayed all Prosperity to the Emperour: They broke their own Rosaries, and other mens as they met them, and burned some, saying, 'That it was enough for them that they BELIEVE CHRIST TO BE TRUE GOD and TRUE MAN, and THERE IS NO NEED OF DISPUTING ABOUT TWO NATURES, and so they returned to the old way.

It's worth the noting here, that the Papists way was cast out as Novelty, and the other kept on the account of Antiquity: For Habassia never had received the Pope till the Portugals came to help them. Yet are they not ashamed here to call theirs the old Religion, because when they had banished the old, [which was simple Christianity] we returned to it by Reformation.

Besides the Doctrine of Two Natures, about which they saw they agreed in sense, while the Jesuites Hereticated them, three things much alienated the Habassines: 1. Denying them the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds. 2. Rebaptising their Children. 3. Reordaining their Priests.

This
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This much being done, the Papists were by degrees soon overcome. 1. The Patriarch is accused for preaching Sedition: 2. Then the Temples are taken from them, and they break their own Images lest the Habaslines should do it in scorn. 3. On Sept. 16. 1632, the King died, and his Son Basilides was against them. 4. Ras-Seel-axus their most powerful friend is banished, and others after him. 5. Upon more Accusations their Farms, Goods, and Guns are seized on. 6. They are confined to Fremona: Thence they petition again for new Disputation: The King Basilides answereth them thus by writing:

['What I did heretofore was done by my Fathers command, whom I must needs obey, so that by his conduct I made War against my Kindred and Subjects. But after the last Battle in Wainadega, both learned and unlearned, Clergy and Laity, Civil and Military men, great and small, fearfully said to my Father the King, How long shall we be vexed with unprofitable things? How long shall we fight against our Brethren and near friends, cutting off our Right Hand with our Left? How long shall we turn our Swords against our own Bowels, when yet by the Roman Belief we know nothing but what we knew before? For what the Romanes call two Natures in Christ, the Divinity and Humanity, we knew it long ago, from the beginning even unto this day: For we all believe that the same Christ our Lord is perfect God and perfect Man; perfect God in his Divinity, and perfect Man in his Humanity: But whereas those Natures are not separated, nor divided, (for each of them subsisteth, not by itself, but conjunct with the other) therefore we say not that they are two things, for one is made of two, yet so as that the Natures are not confounded or mixed in his Being. This Controversie therefore is of small moment among us:']

'Nor
Nor did we fight much for this; but specially for this cause, that the Blood was denied the Laity in the Eucharist, whereas Christ himself said in the Gospel, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood ye shall not have eternal Life. But they detested nothing more than the Reiteration of Baptisms, as if before the Fathers rebaptized us we had been Heathens or Publicanes: And that they Reordained our Priests and Deacons. You too late offer us now that which might have been yielded at the first; for there is now no returning to that which all look at with the greatest horror and detestation, and therefore all further Conferences will be in vain.

In short the Patriarch and all the rest were utterly banished out of the Empire. Ludolph. I. 3. c. 13.

I add one but thing (ex cap. 14.) to end the story. As the new Alexandrian Abuna was coming out of Egypt, the foresaid Dr. Peter Heyling of Lubeck being then in Egypt, took that opportunity to see Habaffia, and went with him: On the Borders at Suagena they met the departing Roman Patriarch; where Peter Heyling enters the List with him, & so handled him as made it appear, that it was only the poor Habassine Priests unlearnedness, which had given the Jesuits their Success: And the Patriarch at the parting, full of assurance, said to his Company, If this Doctor come into Habaffia, he will precipitate them into the extreamest Heresie. But what became of him is yet unknown.

And so much for this History of the Roman Conquest in Habassia, by the Calecdon Council, and the Hereticating the Habassines, about the one or two Natures, and the Eight years possession Popery got by it, and the many bloody Battles fought for it, the Prelites powerful Oratory for it, and the Peoples more powerful against it;
The Kings mind changed by sad experience, and the Pa- 

And it is exceeding observable, that their very Victo- 

And if Ludolphus and the Abaslines can say so much 

There is in Biblioth. Pat. To. 6. p. 131. the Missa quâ
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I had rather have had it with all its Errors, that we might have truly known how much is genuine. But it being one of the most Scriptural, rational, and well composed Liturgies of all there published: It would make one think, 1. That these Nestorians were not so bad a people as their Anathematisers would have made the world believe them. 2. That the Banishment of the Nestorians and Eutychians accidentally proved a great means of the Churches enlargement beyond the bounds of the Romane Empire, whither they were banished: And this is plain in current History.

I have given you this account of my Design in both the Books, (The History of Councils, with its Vindication, and the following Treatise.) I add an Answer to a Lord Bishop of Corke and Rosse, who hath written many Historical Untruths by his credulity, believing false Reporters. As to his and others Reprehension of my sharp unpeaceable words, my Case is hard; My own Conscience at once forbids me to justifie my Stile or Passion; and also tells me that if making odious Gods servants, silencing and persecuting faithful Ministers, and Perjury, should prove as great a guilt and danger of Destruction to the Land, as is feared, I cannot justifie my long Silence, nor that I use no more plainness and fervency in calling the guilty to Repent.
The CONTENTS.

I. A Specimen of the Way by which this Generation confuteth their Adversaries in several Instances.

II. In the General Part:
   § 1. Hard for young men to know what Teachers or History to believe.
   § 15. The different Opinions of Popery in the English.
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   Some Questions put to Mr. M. and some Reasons to abate his displeasure.
   § 22. Of a late Book of the History of my Life, to prove me the worst of men.
   § 24. Whether I be guilty of falsifying History.
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   Ch. 1. The Reason and Design of my History of the Schisms of Bishops and Councils.
   Ch. 2. Whether we ought to tell of the Bishops and Councils Church-corrupting Ways.
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   Ch. 10. His false Accusation that I make the Bishops the cause of all Heresies and Schisms.
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Ch. 11. And that I mention all the Bishops Faults and none of their Goodness.

Ch. 12. His Accusation of Spite, Malice, and Railing examined, Dr. Burnet satisfied.

Ch. 13. His Supposition that I speak against all Bishops Councils.

Ch. 14. Some mens Credit about ancient History, tried by their History of this Age. Twenty Instances of the History of our times. My own experience of it. Whether I hate compliance with Superiors, or to preach by Licence.

Ch. 15. Mr. M's Magisterial authorising or rejecting what Historians he pleases. His Accusation of Socrates and Sozomene, and valuing Valeius, Sirmond, &c.

Ch. 16. His Observation on my Notes of credible and incredible History. His Instances of my Railing particularly considered. Whether the word [Hereticating] be railing or causeless. An Instance of Fifty five of Bp. St. Philaftrius's accused Heresies, by which I desire any sober man to judge. Other Instances. Whether St. Theophilus, or Socrates and Sozomene were the Criminals. Even Pope Honorius and Vigilius hereticated for being wiser than other Popes.

Ch. 17. Of his Censure of my Design and Church-Principles: Whether I be guilty of exposing Christianity more than Julian & Lucian.

Ch. 18. Of his 2d Chap. Who is most against Discipline. Of Anathematizing. Whether Novatus was a Bishop or an ordaining Presbyter. Councils for rebaptizing. His Self-contradictions. Some Questions to him. Whether the Dioceefane Party (as Mr. Dodwel) who nullifie our Sacraments, are Heretics, if the Re-baptisers were such. The old qu. was not of Rebaptizing Heretics, but of such as Heretics had baptiz'd. Of the Donatists and many Councils. Of our Liturgy's Rule to find Easter-day. What the Novatians held. Petavius and Albaspineus Testimony of them. His quarrels about Epiphanius, the Arians, the Audians divers Synods. Antioch. Of the Circumcellians. Optatus of the Donatists as Brethren. His Excuse of the Bishops.
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Ch. 20. His 5 Chap. Of the 1st Ephes. Council. His reviling Socrates and Sozomene, as against Cyril. Cyril's Story. Of the Presbyterians Cruelty. Nestorius Case. His cavils against my Translations. The effects of that Council at this day considered.

Ch. 21. Of the 2d Ephes. Council. Of Cyril, the Eutychians, and Dioscorus.

Ch. 22. Of the Calcedon Council: Pulcheria and Eudocia. What one sound man can do in a Council. Whether our late Conciliatory Endeavours about Arminianism, have been as vain as these Councils. Of Theodot. 2. and the Eutychians. The whole story of that Council. Luther as well as I, makes the Controversie verbal. Of the Bishops Peccavimus: Many Accusations refelled: More of the Councils Successes, and late Conciliators. The Westminster Synod. Mr. M's way of Concord. Of the old Conformity and ours. Mr. Edwards Gangrena, and the late Sects and Heresies.

Ch. 24. Of his 7th Chapter. Of the old Heresies. Whether Projects for Moderation have been the chief distracers of the Church: He oft falsly saith, that I charge the Bishops with all the heresies in the world. What it is that I say of them. The true cause of Schism confessed. His misreports of the cause and Bishops. His false saying of me that I compared Oliver and his son to David and Solomon My profest Repentance which he feigneth me an Enemy to. What Nonconformity is, and what his misreports of it. An explicatory profession of the meaning of this Book against Misinterpreters.

THE
THE
Ready Way
of
Confuting Mr. Baxter,
A
SPECIMEN
OF THE
PRESENT MODE
OF
Controversie in England.

John 8. 44. 1 Kings 22. 22. Prov. 29. 12.

In 1662. Dr. Boreman of Trinity-Colledge in Cambridge, Published a Book against me, as having written to Dr. Hill against Physical-Predetermination to Sin; and in it faith, That it is reported, That I kill'd a Man with my own Hand in cold Blood; and if it be not true, I am not the first that have been wronged. The Man, though promoted to the Charge of this Parish, St. Giles in the Fields, A
was accounted so weak, (forbearing his Ministry, and saying he was suspended some Years before he died) that I thought it vain to take publick Notice of his Words; neither imagining whence he had them, nor ever hearing of them before.

But a few Weeks before the late Plot was reported, one Mr. P. came to me, and told me, That at the Coffee-House in Fullers-Rents, where Papists and Protestants used familiarly to meet; he provoking the Papists to Answer my Books, or to Dispute with me, was answered by a Gentleman of this Parifh, said to be of the Church of England, That [Mr. Baxter had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.] Mr. P. provoked him by a Wager to make it good. He refusing the Wager, was told, He should hear of it publickly, unless he would ask me Forgiveness. After some time, the Gentleman came to me with Mr. Taiborough, (since imprisoned, as is known) and with great Civility, ask't me Forgiveness. He was the Son of a Knight, and Judge, of my Acquaintance; and had an Aunt, that had been my very dear Friend. I told him, That Slandering is so common, and asking Forgiveness so rare, that I took it for a Note of great Ingenuity in him; and, as I must forgive all Men as a Christian, so I could easily forgive any wrong to one related to such a Friend of mine. He told me, He was resolved openly to confess his Fault, and to vindicate me on all Occasions.

Accordingly, at the same Coffee House, he openly declared his Repentance. Upon which, Mr. P. tells me, That Mr. G. an Aged Lawyer, Brother to the Lady Ab. was displeased, and said, He would prove the thing true by many Witnesses: (And, faith Mr. P. the Story among some of them was, That a Tinker did beat his Kettle at my Door, and being disturbed by him, I pistoll'd him, and was tryed for my Life at Worcester.) Mr. P. said, He provoked Mr. G. to lay a Wager on it: And he refusing, was told, [Then he should hear of it in Westminster-Hall.] Upon this, faith Mr. P. his Fellow-Catholick ingeniously resolved to disown him, unless he would ask Forgiveness; which he being unwilling to come to me to do, Mr. P. faith, He at last performed before Him, and Capt. Edmund Hampden.

All this being done without my Knowledge (till after,) I was relating it to Mr. John Humfrey: Why (faith he) I did twelve Years ago hear Dr. Allestry, now Regius-Professor in Oxford, say the like, That he could not think well of that Man, that had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.
I little regarded all the rest: But Dr. Allestry had many Years been my old School Fellow; many a time I had taught him; and he was the best at Learning, and of the honestest Disposition of any Boy that ever I knew; and I thought, if Parties could draw such as he into such Guilt, there was little Account to be made of the Reports or History of Men, if once they fell into different Factions. Wherefore I wrote to him what Mr. Humfrey told me, and received from him this honest ingenuous Letter, which I here annex.

And as to all this Story, I do here solemnly profess, That I never killed, wounded, or hurt any Man in my Life, (save one Man, whose Leg I hurt with playful Wrestling, when I was a Boy, and once or twice boxing with School-Boys, and correcting Lads when I was one Year a School-Master.) Nor in all the Wars, or in my Life, did I ever see any other kill any Man, save one; and that was at the same Bickering, (about Forty of a Side) when Jennings was wounded: While they were Fighting with him in one great Field, I being in another near the House, saw the Souldiers offering Quarter to a Foot-Souldier, and promising him Safety, if he would lay down his Musket; which he did not, but struck at them; and Captain Holdich shot him dead: And it proved after to be a Welsh-man, that understood not English; which grieved them when they knew it.

I have gone the next day where Fights have been, and seen many dead, when I had nothing to do with the Armies of either Part. But I never saw any, to my Knowledge, kill or hurt any Man, but this one.

Dr. Allestry's Letter: (Which I should not Publish, but that even in Oxford, and elsewhere among the Clergy, the Report yet goeth on.)

SIR,

I must profess sincerely, That I cannot recollect I ever said such Words of you to Mr. Humfrey, as it seems he does affirm I did: But yet I cannot but acknowledge, it is very possible, that I related, (and may be, to Him) That I had heard, you killed a Man in cold Blood: Since I very well remember, that above Thirty Years since, at the End of the War, I heard that pub-
lickly spoken before Company; and with this farther Circum-
stance, that it was a Soldier, who had been a Prisoner some 
Hours. Now this Report relating to the Wars, in which (I fear) 
such Things were no great Rarities, and from my very tender 
Youth, I having not had the least Converse with you, nor likely-
of any for the future, did not therefore apprehend, at present, 
your Concern or Occasion of inquiring, whether it were true; of 
which, upon that confident Asseveration, I did make no doubt. 
And I took so little thought of laying up the Relation, that I 
protest to you, as in the Presence of Almighty God, it is impossi-
ble for me to recover, who made up that Company in which I 
heard it, or from whom I heard it: And I wonder, how it came 
into my Mind, to say that I had heard it, so long after. But 
however, though it be some Ease to me, to believe the late Disc-
courses of it, do not come from my relating so long since that I 
heard it, neither are likely to receive any Confirmation from it, 
unless it be made more Publick than I have made it; yet I do 
profess, it is a great Affliction to me, to have spoken that, though 
but as a Report, which (it seems) was a Slander, (for so I be-
lieve it, upon your Asseveration) and not having endeavoured 
to know whether it were true. And, as I have beg'd God's For-
giveness of it; so I heartily desire, You will forgive me: And 
if I could direct my self to any other way of Satisfaction, I would 
give it. This is the whole Account I can give of this Matter; 
to which I shall only add, That I am,


SIR,

Your very Affectionate Servant,

Richard Allestry.

II. In the Preface to the Life of Dr. Heylin are these Words.

Mr. Baxter may be pleased to call to mind, what was done to one Major 
Jennings, in the last War, in that Fight that was between Lyndiel and Long-
ford, in the County of Salop, where the Kings Party, having unfortu-
nately the worst of the Day, the poor Man was stripped almost naked, and left for
for dead in the Field: But Mr. Baxter, and one Lieutenant Hurdman, taking their Walk among the wounded and dead Bodies, perceived some Life left in the Major, and Hurdman ran him through the Body in cold Blood; Mr. Baxter all the while looking on, and taking off with his own Hand, the Kings Picture from about his Neck; telling him, as he was swimming in his Goar, That he was a Papish Rogue, and that was his Crucifix. Which Picture was kept by Mr. Baxter for many Years, till it was got from him (but not without much difficulty) by one Mr. Somerfield, who then lived with Sir Thomas Rous, and generously restored it to the poor man, now alive at Wick near Pershore in Worcestershire, although at the Fight supposed to be dead: being, after the Wounds given him, drag’d up and down the Field by the mercifles Souldiers; Mr. Baxter approving of the inhumanity, by feeding his Eyes with so bloody, and so barbarous a Spectacle.

I Thomas Jennings, Subscribeto the truth of this Narrative abovementioned, and have hereunto put my Hand and Seal this second Day of March 1682. Thomas Jennings. Signed and Sealed, March 2, 1682, in the Presence of John Clark, Minister of Wick, Thomas Ducke. Published by George Vernon, Minister.

The like was before Published by Roger L’Strange.

Answ. I do not think Major Jennings knowingly made this Lye, but was directed by some bodies Report, and my fending him the Medal. I do solemnly protest, 1. That, to my Knowledge, I never saw Major Jennings: 2. That I never saw Man wound, hurt, strip, or touch him: 3. That I never spake a word to him, much less any word here affirmed: 4. That I neither took the Picture from about his Neck, nor saw who did it: 5. That I was not in the Field, when it was done: 6. That I walked not among any wounded or dead, nor heard of any kild, but the one Man before-me tioned: 7. That the Picture was never got from me with difficulty. But that this is the Truth: The Parliament had a few Men in Longford Houfe, and the King at Lyndfel, about a Mile and a half a-funder; who used off to skirmish, and dare each other in the Fields between: My Innocent Father being Prisoner at Lyndfel, and I being at Longford, resolved not to go thence till he was delivered. I saw the Souldiers go out, as they oft did, and in another Field discerned them to meet and Fight: I knew not, that they had seen Jennings; but, being in the Houfe, a Souldier shewed a small Medal of Guilt Silver, bigger than a Shilling; and told us, That he wounded Jennings, and took his Coat, and took that Medal from about his Neck: I bought it of him for 18 d. no one offering him more. And some Years after (the first time that I heard
I heard where he was, freely desired Mr. Somersfield to give it him from me, that had never seen him; supposing it was a mark of Honour, which might be useful to him. And now all these Lies, are all the Thanks that ever I had.

III. The Observator, N. 96. faith, [Tor. Who faith, they (the Presbyterians) brought in the King, besides your self? Wh. Mr. Hunt, the Author of the Conformists' Plea, Mr. Baxter and who not? 

Tor. Prethee ask Mr. Baxter, If he knows who it was, that went with five or six more of his own Cloth and Character, to General Monk, upon his coming up to London, in 1659; and finding a great deal of Company with him, told his Excellency, That he found his time was precious, and so would not trouble him with many Words: But as they were of great weight, so he hoped, they would make an answerable Impression on him: I hear a Report, Sir, (faith he) that you have some thoughts of calling back the King; but it is my Sense, and the Sense of these Gentlemen here with me, that it is a thing you ought not to do on any termes: For Prophaness is so inseparable from the Royal Party, that if ever you bring the King back, the Power of Godliness will most certainly depart from this Land.

Ans. Dr. Mammon (and whether any other, I remember not) went once with me to General Monk, and it was to congratulate him; but with this request, That he would take care, that Debauchery and Contempt of Religion might not be let loose, upon any mens pretence of being for the King, as it already began with some to be. But there was not one word by me spoken, (or by any one, to my remembrance) against his calling back the King, nor any of the rest here adjoyned; but as to me, it is a mere Fiction.

And the King was so sensible of the fame that I said, that he sent over a Proclamation against such Men, as while they called themselves the Kings Party, did live in Debauchery and Prophaness; which Proclamation so rejoiced them that were after Nonconformists, that they read it publickly in the Churches. Such gross Falshoods as these, are part of the Evil deprecated.

As to his Question, Whether the Presbyterians brought in the King? Who can affirm or deny any thing of equivocal Words? A Presbyterian is, who these Men will call such. They that in the Face of the World deny the Publick Acts of Three Kingdoms, in the Age they were done in, no wonder if they multiply the groffest Lies of such as I. The Parties that restored the King, were these; 1. The Excluded Members of the Long Parliament, the Ministers that were since
since silenced; and the frustrated endeavours of the Scotch Armies, and Sir George Booth, Sir Thomas Middleton, joining with some of the King's Souldiers, prepared Mens minds to it. 2: General Monk, and his Army, who were Fighting against the King a little before, reprefte Cromwels Army. 3. The Long-Parliament Members restored, agreed
to dissolve themselves, and set up a Council to call home the King:
4. Sir Thomas Allen, Lord Mayor, and the Aldermen, invited General Monk into the City, who joining with him, turned the Scales.
5. The City Ministers (called Presbyterians) perswaded the Lord May-
or to this, and wrote to Monks Colonels (called Presbyterians) to be
for the King: (speciably Mr. Afb, by Mr. Calamy's Counsel.) 6. The Lord Mazarine, Lord Broghil, and others of the fame Party in Ire-
land, contributed their help; and Colonel Bridges, with others, sur-
prized Dublin Castle. 7. Many of the Old Parliament Men openly
provoked Genr Monk, and secretly perswaded and treated with him,
to bring in the King (whom the Earl of Anglesey, the Earl of Shafts-
bury, and others yet living, can Name to you.) 8. The Parliament
called by General Monk, (by agreement with the Long-Parliament,)
accounted mostly of the fame Party, Voted the Kings Return: Which
no doubt also, the Old Royalists most earnestly desired, and en-
deavoured.

This is the Historical Truth; which if in this Age, Men will deny,
I will bear any lies that they shall say or swear of me.

Now, either the foresaid Armies, Parliament men, Ministers, &c.
were Presbyterians, or not. If they were not; then, 1. Say no more,
that it was Presbyterians that raised War against the King; but that it
was the Epifcopal Men, if these were such. 2. Why then have you cal-
led them Presbyterians fo long, and do fo still? But if they were Pres-
byterians, then it was such that Restored the King. But alas, how con-
temptible, yea, how odious is Truth grown to this Generation!

IV. There is yet a more Famous Historian, than any of these,
though unnamed; who pretending to militate after Dr. Stillingfleet,
as in a 2d. Part against Separation, takes on him to give you the Histo-
ry of my Life. Partly making it my Reproach, that when I grew to
Understanding, I remembered how many Drunken or Ignorant Rea-
ders had been my Teachers: Partly raking up retracted and obliterate-
d Passages of Old Writings; while at once they perswade me
to Reviews and Retraftations: Partly heaping up abundance of
down right Fallhoods: Partly clipping Sentences, and leaving out the
the part that should make them understood, and turning true Words, by perversion, into Fallhoods: And partly by mixing this known Truth, [That I was on the Parliaments side, and openly declared it.]

But when at the new Model, I saw that they changed their Cause, I changed my Practice, & was from the Day that I went into the Army, a resolvd Opposer of all that they did, to the Changing of the Government, & their Usurpation: & was sent among them to that end; which was immediately after Nasby Fight: And continued openly disowning the Usurpation, and the Means that set it up. And though I was Preaching and Writing against the said Usurpers, when an Army was Fighting for them, against the King, and the King knew how to forgive and Honour them, that did so much to his Restoration; yet are the Accusers so far from forgiving those that never personally hurt a Man, that they forbear not multiplying false Accufations; yea, and accusing those Minifters, and private Men that never had to do with Wars: Yea, the fame Men that then wrote against me for the Changers and Usurpers, have since been the fierce Accusers of us, that opposed them.

And if these Men be unsatisfied of my present Judgment, I have no hope of giving them Satisfaction, if all will not do it, which I have largely written in my Second Plea for Peace, for Loyalty, and against Rebellion; and all my Confutation of Hooker's Politicks, in the Last Part of my Christian Directory; with much more.

But this Book must have (if any) a Peculiar Answer.

V. Lately, when I taught my Hearers, That we must not make the World believe, that we are under greater Sufferings, than we are, nor be unthankful for our Peace, and that we must when any hurt us, love and forgive them, and see that we fail not of our Duty to them; but not for sake the owning, and just defending by Scripture-Evidence the Truth oppsed. They Printed, that I Bid the People Refist, and not stand still, and dye like Dogs. And I was put the next Day to appeal to many Hundred Hearers, who all knew, that the Accusation was most impudent Lies. This is our present Case.

VI. The Players, I hope, expect no Answer to their Part.

The General Part containing the Design and Sum of this and the former Book, that it may be understood what it is that Mr. Morrice defendeth, and opposeth; and what it is that I maintain or blame, and by what Evidence.

§ 1. Have been these forty years much troubled with the temptation to wonder, why God suffers most of the World to lie drown'd in Ignorance, Infidelity and Sensuality, and the Church of Professed Christians to live in so great Scandal, Contention, Division, and for the greater number, in a Militant Enmity against the Word, Will, Way, and Servants of Christ, while in Baptism they are Lifted under him. But of late since Experience tells me of the marvelous Diversity of Humane Interests and Apprehensions, and the deep Enmity of the Fleshy Mind to Spiritual things, I admire the Wisdom and Providence of God, that there is so much Order, and Peace, and Love in the World of Mankind as there is: And that all men live not as in a continual War. And I perceive that if God had not preserved by Common Grace some remnants of Moral Honesty in the World, and had not also sanctified a peculiar People, whose New Nature is LOVE, the Sons of Men would have been far worse than Bears and Wolves to one another; and a man would have fled with greater fear from the sight of another man, than from a Snake or Tyger. But God hath not left himself without witnesses, in his Works, and daily Providences, and in the Consciences of those who have not sinned themselves into Brutes or Devils. And hence it is that there is some
Government and Order in the World, and that sin is ashamed of its proper name, and even they that live in Pride, Covetousness, Ambition, Lying, Persecution, &c. cannot endure to hear the name of that which they can endure to keep and practice; and cannot endure to for sake.

§ 2. And indeed it is a great Credit to Honesty and Piety, to Truth, and Love, and Peace, and Justice, that the deadliest Enemies of them are ambitious of their Names; and though they will damn their Souls rather than be such, they will challenge and draw upon any man that denieth them to be such.

And I must profess, that I fetch hence a great confirmation of the Immortality of Souls, and a Future Life of Retribution. For if there were not a very great difference between Moral Good and Evil, what should make all the world, even the worst of men, be so desirous to be accounted Good, and so impatient of being thought and called naught, and as they deserve. And if the difference be so vast here, must there not needs be a Governor of the World that hath made such a difference by his Laws and Providence, and who will make a greater difference hereafter, when the End and Judgment cometh.

§ 3. Among other Causes of Humane Pravity and Confusion, one is the exceeding difficulty that young men meet with, in the communication of so much Knowledge as they must necessarily receive from others. Knowledge is not born with them: It is but the power and capacity of it, and not the act in which an Infant excels a Dog. And how shall they have it but by Objects and Communication? And Objects tell them not things past, the Knowledge of which is necessary to make them understand things present, and to come; and without which it is not possible to be wise. And God teacheth not Men now by Angels sent from Heaven, but by Men that were taught themselves before; and by his Spirit blessing mens endeavours. And when I have said [by Man] how bad, how sad a creature have I named? Alas! David's haste Psal. 116. was not erroneous passion; nor Paul's words, Rom. 3. a flander, when they called all men Lyers, that is untrusti; and so little do men know that must teach others, and so much doth all corruption incline them to love flattering Lies, and to take fleshly Interest, the World, and the Devil for their Teachers, and to hate the Light, because it disgraceth their hearts and deeds, and so much goeth to make a man wise,
wife, that it must be a wonder of merciful Providence that shall
help young men to Teachers that shall not be their Deceivers.
There were ever comparatively few that were truly wise and
trusty, and these usually despised in the World.
§ 4. And how should young men know who these are? This
is the grand difficulty that maketh the Error of the World so
uncurable. It requireth much wisdom to know who is wise,
and to be trusted; who can well discern and value that Know-
ledge in another, which he is a stranger to himself? Experience
tells us, that young inexperienced men do commonly receive
that man's Opinions, 1. Who hath by nearness, or some acci-
dent the greatest advantage in their esteem and love: 2. Or his
that speaks most for their fleshly Interest, and for that which
they would have to be true: 3. Or his that hath the last word.
It cannot be expected that they judge of any thing, beyond the
advantage of their senses, and the Notitia communes, accord-
ing to Evidence of Truth, which must be received by long and
serious study, and by willing honest minds, and by the help of an-
tecedent Verities.
§ 5. In this therefore Divine free Election is very manifest;
As in giving the Gospel to some Nations in the World, when
most others never have it, so in giving some young persons the
blessing of good Education, and Teachers, and chusing for them
that were unable to chuse well for themselves; as also in bless-
ing the same helps to one, which are despised by another. And
verily when I have been long stalled with the difficulties about
Election and Differencing Grace, undeniable Experience hath been
my chief Conviction. If the Gospel be true, the common world-
ly fleshly sort, that are for Christ but by Tradition, Law and Cu-
stom, and are religious for worldly ends, and no farther than the
Interest of the Flesh and World will give them leave, have no
true Saving Grace at all. And the rest that seriously believe
and seek a better Life, and live above fleshly worldly Interests,
are in most places few; and made the scorn and hatred of the
rest. And if de facto, God do sanctifie only a peculiar People,
who can deny his differing Will and Grace?
§ 6. I was my self in my Childhood ignorant what Teachers
among such diversity I should prefer. And first God had such a
witness in my Conscience, that Virtue and Holiness were better
than Vice and Sin, that it made me think that the sort of
Teachers
Teachers who traded merely for the World, and never spake a serious word of Heaven, nor differed from sober Heathens, but in Opinion; yea, that endeavoured to make serious Godliness to seem but Hypocrifie, were not like to be the wisest and most trusty men. And yet how to judge among the serious, which were right, was long too hard for me.

§ 7. When I came to consider of the Divisions of the Christian World, and heard the Papists pretend to Catholicism, and call all others Schismaticks or Hereticks, it sometime seemed a plausible Opinion, that the greatest Power and Dignity of the Clergy, was the Interest of Christianity: By Riches, Honour and Power, they may protect the Godly, and keep Religion from Contempt among the worldly sort of men, or from oppression at the least.

2. And I saw that in all Ages and Countries of the World, Historians tell us how rare a thing, a wise and holy Prince hath been, and how commonly by Wealth and Greatness they have been bred up in that Sensuality and Pride, which hath made them the Capital Enemies to serious Piety; if not the Persecutors of it.

3. I thought with my self if such godly Christians, as much value the Interest of Religion had lived in such times and places, where Rulers were Persecutors of the Truth, how glad would they have been to have had the Power of Church-matters put into the hands of their Chosen Pastors, what would they have desired more?

4. And I read that till Riches and honours were annexed to the Office, the People had still the Choice of their own Pastors, and therefore could not choose but with their Estates and Lives, and all, as well as their Religion, to be as much as might be in their hands. And so no doubt when the Bishops were advanced to great Diocesses, and Power, it was by the desire of the most Religious Christians, who valued most the Interest of the Church.

5. And I could not but observe, that though Christ gave his Apostles no Power of the Sword, he set them above other Ministers, not only in Miraculous Gifts, and Infallible testifying and recording his Commands and works, but in some sort of oversight, which seemeth a thing appointed for Continuance as well as preaching.

6. And I thought that if Church-Grandure were the Interest of Religion and Unity the strength of the Church, it lookt very plausibly
plausibly to reason, that as Bishops were over Presbyters, so there should be some over Bishops; and that National Churches should by such Government be hindered from Schism and Heresy as well as Parochial. And that Diocesans and Metropolitans Power should be derived from a Superior as well as Presbyters. And that when poor Subjects dare not reprove a Prince, some that are above fearing his Power may.

7. And when I read the Popes Claim, I thought it seemed not improbable, that Petrus primus, and pasce oves meas, and super hanc Petram were not spoken in vain. And these thoughts pleaded thus for Church-Grandeur in Prelates and Popes.

§ 8. On the other side, I saw 1. That Christ said, His Kingdom was not of this world, and comes not unto Jerusalem, with observable Pomp. And that when they strove who should be greatest, he reproved them, and Concluded [with you it shall not be so] and that the most serviceable is to be accounted the greatest; that Peter himself accordingly describeth their office, 1 Pet. 5.

2. I find that Christ appointed them another sort of work to do, even to Preach the Gospel to all Nations through all streights, difficulties and sufferings, and to baptize, and teach Christians to observe the Laws of Christ. And that as he never put the Sword into their hand, so an official declaring and applying his Word, to voluntary Disciples was all their Office, as ordinary Pastors to be continued.

3. I find that Christ sent them out by two and two, as if it had been done on foresight, that men would erect a Church-Monarchy: And that no Scripture tells us of any division of the Church into Dioceses, where one Apostle was a Monarch, or had Power above the rest, or was his Peculiar Province: Nor that the twelve settled twelve such, or any as the seats of their Successors.

4. I find not that ever any one Apostle exercised Government over the rest: Nor that ever Christ gave the rest any Command or Direction to obey any one; Nor that ever the Contending or Schismatical sort of Christians were directed to end their strife, by taking any one for the Head who must determine all their Controversies: And that they that said [I am of Cephas] are reproved with the rest. And that all are called Members of the Body, and only Christ the Head. And if it had been his will that One Universal Head or Power should have been set up as the Principium, or Center of Unity, it is a matter of so great
great consequence, that it is not to be believed that Christ would not have plainly commanded it.

5. I find that Christ hath himself done the work, for which the necessity of Universal Humane Government (by Pope or Councils) is pretended; viz. He hath made and caused his Apostles (peculiarly qualified for it) to record Universal Church-Laws, even as many as are Universally necessary: And if so, I cannot but think, 1. That he hath done it better than Man can do; 2. And that to add more unnecessarily must needs be a shame and burden to the Church; 3. And that it must be an usurping the Power of Christ: For if there be no other Universal Government, there is no other that hath Authority to make Universal Laws. Therefore this is Treason against Christ, and a making Man a Vice-Chrift.

6. I found that there is not so much as a Natural Capacity in any one, or many, for an Universal Government: Church-Government being of such a nature as maketh it far more impossible, than for one Monarch or Aristocracy to Govern all the Earth: And to do it by a truly General Council, or by the Diffused Bishops of all the World is further from possibility than to do it by a Pope.

7. I searcht the Councils pretended to be General, to see whether they had made any better Laws than Christ's, or made any desirable addition. And I found 1. That while they were not wholly Papists, they never pretended to make Canons for any Christians, but only those in the Roman Empire. 2. And that it had been much happier for the Churches if they had made no more Laws than Christ had made them, for holy Doctrine, Worship, and Church-Discipline, and had only as Teachers expounded and applied the Laws of Christ.

8. I considered the Present State of the Church Universal, and I find it such as no Party of Christians in the World doth own. The Pope pleadeth for an Universal Sovereignty, and all his Clergy do the same; some saying it is in Councils, some in the Pope, and most in both together, or Councils approved by the Pope: And Protestants, Greeks, Nestorians, Jacobites, and almost all other Christians in the World, accuse this Roman Church and Claim.

The Papists condemn the rest: The Greeks, Arminians, and almost all the rest accuse each other.
9. I considered what Popery is, that is, Clergy-Power in its height, and what it hath done in the World. And I found 1. A woful description of the lives of multitudes of Popes, recorded by their own most credited Historians. And 2. I found multitudes of vicious Canons obtruded by them as Laws on the Universal Church. 3. I found most doeful Histories of the Wars and Rebellions that they have caused from Age to Age. 4. I found that they have corrupted the Doctrine of Christ in abundance of particulars. 5. And that they have lockt up the Sacred Scriptures from the Vulgar, as they have not done their Canons. 6. And that they have turned God's Spiritual Worship into a multitude of Superstitious Rites, and scenical Ceremonies and Shews. 7. And that they have turned Spiritual Church-Discipline into a secular sort of Tyranny. 8. And that they have most schismatically unchurched the rest of the Churches, because they are not Subjects of the Pope. 9. And that they have branded the soundest Churches with the name of Hereticks, while they are the grand Heresie of the World, 10. And that they have been and are the greatest Silencers of sound Preachers, and hinderers of true Piety and Reformation in the Church. 11. And that they have wofully vitiated the People that are their Subjects, so that odious wickedness fed by Ignorance, abounds among them; and it is their Votaries that are called Religious, and a few Canonized persons Saints; as if Religion and Sanctity were rarities, or any could be saved without them. 12. Lastly, I find that they have lived upon Blood, like Leeches, and have been the cruellest Persecutors of holy men, on pretence of killing Hereticks: And that it is this to which they trust.

10. I took not this notice of them upon meer prejudice, but have read, I think, as many Papists Books, as Protestants, or any other against them. Nor have I taken it upon dark Scripture Prophecies, suspecting my understanding of them: But 1. The matter of fact from themselves: 2. Against their Papal Supremacy from such Arguments as are fully collected by Dr. Barrow. 3. Against their heinous Church-corruptions, from such Moral Evidence as Dr. H. Moore hath fully gathered in his Mystery of Iniquity. 4. Against their pretences of Tradition and Antiquity, I fetcht my Arguments from the Histories and Authors which they themselves alledge, and especially their Councils, with the Fathers Writings. § 9. Seeing
§ 9. Seeing the Church in this sad Condition, and the Papal part so greatly vitiated, I considered how long it had so been. And I found that the Pope and his Bishops grew not up like a Mushroom in a day; but had been long in thriving to maturity: And I met with no man that could just tell what Year or what Age the disease or tumor did begin. Bishop Bromhall thinks if they will abate their last 400 years Innovations, we may have hope of agreeing with them. Bishop Gunning will own no General Councils, but the first six; some will receive eight; some but four. Mr. Morrice here goeth no further in his defence of them, whatever he think. Some begin Popery with Leo the great, some with Gregory's Successour. But it is most certain, that it was first an Embrio, and next an Infant and so grew up from Childhood to maturity by degrees. And the first Church-corruption was not that which we now call Popery. And it is as certain that the tumor did neither begin nor grow up in the Bishop of Rome alone, but in other Bishops, who grew up with him, & were his strength and Councils, and he their Head.

§ 10. It is known when the Greeks and Romans began most notably to strive which should be greatest, and how the division increased, and when and how it came to an anathematizing or excommunicating each other.

§ 11. It's notorious that it was from the Councils of Calcedon, and Ephesux, that the great separated bodies of Nestorians and Eutychians (now called Jacobites) that possess the East and South, were broken off with Nestorius and Dioscorus, and so continue to this day.

§ 12. I considered who were the Chief Authors of all these lamentable Schisms, and Church-corruptions in the several Ages when they rose, and who continue them to this day: And I found that many Princes were much to be blamed, and the People not Innocent, no not the Religious Monks. But the Bishops that had the main Church-power, by abusing it, were with their Clergy the principal Causes, and so are to this day: The breaches might yet be healed in East, West, and South, were it not for them.

§ 13. Finding this in History of undoubted Truth, I next considered what was the Cause that the Bishops and their Clergy should become such Church-corrupters and Dividers, and still continue the Churches miseries.
And I found as followeth. 1. That none are able to do so much hurt as those that have the greatest Parts, Power, Interest, and Trust. None kill so many (except Souldiers) as those Physicians who are entrusted to heal and save them. If five hundred neighbours mistake a man's Disease, whom he never trusted, it hurts him not: But an unskilful Nurse or Parent may kill a sick Child; and an unskilful or unfaithful Physician may kill multitudes.

2. And there goeth so much to make a man a skilful, faithful Pastor, as that such are rare. As a Physician is like to kill his Patient, if he mistake but some one thing in his Disease, or some Ingredient in his Medicine, though he were right in all the rest: So if a Guide of Souls were excellent in all other things, what work one Opinion, yea or unskilful word may make, not only the case of the Nestorians, Eutychians, Monotheites, &c, tell us, but even the strife that arose in the Church about Hypostases and Persona, which had almost hereticated Ierom himself, for all his skill in the Languages: And the case of the Greeks and Latines about [Filioj;] and abundance such.

3. And Pride is the Heart of the Old Man; first living, and last dying. And great Power, great Parts, and great Esteem do feed it, if true Grace do not mortifie it. Knowledge puffeth up; and especially when men live among the ignorant and unlearned, and are but half Learned themselves, and are thought by the people and themselves, to be much wiser than they are: Inter cacos luscus Rex.

4. And Selfishness is the very sum of all positive iniquity: And Pride and Selfishness make men defirous to be the Idols of the World, and to seem as Gods knowing good and evil, and to have their will of all that they have to do with.

5. And the strongest temptations use to cause the greatest sins.

§ 14. These Generals presupposed, it is most clear, 1. That the remnant of these sins, even in Christ's Apostles, set them on striving who should be greatest, and made James and John desire preheminence, and also to have called for Fire from Heaven; and made them after Christ's Resurrection, hope that he would have restored the Earthly Kingdom unto Israel. And it put Paul to vindicate his Apostleship against many that disparaged him; As it made Diotrephes, who loved to have the preheminence, to cast out the Brethren, and speak evil of John: It gave Peter occasion to warn the Bishops not to Lord it over God's Heritage, but.
But to be Examples to the Flock, overseeing them not by constraint, but willingly.

2. Even in good men this fault, though not in a reigning degree, did live more in others afterwards, that had not that measure of the Spirit as the Apostles had to overcome it. And if even in Paul's daies he had none like-minded to Timothy, who naturally cared for the good of all; for all (too much) fought their own, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's, as Demas forsook him for some worldly Interest; what wonder is it if afterward Pride and Worldliness grew greater, and Heresies and Strifes increased.

3. Yet while Christianity was a suffering and laborious State, the Pastors of the Churches were commonly the best men, that had more Knowledge, Holiness and Love than others, and the Churches prospered under the Cross: They that spared not their labours, but imitated the pattern set by Paul, Acts 20, did not strive who should have the largest Dioces, and undertake that which they could not do, but they strove to do as much as they were able, and to increase and edifie the Flock.

4. But when extraordinary Gifts abated, and acquired Ones became more necessary, and few Philosophers turned Christians, able Taking Preachers or Orators grew fewer, and those few that were eminent in Knowledge and Speech were justly preferred before the rest. And usually some one man had the chief hand in converting men, and gathering a Church in each particular Town, and then he rightfully was taken for their Pastor: And it being found that the publick and private care of Souls required in each Church, where were fit men, more than one Pastor; 't was not meet that more should be brought to him that was there before, without his approbation and consent; but that he were to the Juniors as a Father; And because the rest were usually below him in Gifts and Worth, it was thought but meet that they should do what they did by his consent: And also to avoid Divisions, to which they were over-prone, it was judged fit that one should have the preheminence, and a negative, and partly ruling Vote.

5. The Churches, which in the beginning had these Bishops and Fellow-Presbyters, were single Congregations: And shortly they grew to be more than could meet together in some few great Cities; Persecution hindering them from very large Assemblies,
fembles, besides their want of large capacious Temples. Dr. Hammond thinks that there is no evidence, that in Scripture-time there were any other Presbyters than Bishops, and consequently a Bishop had but one Congregation, unless he went one hour to one, and another to another, which was not their use. But doubtless in this he is mistaken, as the many Speakers as Corinth shew.

6. The Greatness of the Roman Empire was prepared by God to be then an exceeding great furtherance of the Gospel: For under the same Civil Laws and Powers, where one or two Languages were understood by most, Christians had the far greater advantage for Communication. Want of foreign Languages is now our great hinderance from Preaching the Gospel to other Nations of the World: And the Confusion at Babel was an unspeakable Judgment. But as Ships, yea Navies, can sail on the Ocean, when small Barks or Boats only can pass on Rivers; so the vastness of the Roman Empire was a great help to the Church, by Communication, Language and Accesses: But especially when the Emperour became Christian, the advantage was exceeding great: Whereas now the Greatness of the Turkey, Tartarian & Indostan Empire, are great Impediments to the Gospel; because the Barbarians are more cruel Enemies than the Civil Romans (notwithstanding the ten Persecutions) were; and their opposition is the more extensive by the extent of their Dominions; and the Christian Churches having now more scandalized the Infidels by their corruptions. While they were not corrupted by worldly power and wealth, the great holiness of the Churches convinced the sober part of the Empire. Albaspineus shews us clearly that their strictness was so great, that they endured no notable scandalous sin among them; yea and came very near to the Novatians in their Discipline: And that it was not for greater strictness that the Novatians were condemned, but for denying the Power of the Church to absolve men penitent that sinned after Baptism. And their Canons shew it. And it is certain, that Christians obeying Paul, avoided the Heathen Judicatures as much as might be, and censured those that did not, and ended their Differences by the way of Arbitration, and took the Bishop with the Consent of his Clergy to be an Authorized Arbitrator; and thus the affairs of all the Christians being cast upon him, and he having no power to force any
man, but only to govern Volunteers, the Bishops were constrained to make their Rules of Discipline so much the stricter, that all that would not renounce Christianity, and Church-Communion, might be brought to Obedience to escape Excommunication.

7. God having made the Great Power and Extent of the Roman Empire, so great a means for the propagation of Christianity, the Christians thought that the Greater they grew themselves, the more it would tend to the Churches deliverance, from contempt and persecution: And their advancement lay in that advancement of the Bishops, which private men could not expect, save only by subsequent participation. Hereupon the Bishops, by the Peoples consent, endeavoured to form the Government of the Church within the Empire, into a conformity to the Government of the Empire: And they contrived that those Cities whose Governours had the chief Civil Power, their Bishops should have answerable Church-Power; the Glory of the Empire drawing them for seeming Interest, into imitation.

8. From the like Principles they desired greatly the enlargement of the Churches of which they were Overseers: And whereas Christ had made single Churches like Schools, and every stated Worshipping Church, was also a Governed Church, as every School hath its School-Masters, one, or more, by degrees these Churches were by degeneration quite altered into other things: First, They were like a Parochial Church, which added Chappels: They thought not so contemptibly of the Pastoral work as we do, but found enough, as is said, for many men in a Church of a few hundred or thousand souls: And when by Persecution, or Numbers, or Distance, they could not all meet ordinarily in one place, they appointed them to meet under several Presbyters, in several places, but without appropriating a particular Presbyter to each Assembly.

2. After they appropriated them to their distinct charges, and distinguished a stated Worshipping company from a Governed Church, the Bishop and his Consistory ruling all in common; and the People tied to communicate only at the Bishops Altar, and elsewhere to be but Hearers and Worshippers.

3. After that they set up Altars up and down for Monuments and Memorials of Martyrs, and then in the Presbyters Chappels, yet so that the People were at Easter, Whitsunside, and the Nativity,
tivity, to communicate with the Bishop in the Mother Church or Cathedral.

4. Then when Country-Villages distant had a great increase of Christians, they allowed Country-Bishops, Choreepiscopos, (proved by Petavius to be true Bishops; if they were not, Presbyters ordained.) But they must be subject to the City Bishop. 5. After this they decreed that every little Cities should have no Bishops, no vilescat nomen Episcopi; whenas before that every City had a Bishop and Elders, that had Christians enow: And every Town, like our Corporations, or Market-Towns, were called Cities: nias did not signify only such as we now call Cities distinct from such Towns; were they no bigger than Cenchrea, Majuma, and such others close to greater Cities, they had Bishops. Yea every Church was to have their Elders, (and consequently Bishops, faith Dr. Hammond) where ever it was, by the Rule of the Holy Ghost, Acts 14.23. And God never said, Let there be no Churches but in Cities: Else when an Emperour would put down all the Cities, or many, he should put down as many Churches.

6. After this they set up Patriarchs as before they had done Metropolitans: And it was three that they first set up (but no where out of the Empire;) And the Papists find in the Institution the mystery of Trinity in Unity: For they could not find any where Twelve Seats Successors to the Twelve Apostles; and so they feigned, that Peter being the Center of Unity, The Trinity flowed from him. 1. He as Bishop erected the Antiochian Patriarchate. 2. By St. Mark his Disciple, the Alexandrian. And 3. By his final Episcopacy the Roman, faith Joh. Dar- tis, de Status Eccles. tempore Apostoli, pag. 23, 24. [Imitatur Ecclesia D:um ut trium in Personis & unum in essentia, quatenus sint tres una & eadem Ecclesia est multiplex ratione locorum; nam distributio prima & generalis omnium Ecclesiarchi: in tres Patriarchatus, Romanum, Alexandrinum, & Antiochenum, ut unum esset per tres Antifites Sacerdotum ad Trinitatis infar cui una est atque individua potestas ut reale interpretatur Symmachus Pap. ad Eonium--- Dicendum est quod sicut in Trinitate una existente esse must, tamen personas differentes existunt, ita Ecclesia una est essentia, licet plures particulares existant: Et sicut omnes Trinitatis personas originem sumunt & Patre, qui est origo Fili, & uterque Sp. Sancti, ita Ecclesia origo est Romana aliarum.]

7. After
7. At the same time they began to describe Churches or Bishop Provinces by the Measures of Land, which before were described by the Persons of Volunteers, inhabiting near each other, faith the aforesaid Davis p. 128. Et sanc diu duravit ille mos tamen Apostolica in Ecclesiis, ut non essent aii termini Episcopatus quam multitudo eorum quos ab idem convertissent & baptizassent, which he proveth out of the Canons.

8. Rome being the imperial Seat, the Bishop of Rome was nearest the Emperour and subordinate Rulers, and so most capable to make Friends for Christians under any Accusations and Persecutions; by which advantage all Christians through the Empire needing and being glad of such help, did willingly give the Primacy to the Romane Patriark.

9. The Emperor Constantine turning Christian, and taking them for his surest Souldiers, resolved to raise them as high as he well could, for the interest of Christianity and his own, and thereby to work down the Heathens by degrees, and accordingly gave them chief Countenance, and chief Power; and their Bishops being their chief men, it must be done by exalting them. He made them the authorized Judges of all Christians that desired it, even in criminal cases. He yet gave not the Bishops the power of the Sword; but if any Christians had committed Fornication, Adultery, Perjury, yea Murder, the Bishop was to punish them by Pennance and Suspension from the Sacrament: Besides which, Christians had the chief Preferments as they were capable of in the Armies and Civil Government: So that, they triumphed over their late Persecutors, And now Honour, Power and Wealth, were most on the Christians side, but especially the Bishops.

10. Worldly Interest being now on the Churches side, much of the World by such Motives crowded into the Church, and no man can imagine that it could be otherwise, who considers which way the Vulgar go, and how apt to be of the Prince's mind, and how much nature inclineth to fleshly Interest: Who had not rather be kept from the Sacrament and Communion for a crime, till he profess Repentance, than to be hanged or banished, or ruined for it?

But especially the Temptation was strongest to the Bishops, whose baits were the most alluring: And ever since then they that most loved Wealth, Power and Honour (that is, the worst, most worldly
worldly men) have been the most eager defirers and seekers of Bishopricks: And while humble holy men must rather be sought to, such earnest seekers are like to be the ordinary finders and possessors.

11. But yet three things kept up for some time a considerable number of godly Bishops in the Churches, which with the humble Presbyters, kept up the Interest of sound and practical Religion.

1. Those that had been tryed worthy men before Constantines conversion, and the Bishop's exaltation, kept their Integrity in the main; though in the Nicene Council their contentious Libels shewed that we are more beholden to Constantine than to them, that they fell not into such strife as their Successors did. Good men may be carryed too far in Pride and Strife, but they will not be mastered by them, and turn against the Power of Godliness.

2. The People and Inferiour Clergy had the choice of their Bishops: And so (though they oft had tumults, as in popular Elections it will be) yet the worst ambitious men were long kept out, and the best oft chosen, till the People and Presbyters themselves were corrupted.

3. And divers good Emperours arose that took some care to promote the best: But alas! this had sad and frequent interruptions.

12. For the Arians posses Constantine himself with hard thoughts of Athanasius and his Adherents: And it could not be expected that Julian should countenance the best, when Constantius and Valens had done so much against them, and got most of all the Churches headed by Arian Bishops; to say nothing yet of after times.

13. But now two things became matter of Contention among the Bishops and their Clergy, and increased the strife from time to time. The first and chief was the Old Cause greatly strengthened, viz., Who should be greatest? Who should have the largest, fatterst, and most Ruling Diocess and Seat? The other was, Who should be taken for the most Orthodox, and whose Explications of the Faith should be taken for the soundest; especially about the description of the Person and immanent atts of Christ? Or briefly, 1. Jurisdiction and Greatness: 2. Wisdom and hard words.

14. Now
14. Now also Constantinople contended with Rome, and being the Seat of the Empire which they judged to be the true Reason of Church-preheminence, they at first modestly took the second place: And now the Trinity of Patriarchs was turned to five, Jerusalem being made the fifth. At all this Rome grudged.

15. All this while the old Discipline of the Church was tolerably kept up; 1. Because though much of the world had got into the Church, yet a very great part were tenacious of their Heathenish Customs, and prejudiced against Christians by their Contentions, (odiously described by Am. Marcellinus, and many others, and prejudiced against Constantine for his Son Crispus and Sopaters death, &c. and against Constantius for the Murder of Julian's Relations; and being taken with the plausible parts of Julian, and with the great Learning and highly extolled Lives of Plotinus, Porphyrius, Iamblichus, Aedesius, Maximus, Proceresius, Libanius, Chrysanthius, and such others, described by Eunapius, &c. so that except Rome and Alexandria, for 200 years, and some few of the very great Churches, for 400, the Churches were no greater than one Bishop and his Confessus, might tolerably govern by the Keys. 2. And all this while all the Presbyters were Church-Governours as well as the Bishop, though he was their Chief, and all Excommunications were to be done by joint consent; And so many Church-Governours may do more than one.

16. Then Councils called General, having by the Emperours Grant, and the Clergies Desire and Consent, the Supreme Church-Power, it was in these Councils that the Pride, Ambition and Domination of all the worldly Prelates that were too soon got in, did exercise itself as the valour and wit of Souldiers in a field of War: And as 1. The good men yet among them; 2. And the Articles of Faith yet retained by them, did cause them to do much good against some Heresies and Disorders, so the Pride and Turbulency, yea ignorance of the rest, caused them to become the occasions of the doleful Schisms, and Heresies; and Enmity of Christians against each other, which continue to this day unhealed.

17. These hurtful Contentions in Councils at first prevailed but little; and that at Nice did much more good (I think) than harm: And after at Constant: a little more hurt was done, and unch good: And those that followed did worse and worse, till the proud worldly Spirit contracted Malignity, and so much prevailed,
prevailed, that for a thousand years at least the Bishops with
their Prelatical Clergy and their Councils have been the grand
Corruption and Plague of the Church; which many of the most
Learned Expositors of the Revelation, take to be the Image of
the Beast; and Dr. H. Moore calls it a Heathenish Christianity,
which they have made their Religion.

18. In their progress to all this, as the Dioceses first grew up
from our Parochial Magnitude towards that of the present Dio-
cesan, so the very Pastoral Power of all the rest of the Presby-
ters, was by degrees taken away, so far as that they had no
consenting power in Ordinations or Excommunications, unless
the Bishop would choose a few for his Council: so that the proper
power of the Key's was confined to one Bishop over many
hundred Parishes; and so Discipline became an impossible
thing, save as it served the Bishops against some that they dis-
liked: And so the Church which was as the Garden of Christ,
became like the Commons, and good and bad were little diffe-
renced in Communion.

19. Yet because the Power must still be useful to the Bishops
ends, as he sees cause, some shadow of the old exercise must be
kept up: But the Bishop having not leisure for the tenth part of
the labour which this very shadow required, Lay-men are made
his Chancellours to decree Excommunications and Absolutions,
and to Govern by the Church Keys; like a secular Court: And
Commissaries, Officials, Surrogates, and other hard names and
things, are set up instead of the Presbyters and their Antient
Office.

20. By this time the Antient Species of the Churches was al-
terred; and whereas it was long held, that a Church and Bishop
were Correlates, and there were no more Churches than Bishops,
now many hundred or a thousand Parishes are become no
Churches, but parts of one Diocesan Church, which is the lowest,
and many score or hundred of the old sort of Bishops, all cast
out and swallowed up by one. Just as if a thousand, or some
hundred Schools should have but one Governing Schoolmaster,
and be but one School, but each part have an Usher to read to
the Boyes, and tell the one Schoolmaster as a Monitor what they
did amiss; but might correct none, nor put them out.

21. By this time they began to live on blood; and even as
they swelled in the beginning, cruelty grew up equally with
Pride:
Pride: For Reason and Scripture were not on their side, nor would justify their Cause and them, and therefore violence must do it: They desired not the bare title of Power, but the exercise of it, to promote the Issues of their Wit and Will. They began with rash silencing, ejecting and deposing Dissenters, and thence to anathematizing them, and thence to banishing, till at last it grew up to tormenting in the Inquisition, and burning them.

22. And whereas (notwithstanding the petty Heresies among Christians too early) the glory of the Antient persecuted Christians was their entire Love and Concord, and the shame of the Philosophers was their discord; it came to that pass, that whereas a Heresie of old did start up among a few for a small time, like our Ranters and Quakers, who shame Religion no more than Bedlams shame Reason: Now the great Continents of the Earth have been the Seats of the millions of those called Hereticks and Schismaticks by each other, about 1400 or 1300 years. Euseb. in Prapar. & Demonstration copiously sheweth that the Philosophers were all confounded in disfention (and yet did not persecute each other) but that the Christians were all of one Religion, cleaving to one Sacred Word of God: Of which also see Rayn. Breganitam in Theol. Gent. de Cogn. Dei, Euar. 5. cap. 8. To be Lovers of good men, was the character of the old Bishops: To be dividers, and haters, and slanderers, and silencers, and persecutors, and murderers of them, grew up with corrupters Pride.

23. And with these did gradually grow up corruptions of Doctrine, even while they pretended a burning Zeal against Heresie; and corruption of God's publick Worship, till it grew up to all the Mafs and Roman Impurities.

24. And to secure all this against Reformation, ridiculous Legends, and falsification of Church-History, made it hard for posterity what to believe, or whom.

§ 15. Being thus far sure of the matter of fact, by what degrees Prelacy grew up to the height, that it hath now attained in the World abroad, I considered what men thought of it now at home (I am speaking yet but of matter of fact;) and I found great diversity in mens thoughts of it.

1. As to the Roman height, I found that the Church of England since the Reformation till A.B.Laud's time took the Pope to be the Anti-
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we may unite with the Church of Rome, though they claim
as Peter's Successors, the Universal Supremacy at least to be
exercised according to the Canons of Councils. And that it
is not the Church of Rome, but the Court of Rome, which at
present we may not unite with. That the Church of Rome is
a true Church, and hath had an uninterrupted Succession, and
its Sacraments true Sacraments: But none of those Protestants
Churches are true Churches, that have not Diocesan Bishops;
not any of their Pastors true Ministers of Christ, who have not
Diocesan Episcopal Ordination; nor any that have such, unless
it hath as such been conveyed down from the Apostles by un-
interrupted Succession by such Diocesans. That such men have
no true Sacraments, God not owning what is done by any not
so ordained: That therefore they have no Covenant-promise
of, or right to Pardon and Salvation, because such right is
given only by the Sacrament: That therefore all such Pro-
testants Sacraments are but nullities, and a prophanation of
holy things: And that the Holy Ghost being the Instituter of
these sacred things, it is the sin against the Holy Ghost to under-
take and exercise the Ministry, & celebrate Sacraments without
such uninterrupted successive Ordination. That an Ordained
Minister, hath no more power than was intended him by his
Ordainers: That in such Presbyterians, or Episcopal Churches,
which have their power from the Ordainers, and so far for want
of Succession, are nullities; it is safe for men (as e.g. in France)
to be rather of the Roman Church than theirs.
§ 16. And as I found this Doctrine in the ascendent in Eng-
lund, so I met with such as were for using Protestants according-
ly, even for the silencing of them by thousands, if they would
not swear, profess, promise, and do all that — And for using the
People accordingly. And abating neither big nor little, an
Oath or a Ceremony to unite or save them. And I lived in an
Age where these things were no idle speculations.
§ 17. Being thus far sure of the Matter of Fact, I studied as
well as I was able to know which of these waies was right: And
I saw that either Popery that is, the Popes universal Headship
or Government is of Divine Institution, or else it is a heinous U-
furpation, and formeth a sort of Church which is not on any pre-
tence of Concord to be owned. And as to the first I have said
before and in many Books what I have to say against it; which
is all summed up in Doctor Iz. Barrow, and Doctor H. More, and largely told the world by Chamier, Sadecl, Whitaker, Jewell, Usher, Morton, White, Chillingworth, Crakenthorpe, and abundance more. And I thought it strange if either Papacy, or that Tympanite of the Clergy which tended to it, were of God, that the Persons should be ordinarily so bad, and it should introduce so great mischief in doctrine, worship and practice over the Christian world, and bring the Church into such a divided and polluted state, and that as the Clergy swelled the Body should pine away, and the Spirit of holiness and Love be turned into the Skelleton of Ceremony and Formality, and into hatred, cruelty, and tearing and tormenting pains.

§ 18. Upon all such thoughts I concluded in these resolutions; 1. That I must not accuse any Office made by God, for mens abuse of it. 2. Nor must I accuse the good for the faults of the bad. 3. Nor Confound the Office it self, with its disease, and the accidental Tympanite. 4. Nor aggravate humane infirmities in good men, as if they were the crimes of malignant Enemies. 5. Much less lay any of the blame on Christianity or Piety, when nothing in the world is so much against all these Evils, nor would they have been so far limited, restrained or resitted, had it not been for that Christianity and Piety that was kept up against it; nor is there any other cure of it. It is not by Religion, but for want of more true and serious Religion, that all these mischiefs have so lamentably prevailed.

§ 19. I therefore resolving to avoid extrems, concluded thus; 1. That it is most certain that Christ is the only Head of the Church.

2. And that as such he himself did make universal Laws, and will be the final universal Judge, and there is no other that hath universal Legislative and Judicial Power but he.

3. As such he instituted necessary Church-Officers; first, extraordinary ones to be his Instruments in Legislation, as Moses was to the Jews, giving them his Spirit extraordinarily for that use, to bring all that he taught them to their remembrance, and guide them to deliver and record all his Commands: And ordinary Ministers (as the Priests and Levites to the Jews) to teach and apply these Commands, or universal Laws, to the end of the World, but not to add, diminish or alter them.

4. That the formal Essence of this continued Sacred Ministry consisteth
confirmit in a derived Power and Obligation in subordination to Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, to Teach, to Guide the Churches in holy Worship, and to Rule them by the Pastoral Power, which maketh them Ministerial Judges of mens capacity for Church-Communion; but they have as such no forcing power of the Sword.

5. That there are two sorts of these Ministers accidentally distinguished: 1. Such as are only ordained to the Ministry in general, and not specially related to any one particular Church more than other; whose work is to do their best to Teach Infidels, and baptize them, and gather Churches, and occasionally to Officiate orderly in such Churches where they come as need their help. 2. Those that have moreover an additional call to be the stated Pastors, Overseers, or Guides of particular Churches as fixed Officers of Christ. All which have the three foresaid Essentials of the Office, to Teach, Worship and Rule.

6. That the Office of these men is to be performed by themselves, and no Lay-man may do any Essential part of them by their deligation, and therefore (as in Physicians, Tutors, &c.) necessary Personal abilities are as essential as the necessary dispositio materiae is ad receptionem alicujus forma. And ex quo vis lignum non fit mercurium.

7. That it is very much, and great, and most important work, which these Ministers have to do. To Preach God's Word understandingly, faithfully, constantly, fervently; to resolve the doubtful, to reprove the scandalous, to persuade the obstinate, to confute gain-sayers, to comfort the sad, and strengthen the weak, particularly as there is occasion. To visit the sick, Catechize, Baptize, besides all acts of publick Government. Therefore one man cannot possibly do all this for too great a number of souls, but great Congregations must have many Ministers: And so they had in the Primitive Church, where the most able Speakers preached usually in publick, and the rest did more of the personal and more private work.

8. And whereas it was very early that most single Churches had one that had a preheminence amongst the rest (not as of another Office, but as a President in a College of Philosophers, Physicians or Divine Students, to be a Governor over those of his own profession, by moderate Guidance,) and it is not unmeet, that when one worthy Teacher hath gathered a Church, and
and brought up younger Christians to Ministerial abilities, that they when they are ordained should take him for their Father, I will never gainsay such an Episcopacy in single Churches (that is, societies of Christians combined for personal Communion in Doctrine, Worship and Holy living under such Pastors as aforesaid.)

9. And because I find that the Apostles and Evangelists had a Ministerial care of many Churches to teach, reprove, exhort the Pastors and People; And though the Apostles' extraordinary power and work ceased, yet Church-Oversight as well as Preaching being an ordinary continued work; and when I find Christ hath instituted some Teachers over many Churches, I dare not say that he hath repealed this till I can prove it. And the nature of the thing tells us, that if some grave holy men have the care of counselling and warning and reproving the Ministers of many Churches who are below them in parts and worth; it may do much good and can do no harm to the Churches, while they have no power of force or tyranny, Therefore I resolved never to speak or do any thing against such Bishops of Bishops, though Diocesan.

§ 20. Thus far I have oft declared my self for Episcopacy: But finding in all the aforesaid History, how the Church came to the woful State that it hath been in these 1200 years, and what it suffereth by the Bishops and their Clergy in almost all parts of the Christian World; and that even the English Diocesans can endure no more Parochial Pastoral Discipline than they do, (I mean such as Bucer in Script. Anglic. preist so vehemently on King Edw. and the Bishops) and that they cannot contentedly hold their Lordships, Wealth and Honours, without silencing and ruining Two thousand such as I, or better; and using many thousands of godly Christians as they do; and finding that I and such others are accused as being disobedient to them—- and for not swearing and covenanting never to endeavour any alteration of their present Church-Government, and all excommunicate by the Canon that say there is any thing in it (even from the Archdeacon downward to [the rest in Office ] repugnant to the Word of God) I took it at last to be my duty to give the Reasons of my dissent in a full Treatise of Episcopacy.

And because I perceived young men and strangers to former times, deceived by the general noise, How Antient and Univer-
Universal Episcopacy hath been; as if all that is called Episcopacy were but one and the same thing; or as if we were against the Primitive Episcopacy; therefore I suddenly (and too hastily for want of time,) bestowed a few weeks in summing up the Heads of the History of Bishops and Councils, out of a few Historians which were most common, next at hand, and of most credit with those whose faults I opened: That it might be truly known How much the tumified degenerate sort of Prelacy had caused the Divisions and Calamities of the Church.

§ 21. For this Mr. Morrice (as same faith) and many, more are so greatly offended with me, and say of me herein what they do. And on pretence of Vindicating the Primitive Church which untruly implyeth that I who vindicated it against corrupters did oppose it: he defendeth the corruptions and sinful miscarriages and diseases of the Prelates: And this he doth, 1. By striving to make me contemptible as unlearned, as if that would excuse the sins which I rehearse and lament: He findeth in one place through my haste and heedlesnes, a word of Theodore misplaced, and the word [Calamis] translated Quills, which he thinks should be Reeds; and one or two more such; as if he prevaricated, and had a design to extoll the Book, which he finds no more and greater fault in, than he really hath done. And he proveth it likely that I never saw the Histories that stood by me near twenty years, because the Printer put a Comma between [Marquardius] and [Freberus] (I think there are a dozen Comma's misplaced in my whole Book;) when he himself faith of his own Book [The faults that have escaped are almost infinite.] But of these things more anon.

2. He loudly and frequently chargeth me with malicious falsifying History; and when he cometh to the proof, I have shewed you who the falsifier is.

3. The great thing I am accused of, is making the Bishops more the causes of Heresies, Schisms and Violence, than they were: And of that I have said nothing, but what I think I have fully proved: And let the Reader judge by this following Catalogue.

Domineering Pride hath been the chief cause of Heresies and Schisms, especially working in the Clergy to tumid Prelacy and Tyranny.

1. I before noted how the Apostles began to strive who should be greatest, till the effusion of the Spirit after Christ's rebukes had
had cured them. And what tyranny Diotrephes used through love of Preheminence.

II. If the doubtful stories of Simon Magus be true, his tumor was more than Papal; And Epiphanius makes Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, to be but his Offspring. The Original of the Nicolasians and Gnosticks (who Epiphanius faith, had ensnared himself one) is utterly uncertain; Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Ebion, Valentine, Secundus, Prolemus, were all but Birds of the same Gnosticks Neft, a crazed sort of men that mingled Christianity, Platonism, and Magical Imaginations; and what they were themselves, is not known: Such was Marcus, Colarbasus, Heracleon, the Opistae, the Cainites, the Sethians, Cerdo; Marcion was a Bishop's Son cast out for vice; and Lucian, Apelles and Severus his Offspring, the Heads of their little Sects; whether Bishops or not, is unknown. What kind of Hereticks Tertullian, Tatianus, and Origen were, and how many faults as foul Laelian, and many not numbered with Hereticks have, is well known: And among all these in those early days, till there were Popes and Diocesans (such as now) in the world, none such could be Hereticks.

III. Many Councils contended about the time of Easter, and Victor with one part of Bishops, excommunicated Polycrates and the Arian Bishops; while, as Socrates and Sozomen tell us, the Churches that left it indifferent had peace.

IV. A Council of the best Bishops at Carthage decreed Re-baptizing.

V. A Council of the Bishops of Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia, &c; at Iconium, for Re-baptizing those Baptized by Hereticks: And Stephen Bishop of Rome excommunicated them all.

VI. A Council at Synadis, and divers others decreed the same Re-baptizing.

VII. Divers more African Councils of good Bishops with Cyprian, decree the same, whom Stephen Bishop of Rome condemned.

VIII. Divers Bishops are said to be Sabellian Hereticks.

IX. Paulus Samosatenus Bishop of Antioch was a Heretick.

X. The Council of Bishops at Cirta in Numidia under Secundus Mr. M. calls worse than I do.

XI. A Carthage Council of 70 Bishops An. 306. set up the Donatists Schism, striving for the preheminence, who should be Bishop of Carthage.
XII. An. 308. Another Donatist's Council had 270 Bishops. Many more Councils they had.

XIII. The first General Council at Nice we honour, and assent to its Creed: But thank Constantine for burning all their Libels, and keeping peace by his presence and speech.

XIV. The Schism made by Meletius and Peter, Bishops, is well known.

XV. The first General Council at Nice we honour, and assent to its Creed: But thank Constantine for burning all their Libels, and keeping peace by his presence and speech.

XVI. Epiphanius faith, that Audius was driven to his Heresie by being long abused, beaten, and at last excommunicated for reproving the Bishops and Priests for their Covetousness, Luxury, and other sins: And so he became a Bishop himself.

XVII. Eusebius Nicom. made Bishop of Constantinople (whom you tell us Valesius thinks was no Heretic) hired a Whore at Antioch, to father her Child on Eustathius the Bishop there, and got more Bishops to depose him, and the Emperour to banish him.

XVIII. A Council of Bishops at Tyre unjustly condemn and persecute Athanasius.

XIX. Three Bishops (faith Mr. M. overcome with too much Wine and persuasion) ordained Novatian falsely Bishop of Rome (before this aforementioned.)

XX. A Council at Jerusalem An. 335. tried and approved Arian Faith, and restored him.

XXI. A Council at Constantinople condemned Marcellus Ancyrenus, and Athanasius, and justified Arian.

XXII. A Council of near 100 Bishops at Antioch, 36 being Arians, depose Athanasius.

XXIII. Another Council at Antioch make a new Creed without [ως δωρα].

XXIV. A Council of 376 Bishops at Sardica, decree Appeals to Rome, which Augustin and the African Bishops were against.

XXV. The Semi-Arian Bishops went to Philippopolis, and condemned such as the other at Sardica had absolved, but cast out [ως δωρα] as not Scriptural, and cast dreadful accusations on Athanasius, Paulus C. P. and Marcellus.

XXVI. An. 350. A Council at Milan received Ursacius and Valens, Arians.

XXVII. Stephen
XXVII. Stephen an Arian Bishop hired a Whore to go in to Bishop Euphrates; and this Euphrates after turned Photinian.


XXIX. An. 355. A General Council at Milan of above 300 Western Bishops (though the Eastern that were most Arian could not come) where Athanasius was condemned, and communion with the Arians subscribed.

XXX. An. 356. A Council at Bytterris condemned and banished Hilary, and condemned them as Separatists or Schismatics that renounced the Arian Communion.

XXXI. A General Council at Sirmium of 300 Western Bishops besides the Eastern, made three different Creeds, condemned Athanasius, left out the word [Substance] made P. Liberius, and old O'sus subscribe against Athanasius.

XXXII. The Oriental Bishops at Ancyra were only for [διονυσόν] and not [διονύσιος] and with Macedonius against the Godhead of the Holy Ghost.

XXXIII. A General Council 400 Bishops met at Ariminum; of whom most at first were Orthodox; but after when the Emperor interposed, subscribed to the Arian Party.

XXXIV. The rest sat at Seleucia, and were more Orthodox, but divided into Acacians, who were for leaving out [Substance] and Semi-Arians, who were for [Like Substance]. Sulp. Severus tells us, that many Bishops quieted their Consciences by [subscribing in their own sense] and so deceived the Arians that thought they had won them.

XXXV. A Council at C. P. made a Ninth Creed, leaving out [Substance and Hypostasis, The Semi-Arians for this banished the Authors.

XXXVI. A Council at Antioch cast out Miletus, and made a Tenth Creed, worse than the rest.

XXXVII. Julian Reigning, Athanasius calls a Council at Alexandria, which had almost divided East and West about the names [Hypostasis and Persona;] but that some wise men persuaded them that the words were both of the same signification; which yet was hardly entertained afterward.

XXXVIII. A Council at Antioch of Semi-Arians Petitioned Galianus to cast out the Acacians; till they knew his mind, and then the Arian Bishops turned Orthodox.

XL. An Arian Council of Bishops in Caria under Valens: And another at Singeduni in Misia.

XLI. Damasus in a Roman Council condemneth Sisinius for Conventicles: For at the Election in the Church they fought for these two: And Damasus his Party one day left 137 dead bodies behind them, and got the better.

XLII. Valens by cruelty set up Arian Bishops in a great part of the East.

XLIII. The first General Council at C. P. is commonly called the Second General, when yet that at Sardica, Ariminum, Sirmium, Milan, were General also: They were many good men, and did good: But how they used Nazianzen to the great grief of the Church of C. P. and how Nazianzen describeth them, I desire the Reader to take from his own words, and not from mine, or Mr. M.

XLIV. The Council at Caesar Augusta did that which made Martin separate from them and all their Councils after to his death.

XLV. A Council at C. P. set up Flavian at Antioch, and a Council at Rome were for Paulinus: The former advance C. P. and Jerusalem.

XLVI. Many Schismatical Councils of Donatist Bishops followed.

XLVII. For Theophilus case I refer you to Socrates and Sozomen.

XLVIII. Epiphanius his Schismatical usage of Chrysostom is unexcusable.

XLIX. And so is Theophilus prosecution of him, and a Synod of Bishops casting him out, and Cyril's restoring the restoring of his name when dead, and reviling the Ioannites that kept separated Meetings for his sake.


The Bishops cast out for Simony, I will not number here.

LI. The Contentions between Boniface and Eulalius, and others after them to get the Bishoprick of Rome, are so many as I will not number them. And the striving of three Bishops successively against the African Fathers for the Roman super-eminence and Appeals to Rome, are commonly known.

LII. One
LII. One of Bishop Boniface's Decrees is, That [No Bishop shall be brought before any Judge, Civil or Military, either for any Civil or Criminal Cause.]

LIII. What the first General Council at Ephesus did in the Cause of Nestorius I have fully opened: Derodons Evidence is undeniable, that Nestorius was Orthodox as to the Matter, though he mistaken as to words, in thinking that Mary should not be called The Mother of God, but of Christ who is God. (which Luther also shews.) Yet since that Councils anathematizing him, a great body of Christians in many Eastern Kingdoms, to this day are a party hereticated by the rest. Is not such an effect of 1200 years continuance, a witness of the failing of that Council?

LIV. The Bishops of C. P. and Alexandria striving which should be greatest, a Council at C. P. decided it for C. P. where Theodoret was for Alexandria, and fell under displeasure.

LV. Leo M. Bishop of Rome, claims the title of Head of the Catholick Church.

LVI. Two Councils at C. P. one against Eutyches and the other for him.

LVII. The second Council at Ephesus is so heavily accused by Mr. M. and such others, that I need not accuse it more. Flavianus of C. P. was there hurt to death. Yet Bellarmin confesseth it wanted nothing of a true General Council but the Pope's approbation.

LVIII. A Council at Alexandria under Dioscorus excommunicate Leo.

LIX. What the Council of Calcedon hath done I have shewed: Instead of reconciling the Nestorian and Eutychian Controversies by a skillful explication of their ambiguous unfit words, they Anathematized both and banished Dioscorus, And ever since to this day, the Eutychians and Nestorians are separated Dissenters.

LX. At Alexandria, the Bishops party that the Council was for (Proterius) and Timothy whom Dioscorus party were for, so raged, that they murdered Proterius, and dragg'd his carcase in the streets, and bit his flesh: And each party still accused the other.

LXI. Pulcheria (Theodosius's Sister and Martian's Wife) being for the Council, and Eudocia Theodosius's Widdow for Dioscorus, they animated the several Parties of Bishops and Monks: And in Palestine Juvenal Bishop of Jerusalem was expelled, Severianus Bishop of Scythopolis killed, &c.

LXII. Leo}
LXII. Leo the Emperour commanding obedience to the Cæcilian Council, at Alexandria and Antioch the Armies of contending Bishops were in continual war, calling each other Nestorians and Eutychians; one Bishop banished by the Emperour, the contrary Bishop murdered by the people, and cast into the River; the next getting the better again, &c.

LXIII. In Martian's and Leo's days most Bishops subscribed to the Council. When Basilius usurped, and was against the Council, faith Niceph. three Patriarchs, and five hundred Bishops renounced it, most before having damned its adversaries. Basilius recanteth his Commands, and commandeth all to be for the Council, and the Bishops obey him, save those of Asia. Zeno recovereth the Empire, and is for the Council, and the Asian Bishops turn for it, and say they subscribed to Basilius at first for fear. Zeno seeing it impossible otherwise to make Peace, leaveth all indifferent whether they will subscribe the Council or not. Then the War grew hotter between the Bishops and their Armies against each other, specially the Patriarchs; all being in Confusion, at Alexandria, Antioch and C. P. and no Emperour wise enough to quiet them.

LXIV. Anastasius a peaceable man, made Emperour, leaveth all to think of the Council as they will: Then the Bishops fall into three Parties; some for every word in the Council; some anathematizing it, and some for the indifferency: The East one way, the West another, and Libya another; yea each Country divided among themselves: Faith Niceph. So great confusion and blindness of mind befell the whole World. The Emperour falls upon the impeaceable of both sides: At his own place C. P. the Sedition of the People overcame him, for their Council Bishop, which turned the Emperour more against the Council, and that Bishop and the rest.

LXV. At Antioch the Armies of two Bishops fought it out, and the Council Party getting the better, killed so many Monks, as to save the labour of burying them, they cast their bodies into the River: And after another Party of them made as great a slaughter. For this blood the Emperour banish'd Flavius the Council Bishop: This was called Persecution. Pet. Alex. being dead, the Bishops of Alex, Egypt and Libya, fell all into pieces among themselves, and had separate Meetings: The rest of the East separated from the West, because the West refused Communion with them,
them unless they would anathematize Nèstorius, Eutychæs, Dioscorus, Mogus, and Aœacus: And yet faith Niceph. Quigerm: Dio enforcing & Eutychæs sectatores fueræ, ad maximum panicitatem redacti sunt. Note that Flavian the Council Bishop for fear with his Fellow Bishops (threatened by Bishop Xenaias) subscribed an Anathema against Theodore, Theodorite, Ibas, as Nestorians: The Isaurian Bishops yield to anathematize the Council. Severus a fierce Enemy of the Nestorians made Patriarch at Antioch, forced many Bishops to renounce the Council; and many to fly. The Isaurian Bishops repent and condemn Severus: The Emperor commanded out two Bishops for condemning their Patriarch: The People defend them, and force the Emperor to desist, because he would shed no blood for Bishops. Helias Bishop of Jerusalem, saw all the Bishops in such confusion, that he would communicate with none of them, but the Bishop of C. P. The Monks at Jerusalem proclaim Anathema to all that equal not the four Councils to the four Evangelists, and write to the Emperor that they would make good the conflict to blood, and went about to engage men to the Council: The Emperor commanded the Bishop to reform this: He refuseth. The Emperor sendeth Soldiers to compel them, and the Bishops and Monks forcibly cast them out of the Church. He sent Olympus with a stronger band, who cast out the Bishop: The next Bishops and more Soldiers had yet more conflicts after this, and the Soldiers driven away by force.

LXVI. Felix of Rome, with 77 Bishops, excommunicate Aœacus of C. P. (with a [Nunquam Anathematis vinculis exundus] and their own two Bishops that obeyed the Emperor in communicating. The Schism between Laurentius and Symmachus, came to blood-shed, when five or six Councils laboured to heal it. Symmachus excommunicateth the Emperor and Bishop of C. P. as communicating with Hereticks; but not an Arian King then at Rome.

LXVII. A Council of 80 Bishops at Sidon anathematize the Council of Cæcædon.

The striving Parties keep up still in great Bodies, and the Melchites (as they call those that obeyed Kings and the Council) have one Patriarch at Damascus, the Eutychian Jacobites one at Mesopotamia, the Maronites one at M. Libanus, all called Patriarchs of Antioch, (and the Romans make a fourth of the same title).
title) and the Nestorians have their Patriarch at Muzal.

Of the many Heresies or Sects that rose up from the intemperate opposition to Nestorius, and the woful ruines they made in the East after the Caledon Councils, and all caused by Pride and Prosperity, and wantonness of Wit, and stoped only by the Conquest of the Sarazens and Arabians, and how orthodox now in their Captivity and Poverty they all are, even the Jacobites, the Nestorians, the Armenians, the Cepthri, the Abyssines, the Indians, and the Maronites, see the notable words of Brierwrod Enquir. p. 180, 181, 182, 183. As also how the Persian King was a great cause of the spreading of the Nestorians through his Dominions.

LXVIII. The East and West were divided in Justin's Reign, on the Question, whether the names of two Orthodox dead Bishops should be restored into the Dypticks, even Euphemius and Macedonius, whom the Pope had damned as communicating with Hereticks; the Bishops of the East being for it, and the West against it.

LXIX. Justin turning the stream for the Caled. Council, the Bishops in a Council at Jerusalem, and another at Tyre are for it, and condemn Severus. And a Roman Council condemneth the three dead Bishops of C. P. Acacins, Euphemius and Macedonius.

LXX. So far were the Bishops yet from Peace, that Justinian being Emperour, headed the Council Party, and his Wife the adverse Party.

About 30000 they say were then killed in C. P. at an Insurrection.

LXXI. A mischievous Schism for the Bishoprick at Rome, between Boniface 2. and Dioscorus and Agapetus after Boniface.

LXXII. In Justinian's time a Controversie arose, whether we may say [One of the Trinity was crucified?] Hormisda Bishop of Rome said No. The Nestorians took hold of this and said, [Then we may not say Mary was Mother to one of the Trinity.] Justinian sent for a Council about it to Pope John: He and his Bishops concluded contrary to Hormisda, that we may say [One of the Trinity was crucified.] And say Baronius and Binius [Ita mutatis hostibus arma mutari necesse est.] Faith changeth as occasions change. Reader, if thou feest not here how Bishops have broken the Church in pieces, I must not tell thee, lest Mr. M. be angry.
I intreat the Reader to see what I said, Hist. p. 132. of the Conference of Hypatius and the Eutychians.

LXXIII. A Council at C. P. calls their Bishop Patriarcha Oecumenicus, and condemn divers Bishops, as doth a Council at Jerusalem.

LXXIV. At Rome the Arian King made Silverius Bishop, and others chose Vigilius that murdered him. Vigilius excommunicated Menna of C. P. which Justinian revenged.

LXXV. A new Controversie is stated whether Christ's body was corruptible: The denyers had Gainas A. Bishop; The affirmers had Theodosius; The first were called Phantasias, the other Corrupticola. Most were for Gainas, but the Soldiers for Theodosius: They fought many daies, and the Soldiers killed many, and many of them were killed, and the Women with stones from the top of the houses, and the Soldiers with fire, continued the war: And the division continued in Liberatus's daies: Justinian was so zealous for the Council of Calcedon, that he murdered thousands (as they say) in Egypt, and yet dyed a reputed Heretick himself, being for the Corrupticola, and Evagrius faith, when he had set the whole world in tumult, he was damned himself. But God best knoweth that.

LXXVI. A Council at Barcelona Decree that Priests must cut their beards, but not shave them.

LXXVII. By the Cheat of an Eutychian Bishop Justinian was persuaded that the condemning of some Writings of Theodore Mopsuest, Theodorite and Ibas, would reconcile the Bishops: He calls a General Council at C. P. to that end (usually called the 5th) His Letters are read opening the doleful divisions, that the Churches had no Communion with one another, &c. The three Bishops writing are read: Theodorite charged by this General Council with that falt Epistle against dead Cyril, and a like Speech at Antioch, and none vindicated him: Binius and Mr. Morice and others say the Letter is forged: I know not; But the Tria Capitula are condemned. And now this General Council hath made a new dividing snare. Many that were for the Calcedon Council feared this was a condemning of what they did in receiving Theodorite, &c. The Adversaries were never the more satisfyed; but faith Binius himself [The end was not obtained, but a most grievous mischief added to the Church--- The whole Catholic Church was torn by Schism, and worse, the Emperour stir'd up Per-
secution, deposed or banished P. Vigilius; But lest the East should all forsake the West, he recanted and consented to the Council. Doth either the work, or the effect commend this General Council?

LXXVIII. A Council of Jerusalem have one Bishop, presently received this Decree.

LXXIX. A Western Council at Aquileia condemn this 5th General Council at C. P. and (faith Binius) separated from the whole Catholick Church (even from Rome) for an hundred years till Sergius reconciled them. Were the Western Bishops or the Pope then the Western Church? So many separated, that Vigilius being dead, there could but two Bishops (and a Presbyter) be got to ordain Pelagius his Successor. But the Emperour and his Pope persecute the Bishops, and the Schism seemed desperate.

LXXX. Another Council at C. P. An. 587. decree that John Bishop of C. P. be called The Universal Bishop; which greatly increased the Churches divisions.

LXXXI. King Gunthram called a Council at Mascon An. 589, finding all things grow worse and worse, & all long of the Bishops only, faith Binius.

LXXXII. Even Great Gregory called a Synod against the dissenting Bishops, and they not obeying his summons, the Bishop of Aquileia was ruined (the Western Head) Sabinian that succeeded Gregory would have had his Books burnt. Boniface the third got Phocas the Murderer to declare Rome the Chief Bishops Seat (He to whom Greg. had sung Latentur caeli, & exultet terra, &c.)

LXXXIII. Next rose up the Monothelite Controversie. Cyrus Bishop of Alexandria, to end the Controversies aforementioned, was told that to use the word [Dei virilis operation & voluntas] would unite them all, which past as satisfaction in a Council at Alexandria. P. Honorius persuaded them to silence [One] and [Two].

But this Counsel was rejected, and now whether Christ had [One] or Two Wills and Operations, became as de side, the new War of the Bishops through the world. Some were for [One] and some for [Two] as if [Will and Operation, and One or Two] were words that had but one signification; When every Novice in Philosophy must grant that Christ's Will and Operation in some sense, was but One, and in other senses Two, as I have proved. But Sergius Bishop of Const. set it on foot, Heraclius being for it, and Pyrrhus his Successor followed it on. And Sergius by a Council
Council of Bishops at C. P. decreed for [One Will.]

The Opinion and the Emperour Constans his silencing both, are condemned at Rome. The Pope, Emperours and Bishops, are all condemned, and persecuting each other about it.

LXXXIV. Con§. Pogonat. called a General Council at C. P. called the 6th, which condemned Macarius Bishop of Ant. and the pacificatory Epistles of P. Honorius and Sergius as Heretical, and all that were for One Will, and One Operation of Christ;
1. As denominated an naturis & earum principiis seu facultatibus, the Divine and Humane Will and Operations were and are Two:
2. As denominated ab unitate personas; they are the Will and Operations of One person, and so far may be called One. 3. As denominated ab unitate objectiva they are One: The Divine and Humane Nature will the same thing, so far as the Humane willeth, and do so far the same work: But if any will make a new Heresie by disputing whether the Divine Nature alone do not will and act somewhat without the volition and action of the Humane (since the Incarnation) they shall have no company of mine in it. 4. In the sense as the Operation of the principal and instrumental Cause are One, producing One Effect; so Christ's Divine and Humane Operations are One. 5. As Consent denominated Unity, and the Old Christians are said to be of One heart and soul, One mind and mouth; and Christ prayeth that we may be One in him, so his Will and Operation are One. 6. Yea if there be a sort of Union between Christ & his Members, and between the Blessed in Heaven, which is quite beyond our present comprehension, it is much much more so between Christ's Divine and Humane Will and Operations.

And now Reader, whether it was well done to pass over these and many other needful distinctions, and to put men barely to say that Christ's Will and Operations were not One, but Two, when really they were both One and Two; and to make the Pope himself a Heretic; for one of the wildest Epistles that ever Pope wrote (I am no such enemy to a Pope as to be partial,) and to divide the very Western Church from Rome, and make Aquileia its Head for an hundred years, and to set all the Roman Empire in a flame, anathematizing and separating from one another, because they had not skill or sobriety enough to ask each other by such distinctions what they meant, I say, if this be wisely and well done, and be a preface to Prelacy, and I be to blame for blaming.
blaming it, then good and evil is but what every diseased soul will make it. Mr. Morrice and his Masters, that honour their Leviathan for such works as these, do tell us, that they would do it themselves were it to be done again. And let it be their work, and the reward be theirs: For my part I abhor and renounce it.

LXXXV. Faith and Salvation now depended so much on Arithmetick, that the Bishops of Spain raised another Arithmetical Controversie, ascribing Three Substances in Christ, his Divinity, his Soul, and his Body, and say, [A Will begat a Will, that is, the Divine, the Humane.] These things are true. But the wise Pope was so affrighted with Arithmetical Controversies by experience of the mischiefous Effects, that he cautioned them much about it, and for that some judged him erroneous.

LXXXVI. The Council at Trull was one of the best that ever they had, yet shewed the Core of the Churches Plague, by decreeing, That whatever alteration the Imperial Power maketh on any City, the Ecclesiastical Order shall follow it. This Clergy ambition nurtit up Anti-Christ.

LXXXVII. A Council at Aquileia condemned the 5th General Council for condemning the Tria capitula.

LXXXVIII. Pope Sergius condemning the Trullan Council, the Emperour commanded him to be a Prisoner, and the Soldiers bribed rescued him.

LXXXIX. Bardanes Philippicus being made Emperor, he calleth a General Council at C. P. where, faith Binius, out of the East there were innumerable Bishops, (which is not said of any other Council) who all condemned the 6th General Council, and their Decrees of Two Wills and Operations.

Here (not I, but) Barovius and Binius say [Thus at the Beck of an Emperour, and the Will of a Monothelite Patriarch, the holy 6th Synod is condemned, and what they said of Two Wills with Christ, and two Operations, and all retracted by the Decree and Subscription of very many Oriental Bishops, that were in one moment turned from being Catholick to be Monothelites.] But do they forget the 100 Year, that even the West made a head against the 5th Council and the Pope.

XC. Next all the World is set together by the Ears about Images, for which the Pope rebelled against and rejected the Emperour for Charles Martel of France.

And Pope Zachary bid Boniface call a Council to eject the Averors of Antipodes.
CXI. In a General Council at C. P. 338 Bishops condemned the worshipping of Images, and swear men not to adore them, and destroyed relics, &c. and decreed, that Christ's Body is not flesh in Heaven; But the Pope and Western Bishops of his Party, condemn this Council.

XCII. The Greek Bishops condemn the Roman Bishops for adding [Filioq;] to the Creed, and so another occasion of Schism is raised.

XCIII. The Schisms in Italy and Rome itself now grew so great and the Effects in Blood and Confusions so dismal, that I must not number them one by one.

XCIV. Constantine and Leo Isaur. Emperours, being dead, a Woman Irene, and her Infant Son are for Images, and call a General Council for them at Nice, where Tharassus Bishop of C. P. got the Bishops to carry it for Images and Reliques, and the Chief Bishops that had condemned them before, now cryed pecavimus, and condemned those that were against adoration of Images, &c. If Mr. Morrice call me an Enemy to Repentance for reciting this, I cannot help it.

XCV. Yet more Schism: Two Bishops, Felix and Elipandus, say, That Christ as the eternal Word was Gods natural Son, but as Man he was but his adopted Son: (thinking that duo fundamenta, viz. Generatio eterna, & temporalis, duas faciunt Relationes, fiationis in uia persona. ) But Councils condemned them as making two Sons. And the great Council at Frank ford condemning the second Council of Nice, and Image-worship, condemn also these two Bishops, 1. For saying Christ was God's Adopted Son; 2. And that by Grace; 3. And that he was a Servant. Is any of this false, not excluding a higher title?

The Council concludeth that Christ was not a Servant subjected to God by penal servitude: Sure it was part of his suffering for our sins, to be in the form of a Servant, Phil. 2. 7.

XCVI. Binius faith the Filioq; was added to the Creed by the Spanish and French Bishops without the Pope.

XCVII. One Council at C. P. restored him that married the Emperour adulterously to another wife: And another condemned Theod. Studita and Plato, for being against it.

XCVIII. The most excellent Emperour Ludov. Pius was so zealous to reform the Bishops, that they hated him, and in a Council at Compendium (Compeigne) most perfidiously deposed him.
Dim, ana aicer oaiery aouieci mm, even witnout me rope.

XCIX. As to please his Son Lotharius, they deposed the Father; so when he was beaten by his Brethren, they after in a Council at Aquisgrane (Aken) deposed Lotharius, accusing him as they did his Father.

C. At C. P. a Council was called by the power of another Woman Theodora and the Bishops that had under divers Emperours condemned Image-worship, now turn to it again, and anathematize on a sudden the opposers.

Cl. The Bishops own Lotharius Adulterous marriage with Waldrada.

CII. The Councils that set up and pull'd down Ignatius and Photius at C. P. and the woful stirs that they made as Emperours changed, were lamentable.

CIII. Many contrary Councils were between the French Bishops that were for Lotharius divorce and the Pope.

CIV. Basl the Emperour writes to the Pope to pardon all his Bishops, or else they should be without, because all had miscarried, and turned with the times.

CV. A General Council at Conft. called by the Papists, The Eighth General Council, condemned Photius again, and set up Ignatius, and the Changers cryed, peccavimus, and make extreme Decrees for Images (But they well condemn subscribing to be true to their Patriarchs and Bishops;) but decree that all Princes and Subjects worship the Bishops, who must not fall down to them. Other horrid Elevations of Prelates above Princes they decreed—saying, A Bishop, though it be manifest that he is destitute of all Virtue of Religion, yet is a Pastor; and the Sheep must not resist the Shepherd.

CVI. A dangerous Rent between Rome and C. P. what Bishop should have the Bulgarians.

CVII. A Council at Metz called Pradorium, gave the Kingdom to Car. Calv. unjustly.

CVIII. A Council at Pavia falsely make Charles Emperour.

CIX. Another (Pontigones) confirmed it; (the Pope claiming the Power.)

CX. A Roman Council unjustly made Ludov. 3. Emperour.

CXI. A General Council at C. P. again set up Photius, and cast out [Filiog;]

CXII. The Roman actions for and against P. Formosus, are odious to all sober Christians Ears.

CXIII. A
CXIII. A Council at Sojons confirm the A. Bishoprick of Rheemes to a Child of five years old, Son to the E. of Aquitane. Divers other Councils do and undo about the same Cause.

CXIV. The History of the Bishops of Rome and their Councils from hence forward is so lamentable that even the most flattering Papist Historians mention them with detestation. So that I must not stay to name many particulars.

CXV. An. 1049. A Roman Council was fain to pardon Simoniical Bishops and Priests, because the Cry was, that else none would be left to officiate.

CXVI. Being come into the Roman sick, I will pass above an hundred more of the Councils of this woful sort of Bishops, lest Mr. Maurice think that I suppose him to vindicate them, or not to abhor them. Only remembering my Reader of a few General or notable things: viz.

I. The multitude of Schisms, and long vacancies at Rome; and the horrid incapacity of very many Popes, which prove an interrupted succession.

II. The horrid wars that long infested Italy by the Popes means.

III. The dismal wars with many Emperours, and the Bishops and Councils half on one side and half on the other.

IV. The Council that called the Emperours and others Princes power of investing Bishops, the Henrician Heresie, and judg'd the Bishops that had been for it to be dig'd out of their graves and burnt.

V. The Subjecting and debasing of all Christian Princes, making them but as the Body, and the Moon, and the Bishops, to be as the soul and the sun. Especially the General Lateran Council which decreed Transubstantiation, and all to be Hereticks that denied it; And oblige all temporal Lords to exterminate all such Hereticks on pain of Excommunication, deposition & damnation.

VI. The Councils of Constance and Basils that were for Reformation how fully and cruelly they dealt with Hus and Jerome and rejected the four great requeltis of the Bohemians, and fixed their pollutions.

VII. The Councils of Florence, and that of Trent, which had more Learned men, who yet more obstinately managed the Enmity to Reformation.

VIII. The present State of the Universal Church throughout the World as it is divided into Papists, Protestants, Greeks, Moscovites.
covites, Georgians, with the Circassians and Armenians, Nefiorians, Jacobites, Coptics, Abasines, Maronites, Melchites. And what thoughts these have of one another.

And I would desire Mr. Morrice to tell us,

1. Whether he believes not verily that all these Instances prove that the Bishops have been the chief cause, and that by Ambition, Pride and Worldliness?

2. Whether it be not the Bishops that in the Roman and other Parties now, are the greatest hinderers of Reformation, and of Concord? and it would not be soon done were it not through them?

3. Where it is that he will stop in his Vindication of the Bishops and their Councils, and go no further? and by what cogent reason?

4. Whether he thought he had well defended the Church-Tyranny which I accused? 1. By vindicating the first Ages, and others whom I praised, and accused not; 2. And by letting fall his Vindication (save a few consequent quibbles) at the fourth General Council; which was in 451. And so seems to vindicate the Bishops and Councils but for the space of 150 years of the time that I mentioned their degeneration?

5. Whether if the Bishops had been willing when they had the King's Commission to make necessary alteration, or were but to this day willing to prefer things necessary before things hurtful or indifferent, we might not live in happy and holy Love and Peace in England?

6. Whether he can blame a man that believes in Christ, for lamenting the doleful corruption and division of the Christian world, and for enquiring of, and lamenting the sinful causes.

7. If that Church Prelacy which they justly call the best in all the world can endure no more Parish Discipline than we have, nor can endure such a Ministry as are silenced by hundreds or thousands (than whom no Nation on Earth abroad that I can hear of hath better) can you blame us for suspecting that something is amiss with them, and more with others?

8. I hope you will yet remember that I did not appear as an accuser of Prelacy or Conformity, but as importuned by your selves to give the reasons why I dare not take your Covenant and Oath never to endeavour any alteration of your Church Government: and that after seventeen years silence. My prayers to
to God shall be my endeavour for these following Alterations.

1. That the Primitive Discipline may be exercised in the Parish Churches, as Bucer importuned the King and Bishops de Regno Dei, &c.

2. That to that end we may either have so many Bishops under the Diocesan as be capable to do it, or the Presbyters enabled, allowed and obliged to do it.

3. And that we may not instead of it have only a distant Court of men that know not the Parishioners, where a Lay Chancellor decreeth Excommunication, and Absolution, which the Parish Priest must publish, though his conscience be against it.

4. And that Diocesans may not silence faithful Ministers without such cause as Christ will allow, nor set up ignorant bad ones and bind the Parishioners to hear and communicate with no other. I am so far from precise expectations from Diocesans, or from reviling them, that I do constantly praise them as very good Bishops who do no harm, or but a little, and if they should never preach themselves, so they will not hinder others.

9. And as for my calling Things and Persons as they are, I hope you will not say that it was out of Malice that Anastasius Platina, Massonius, Stella, Sigibert, Baronius, Genebrard, Bin-nius, &c. have recorded such horrid crimes of Popes, and others also of Prelates. And is it malice in me to transcribe their History?

I am of Dr. Henry Moore's mind, who faith, [Mystery of Iniq. p. 388. "Hence it is plain that they are the truest friends to Chrifendom, even to Rome it self, that do not sooth them up in their sins, by mitigating and hiding their foul miscarriages, but deal apertly and plainly with them for their own safety; that neither admit, nor invent subterfuges to countenance or palliate their Idolatrous and superflitious practices, but tell them plainly how much they are apostatized from the true Worship of God and Christ into Paganism and Idolatry. Better are the rebukes of a faithful friend, than the hired flatteries of a glozing mercenary." I pray mark this well.

10. I take two things to be the degenerating and corruption of Episcopacy.

1. When they became so bad that they were not willing to do good according to their undertaken Office. Bad men will do ill in any place.
2. When they had put themselves into a state of incapacity, that they could not do the Good undertaken, were they never so willing.

1. Since great Baits of Wealth and Domination have tempted the worst men to be the Seekers, Bishops have rarely been good, except under a Saint-like Prince or People that had the Choice; nor are ever like to be. And what work the Enemies of Holiness will make by abusing Christ's Name against himself, is easy to know; such will take the best men for the worst, and call them all that's naught, that they may quiet their Consciences in destroying them.

2. And since a Diocess of many hundred or score Parishes hath had but one Bishop for Discipline, the work is become impossible to the best, but when a few Bad men will mercinarily undertake Impossibilities, and so Badness and Impossibility go together, alas, what hope, but of a better world above?

Salut Luther de Concil. & Eccl. p. 300. Sed quanm sunt intentioni banc crassam & atminam satinitatem? [Unus Episcopus nonnumquam habet tres Episcopatus vel Dioeceses, & tamen vocatur Unus Vxoris maritus, & cum habet tarnum unum Episcopatum, tamen interdum habet centum, ducentas, quingentas Parochias, aut etiam piores, & vocatur tamen Sponsus unius Ecclesiæ — Hi. non sunt digami—Tam insulsas & ineptissimas naniæ recepta mens humana; ita permittente Deo cum a verbo discernimus, & omnia limatius & subtilius scrutamus quia ipsæ unct nos forint.] Whether you reverence Luther any more than Calvin I know not.

11. To conclude this matter, two things I desire you, or at least the Reader to consider,

1. Whether it be not a dreadful thing for a man to make the Church corrupting, dividing and confounding sins, to be all his own by defending or excusing them, on a false pretence of Vindicating the Primitive Church Government, which was contrary to them?

2. Whether you trust to Truth and Evidence, or to Interest and depraved Judgments, if you think men shall believe that you have confuted all this undoubted History, and the present experience of all the woeful Christian World, by a general Cry that I write fallly and maliciously, or by saying that I am unlearned, or that I trusted to a Translation, or Binnius, or that Binnius mistook the year, (things that I will not turn over my Books.
Books to try,) or that I misplaced or misunderstood a word of Theodorite, or mistranslated Calami, or such like. Such Believers of you are guilty of their own deceit.

§ 22. There is lately published by a nameless Prelatist, to shew the World what Spirit he is of, a Book pretending by the description of my Life from 1640. till 1681, to prove me one of the worst men alive. To that I will now say but these few words.

1. That let them take me to be as bad as they will, so they would have some mercy on their own and others Souls, and the Church of God.

2. That it's no wonder that we differ about Antient Times and History, and present impositions, when the main difference in our Times is, who are godly, yea tolerable Christians, and who are intolerable Rogues; and those that (as before God) by long and intimate acquaintance, I judge to be the most serious, conscionable, humble, holy Ministers and People that were ever known to me, are the Persons that the Prelatists prosecute, silence, and cry out against as the most intolerable wicked Enemies of Piety, Truth and Peace. What is it that is the root of this?

3. That this foresaid Book is one continued Calumny, unworthy of an Answer, partly making my duty my sin (as that I disliked the many drunken Readers that were the Teachers of my Youth, &c.) and partly perverting scraps of sentences; and partly reciting one revoked Book, and a few retracted sentences of another, when Augustin is commended for retracting far more, and filling it with a multitude of most gross untruths, of his own fiction.

4. That as to his and Mr. Morrice and others talk of the Wars I say.

1. That I never thought the Parliament blameless.

2. That yet on Bilson's grounds I was in my Judgment, and Speech, and Action, comparatively for them while they made their Commissions to Essex for King and Parliament.

3. That from Naseby Fight I wholly laboured to have drawn off their Souldiers from Error, and Rebellion, and Usurpations; in which I did and suffered more than multitudes of my Accusers.

4. That I never went so far against the Power of the King as

R. Hooker.
5. That I never struck or hurt man in the wars:

6. That I will consent to be silenced and imprisoned if they will but give those Ministers leave to preach Christ's Gospel that never had to do with wars (unless for the King.)

7. That when our beginning Concord had restored the King, the Scots, though unsuccessfully fought for him, Monk & his Army, that had bloodily (at Dunbar, &c.) fought against him, had with the Concurrence of Sir Tho. Allen, the Londoners and Presbyterians restored him, when the King by them came in Triumph, Honoured Monk and others of them, confest them the Cause of his Restoration, past an Act of Oblivion that we might all live in future Peace, I say, If after all this it be Prelacy and Clergy Interest and Spirit, that will rub over all the healed wounds, and strive again what ever it cost us to ulcerate the peoples minds, and resolve that the Land and Church shall have no Peace, but by the destruction of such as restored the King; I shall think never the better of Prelacy for this. But ask them, why did you not speak it out in 1660 to Monk and his Army, or till now.

§ 23. And whereas that Advocate (described Job. 3.) and you are still deceiving the ignorant by facing men down with Confidence that I lie in saying that [ Two Episcopal Parties began the War in England and the Papists and Presbyterians came in but as Auxiliaries.] I again say,

1. Allow me but reasonable leave, and I will prove it to the shame of you if you deny it.

2. At present I will but recite one clause in Whitlock's Memorials, pag. 45. even after they thought themselves under a necessity to please the Scots as far as they could. ["Anno 1640. The Commons had debate about a new Form of Ecclesiastical Government, and July 17. agreed, That every Shire shall be a several Diocess; a Presbytery of Twelve Divines in each Shire, and a President as a Bishop over them; and be with the assistance of some of the Presbytery to ordain, suspend, deprive, degrade and excommunicate. To have a Diocesan Synod once a year, and every third year a National Synod, and they to make Canons, but none to be binding till confirmed by Parliament.

"The Primate of Armagh offered an expedient for conjunction in point of Discipline, that Episcopal and Presbyterian Government might not be at a far distance, but reducing Episcopacy to
the Form of Synodical Government in the Primitive Church.

Were not these men Episcopal? It's much like Mr. Tho\ndike's own motions saving his Opinion for Forein Jurisdiction.

§ 24. As to your first and last Chapters, and about the
Antient Extent of Churches, while my Treatise of Episcopacy,
which fully confuteth you, is unanswered; if I repeat it again, it
will not be read by weary men. And another hath answered
those parts of your Book, which is ready for the Press.

I after tell you where Chrysostom even in his time numbers
the Christians in that great Imperial City to be an hundred
thousand, that is as many as in Martins and Stepney Parishes, and
perhaps in Giles Cripplegate too.

§ 25. To conclude, whereas Mr. M. in general chargeth me
as falsifying History, I still call my self a HATER of FALSE
HISTORY, and loath Mr. Morrice's History, because it is false:
But if he will instead of falsifying and trifling, shew me any fale
History that I have owned, I will thank him unfeignedly, and re-
tract it. But factious reproaching of good men, and painting
the deformed face of Vice, go not with me for convincing
proof. If I am not near of kin to Erasimus, I am a stranger to
my self, even as Merula, and M. Adamus describe him, [Ingenio
crat simplex; adeo abhorrens a mendacio, ut puellus etiam odisset
pueros mentientes; & senex ad illorum adspectum etiam corpore
commoveretur. Dignitatem & magnarum divitiarum contumax
contemptor; neque quicquam prius etio habuit ac libertate.] And
I think, as it is said of Cuspianin, [Ratus se satisfacturam ingenuo
Lectori, sique verissima esse commiserit simplicissima oratione man-
daret posteritati: satis enim est historico (ut praclare dixit apud
Ciceronem Catullus), non esse Mendacem.]

And as to my ends and expectations, I am not so vain as to
write with any great hope of persuading many, if any who are
possess of large Dioeces, Wealth and Power, to forsake them,
much less to cure the common Thirst that corrupted Nature is
possess with, and to be the means of a Publick Reformation: If
I may satisfy my Conscience, and save some from being decei-
vied by fale History about the Causes of the Antient Schisms,
it's all that I can hope for: Had I lived in Alb. Cramzinus daies,
I might perhaps have said as he of Luther [Frater, Frater, abi-
in cellam tuam, & dic Miferere mei Deus:] Et de Canoniciis
net dispregari dictis, Nunquam posse eos reduci ad meliorem frugem.
And for my self, none of the Interested mens reproaches are unexpected to me: Anger will speak. I know what the Papists say of the Reformers, and all the Protestants: And yet I expect that all at last will turn to the disgrace of falsehood, by putting men to search Church-History for the Truth.

The case of Capnio is worth a brief recital. A covetous Jew pretending Conversion, contrived with the Fryers and Inquisitors, to get a great deal of money from the Jews, by procuring an Edict from the Emperour to burn all the Jews Books, that so they might purchase them of the Fryers. The Emperour will first hear what Capnio a great Hebrician faith: Capnio advised to spare all that only promoted the Hebrew Literature, and burn only those that were written against Christ. Hookstraete and the Fryers were vexed thus to lose the prey, and accused Capnio of Heresie: The cause is oft tried, especially at Rome: All the Learned Hebricians were for Capnio: The Fryers raged the more: This awakened many Learned men to search into the Cause, and armed them against the Fryers. Galatinus, Hutten, Erasmus, &c. are for Capnio. The Fryers accuse them also of Heresie: But by this they stirred up such a Party of the most Learned men against them, that when Tezelius came to vend his Indulgencies, Luther had so many ready to joyn against the Inquisitors and Mercenary cheating Fryers, as greatly furthered the Reformation. And two or three ingenuous Conformists who have lately written against the violent battering Canoneers, do tell us that some are like to be excited by the Overdoing of the Accusing silencing Party, to search better into the matter of Fact and Right, till they can distinguish between an Eucrasie and a Tymanite.

Or if this world be incurable, they cannot keep us out of the heavenly Jerusalem, where there is no Error, Schism, nor Persecution, because no Ignorance, Malignity or Pride, but the General Assembly of perfect Spirits, are united in one perfect Head, in perfect Life, and Light, and Love.
The particular Defence of the History of Councils and Schisms.

An Account to Mr. Morrice why my mentioning the Church-directed sins of the Clergy, when worldly grandeur corrupted them, is not a Dishonouring, but a Honouring of the Primitive Church. And to vindicate those sins is no Vindication of the Primitive Church.

CHAP. I.

The Reason and Design of my History of Bishops and Councils.

§ 1. They that know the men with whom I have to do, and the Cause which I have in Controversie with them, will easily understand my purpose. The Persons with whom I am to deal, are such as hold,

1. That a General Council of Bishops or the Colledge of Bishops Governing per Literas formatas out of Council, are the Supreme Governing Power over the Universal Church on Earth, having the Power of Universal Legislation and Judgment.

2. That among these the Pope is justly the Patriarch of the West, and the Principium unitatis to the whole, and the ordinary President in such Councils. And say some, It belongs only to the President to call them, and they are but rebellious Routs that assemble without a just call.

3. That there is no concord to be had but in the Obedience to this Universal Governing Church. But all Persons and all National Churches are Schismaticks who live not in such Submission and obedience.

4. That such as the Diocesan Episcopacy which is over one lowest Church containing hundreds or multitudes of Parishes and Altars without any other Bishop but the said Diocesan is that Episcopacy which all must be subject to, while it is subject to the Universal supreme.

5. That every Christian must hold subjective Communion with the Bishop of the place where he liveth. And say some,
must not practice contrary to his Commands, nor appeal for such practice to Scripture or to God.

6. That if this supreme Power silence the Diocesan, or these Diocesan silence all the Ministers in City or Country, they must Cease their Ministry and forsake the Flocks.

7. And say divers of them, They are no true Churches, or Ministers, that have not ordination from such Diocesan, yea by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles: And for want of this the Forein reformed Churches are no true Churches, but the Church of Rome is.

Much more of this Nature I have already transcribed (and confuted) out of A. Bishop Bromhall, Dr. Heylins Life of A. Bishop Laud, Mr Thorndike, Mr Dodwell and divers others.

§ 2. The first thing then in my intention is to shew that the Roman Grandeur which is thought to be the Glory of the Church on Earth, and the necessary means of its Unity, safety and true prosperity, hath proved clean contrary, even the means of Church corruption in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline & Conversation, the Soil of the most odious crimes, the means of tyranny, suppression of true piety, and persecution of Gods faithful Servants, and of rebellious, War and cruel bloodshed.

§ 3. To this end I descreibed the steps by which the Clergy ascended to the Papal height: For as all Protestants justly maintain that their Corruption of Doctrine & Worship came not in at once but by slow degrees, so do they also of the Papal Government and discipline. And they commonly shew the vanity of the Papists demand, who ask us who was the man, and which was the year, as if the world had gone to bed in simple Christianity, and awaked Papists thenext morning. Whereas it is most evident in all Church history that the Clergy leaving the Christian Purity, Simplicity and Love, did climb the ladder step by step till they ascended to the Papal height. And it's a mere dream of them that think it was the Bp. of Rome alone that thus ascended, and not the Army that made him their General: As the boat riseth with the waters, so did the Pope with the ascending Clergy: Others strife for superiority as he strife for Supremacy: The strife began among Christs Apostles who should be greatest, and who should fit next him in his Kingdom; And though Christ then suppress it by his Word and Spirit, and the sufferings of the Church took down those aspiring thoughts, as soon as Constantine had set them the Ladder
Ladder, what scrambling was there who should climb highest. Yea Constanti nople strove for the Supremacy itself.

§ 3. And I the rather mentioned this because I found some late learned Expositors of the Revelations, taking this inordinate ascent, for the promised glory and felicity of the Church on Earth; and taking it for the fulfilling of many of those prophecies and promises which some applied to the Millennium, and some to the heavenly state. And doubtless Hildebrand and his adherents had such thoughts, and did believe that their rule over Emperors, Kings and Kingdoms, by the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, was the true Glory of the Church, and the Reign of Christ, and that all the honour was indeed given to Christ as King of the Church, which was thus given to the Pope and the Church-Parliaments of Bishops. Campanella de Regno Dei doth but speak the thoughts of greater Clergy men when he applyeth the foresaid Texts to prove that the Popes Universal Monarchy is the true Kingdom of Christ on Earth, to which all Monarchs and Men must stoop.

And Nature is so apt to entertain such thoughts, especially in the Clergy, who think of it as their own prosperity and glory, that it is no wonder, if as Venner, and his Fifth Monarchy men, did itch to be getting up under the name of the Reign of Christ, and so did John of Leyden and his Company at Munster; so the Fifth Monarchy Clergy men, who can aspire more plausibly, do long to be climbing, and are very reconcilable to Papal Greatness; and where Popery is become a distasteful name, they nevertheless desire their share in the Power, Honour and Wealth, and under pretence of Peace and Concord among all Christians, and restoring the Church to its Unity and Strength, they strive for much of the same thing, and think it enough to avoid the name: And the Pope shall be but Principium Unitatis, and the President of the Clergy or Councils. Get but the poor trick of calling nothing Popery but the Pope's Arbitrary absolute Power, and do but tie him to Rule by the Consent and Laws of Church-Parliaments, that is, set up the French Church-Government, and then they are no Papists. Do not the French Protestants deserve all their sufferings then for calling the Church or Bishops there Papists, and separating from so Excellent a Government?

§ 5. And it was not the least of my Motives to try, were it possible to cure their Love-killing Error, who think that all
are Enemies to Unity and Peace, who are not for Obedience to this Universal or Superlative Prelacy, and to save us all from that confusion and calamity, which this Opinion is carrying on, while the Patrons of it think that all are to be prosecuted, silenced, ruined as Rebellious Enemies to the Ruling Church, who do not subject themselves to such a Prelacy; and that we must or can have no Christian Church-Concord, but by Obedience to the Universal Church, as Bishop Gunning hath over and over told me, that is, to the Universal Colledge of their sort of Bishops: Yea not only the Papists, but these Bishops among us, to this purpose repeat and apply Psal.72.11. Yea all Kings shall fall down before him: All Nations shall serve him. Or Isa. Co. 12. For the Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: Yea those Nations shall be utterly wasted.] which Bishop Gunning applyeth to the Episcopal Universal-Governing Colledge.

These are terrible threatnings, as they shew the principles and purposes of men, however they mistake the mind of God. Few parts of Europe have had more long and cruel Wars, than Italy itself, where these Principles have obtained: But the blood of thousands of sincere Christians hath been a Sacrifice to these Principles in the Clergy. When we read in Jesuites, Fryers and Prelates, sound Christians called Hereticks, and all such Hereticks called, mortal, odious, wicked, pernicious, intolerable Enemies to the Church, whom all good men are bound to endeavour to root out and destroy; when we hear our neighbour Papists say, It is no more sin to kill an Heretick than a Dog: And when we hear and read our Clergy calling out to Magistrates for yet more Execution upon us, for not obeying them against that which we undoubtedly take for the Law of God; and the nearer any man is to the Papists, usually the more he is for our destruction, and for their way of cruelty, I thought it time to try if it were possible, if not to save the Land from this consuming fire, yet at least to save some Souls who else were like to be tempted to malignant Enmity to the best and truest Christians, and to perish for ever by this deceit.

How many honest passages are in Mr. Thorndike which shew that it was not any worldly interest of his own that moved him; but yet the Power of this Error: [Of a Church that was Universally One by One Ruling Colledge or Council of Prelates, of which
which the Pope was the rightful President, &c. which must be acknowledged by all Nations and Persons, that will have Christian Communion and not be condemned Schismatics, prevailed with him to the exclusion of all Dissenters, and confining his Communion to those only who owned and obeyed This Universal Governing Church.

§ 6. And as long as this Opinion prevaleth, especially in men of Power and Reverence who take other mens belief and obedience for their unquestionable right, where can we think hatred and Persecution will stop. Will not they still think that they that kill or silence or imprison or banish us, do God service, and that the Magistrate that doth not punish us deserveth punishment from God, if not also from the Church. And they that are most for Seldom preaching, and can dispense with our Ministerial labour therein, will not be indifferent as to the silencing, imprisoning or destroying us.

§ 7. Whether we have any reason to refuse swearing or subscribing to them, and never to endeavour any alteration of their Government as it is in England, I have sincerely endeavoured to shew in my Treatise of Episcopacy. And if Christian Concord and Communion be so hard and narrow a thing, as that no men are Capable of it who are not of a higher form than I, as to understanding, impartiality and willingness to know the Truth, the Church and Christianity are things beyond my capacity and reach: But I doubt not but it is humane error that would dwindle it into so small a Sect.

§ 8. Alas what Persons for Knowledge and Life can they bear with in their Communion, who cannot bear with such as they silence and ruine in this Land! And the Papists can receive even those that know not Christ if they do but profess obedience to the Clergy-Church. Luthers words are harsh, but I will recite them de Concordis Part 3. Pag 291. Si monstraverint mihi unum aliquem ex tanta illa multitudine qui possit aequare unum alphabetarium in aliqua erudita Schola, aut in summa doctrina Christiana, vel in Scriptura Sacratantum profecerint, quantum una aliqua puella septem annum, tunc illis concedam palam—nisi quod plus callem traditionum humanarum, & Sceophantiarum: Quod valde credo, & firmius quam in Deum credo, cum me convincent facto ipso ut credam. To this pass did the Clergeries aspiring then bring the Church, when worthy men were silenced and per-
executed. And we are unwilling of any thing that looketh towards a differencing men so contrary to that which Christ will make at last.

CHAP. II.

Whether we have any reason to report the Faults of some Bishops and Councils, from the beginning of their Depravation till the last?

§ 1. That I had great reason for it, I think what is before said will evince, when we see men destroying Christian Love, themselves, and us, and the Land, could they prevail, by their erroneous endeavour to grant no Concord, Communion nor Peace, to no Christians how conscientable otherwise, who cannot unite in a species of Prelacy which they believe (by such evidence as I have given) to be contrary to the Law of Christ. To the saving men from Herefie and Schism now, our opposers (and we) do judge it useful, to know how Hereticks and Dividers miscarried heretofore, that others may beware. And is it not as true if Bishops be the Dividers? And also when the Clergies Ambition and Usurpation have brought that upon the Christian World which it languiseth and groaneth under in East and West, is it not needful to open the beginning and progress of the disease, by such as had rather it were cured, than the Church destroyed by it?

§ 2. Among the multitude of Protestant Church-Historians and Chronologers, how few are there that do not do the same, though in various degrees? He that will read the Magdeburgergeses, or Lucas Osiander, Illyrici Test. Verit, Melanthon himself, and Carion Funcccis, yea peaceable holy Buckoltzer, Micelius, Neander, Phil. Pareus, Hen. Guthlerleh, &c. yea or Julius or Jos. Scaliger, Salmasius, Hottoman, Hottinger, Morney, shall see the faults of Bishops opened before this day.

§ 3. The pious and moderate Papists themselves report and lament them: Such as Clemangis, Pelagius Alvarus, Mirandula, Feriu, Jos. Acosta, Lud. Vives, Gerson, Erasmus, and many other such.

§ 4. The antient Godly Bishops are they who for the most part
part have been free in reprehending the vices of the rest; especially Greg. Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, and many antient godly Presbyters have been as free, as Gildas, Isidore Pelusiot, Salvian, Sulp. Severus, Bernard.

§ 5. And if I have wronged the Bishops or Popes in this Abridgment, their own Historians, yea their chief flatterers have wronged them. One Pope angered Platina by imprisoning him: Yet if he be partial, it is for the Clergy, and not against them. But who will believe that Binnius, Baronius, Crab, Gentbrad, Bellarmine, Petavius, and such others have spoken too hardly of them. There is no one man that I took so much from as Binnius: And what should move him to name so many of the miscarriages of the Councils, but the necessity of reciting the Acts of the Councils historically as he found them?

§ 6. The Sacred Scriptures record the Crimes of the best men in all the Ages of which they write, even Adams, Noes, Lots, Aarons, Davids, Solomons, Hezekiabs, Josiabs, Peters, all the Apostles, &c. And it was not done out of spite or malice; but as a necessary warning to us all.

§ 7. The fallhood of History is an intollerable abuse of mankind: To know nothing done before our times, is to shut up mankind in a dungeon; and false History is worse than none. And it may be false and deceitful in defect as well as excess. He that should record all that was good in the Popes, and omit all the rest, would be a dangerous deceiver of the world, and do more than hath been done to make all Christians Papists. You tell us your selves, that he that should write the History of Cromwell, e. g. or of any Sect that you are against, and should leave out all their faults, would be taken for a false Historian.

§ 8. They that write the History of mens Lives, do use to record their Parentage, Birth and Education: And so must he that will truly write the History of Church-Tyranny, Persecution and Schism. The end is not well understood, without the beginning. Who is it that heareth how many Ages the Christian world hath been divided into Papists, Greeks, Jacobites, Nestorians, Melobites, &c. and that seeth what work the Papacy hath made, but will ask how all this came to pass? Did the man that died of Gluttony, swallow all at one morsel? or rather one bit after another? And when the Clergy have ventured on one merry Cup, or one pleasant morsel in excess, it's
eafe to make them believe that one, and one, and one Cup more; one, and one, and one bit more, is no more unlawful than the first. *Principiis obsta, is the Rule of Safety.*

If Papifts intending the recovery of England to the Pope should say ["Let us but firft get them under the Oaths, Covenants, and Practices which we will call Conformity, and so cast out most that dare not sin, and by this engage them as two Armies in contrary Interest to fight against each other, and it will be an eafe matter to bring the swallowing Party to go further by degrees, and to believe that as a Parish Church must not be independent as to the Diocesan, nor the Diocesan to the Metropolitical or National, so neither must a National be independent as to the Universal: And that the Universal therefore must have its known stated Government as well as the National,] Were it not necessary here for him that would save the Land from Popery to shew the danger of the first degrees.

The usual Method is not to use Boccalines Roman Engine, which will help a man to swallow a Pompion that he may get down a Pill, but to swallow a leffer Pill firft and a bigger next, till the Pompion will go down. Infancy is before manhood.

§ 9. But the great necessity was as aforesaid, from the reviv-ed or rather Continued attempts, of imitating the fatal ambitious and Contentious malady. If Prifcillians, or Gnofticks should rise now among us, were it not our duty to set before them the history of the miscarriage of their predecessours. And when men are so much set on restoring an Universal Supremacy, is it not meet to shew them where, and when, and with what success the aspiring humour did begin. If we have small visible probability of escaping, we must yet before we come to Smithfield, satisfy our Consciences that we betrayed not the Church.

---

**CHAP. III.**

Of Mr. M's notice that I am Unlearned.

§ 1. Mr. M's Preface Contradiceth the Chief things which he hath to say against me in his book, that the Reader may find them there all together. And of these [that I am unlearned] is not the leaft. And if that be any of his question I affure him it shall be none of mine. I am not yet so vain as
Yea, I will gratify him (though he accuse me of being against repentance) with an unseigned confession that my ignorance is far greater than his accusation of unlearnedness doth import. Alas I want the knowledge of far more excellent things than languages. I do but imperfectly know my self, my own soul, my own thoughts and understanding; I scarce well know what knowing is. Verily if no knowledge be properly true that is not adequate to the object I know nothing: And subscribe to Zancho, quod nihil Scitur, (by such as I.) Alas Sir I groan in darkness from day to day, & I know not how to be delivered! How little do I know of that God whom the whole Creation preacheth, and of that Society which I hope to be jointed with forever, and that world which must be my hope and portion, or I am undone. Many whom I am Constrained to dissent from upbraid me with my ignorance, and I suppose it is that for which they silence me, reproach, hate and prosecute me; even because I have not knowledge enough to discern that all their impositions are lawful (or else I know not what it is for) But none of them all can (and will) tell me, how I should be delivered from this ignorance: If they say, [It must be by hard study] I can study no harder than I have done. If they say [I must be willing to know the truth] I take my self for sure that I am so: If in that also I am ignorant, in thinking that I know my own mind when I do not, what else then can I hope to know? If they say [You must be impartial] I think I am so, saving that I must not deny or cast away the truths already received. If they say [You should read the same books which have convinced us] I read far more of the Papists and Prelates and other sects that write against me, than of those that are for me. And the more I read the more I am confirmed. And when these men preach and write against the Calvinists, they render them odious as holding that men are necessitated to sin and to be damned; and that it is long of God's Decree which cannot be resisted: Therefore I suppose they will not lay the Cause on God. I do then confess my Ignorance, of matters a thousandfold greater and more needful than those which they mention in their accustions. I confess my self unlearned: But I entreat them that tell me of my disease (which I know to my daily grief much better than they) to tell me also how I may be cured. If they say that it must be by Fines and Imprisonment it hath been tried & I am yet uncured: I hope they will
will not pronounce me remediless and not tell me why, who use themselves to speak against those that preach men into desperation, would they but tell me the secret how so many thousands of them came to be so much wiser than I, in far shorter time, and with far less study, it would be (if true) an acceptable deed of Charity; rather than to tell me of the Ignorance which I cannot help. Could I but know needful truth in English, I would joyfully allow them to glory of being more skilful in all the Oriental Tongues, and also in French, Irish, Spanish and Italian, than I am.

**CHAP. IV.**

**Of his Accusation, that I vainly name Historians which I never saw or read.**

§ 1. I must profess that it never was my purpose to tell the world how many Historians I have read; nor to abridge all that I have read: And those that I have most read I have there made no mention of, as not being for my intended end: And multitudes that stood by me, I never opened to the writing of this history, my design being chiefly against the Papists and those Protestants who most esteem their writings, and had rather unite with the French Papist Church, than with us Nonconformists: Therefore when I was past the first 400 or 500 years, it was the greatest and most flattering Popish historians that I abridged, as *ad hominem* being likeliest not to be denied.

I told the reader that I made not use of Luther the Magdeburgenses, nor the Collections of Goldastus, Marquardus Freherus, Reuberus, Pistorius, &c. And the Printer having put a Comma between Marquardus and Freherus, he Conjectures that I took him for two men, because I added not the Christian names of the rest: And he concludes that [whoever this mistake belongs to, it's plain that Mr. B. had but little acquaintance with those Collections.] For I name some of the Authors therein.

*Ans.* Seeing these things are thought just matter for our accusers turn, I will crave the Readers patience with such little things while I tell him the truth. It is about 25 years since I read the German History in the Collections of Freherus, Reuberus and Pistorius, and about 30 years since I read the Collections of
of Goddus: The Magdeburgenses, Otander, Sleidan, or any such Protestants I thought vain to alledge to Papists. About seven or eight years ago as I remember, I was accused for Preaching, and Fined by Sir Thomas Davis; and the Warrant was sent by him to Sir Edm. Bury Godfrey to levy it on me by Distress: I had no way to avoid it but bona fide, to make away all that I had: Among the rest I made away my Library, only borrowing part of it for my use. I purposed to have given it almost all to Cambridge in New-England: But Mr. Knowles (yet living) who knew their Library, told me that Sir Kenelme Digby had already given them the Fathers, Councils and Schoolmen, but it was History and Commentators which they wanted. Whereupon I sent some of my Commentators, and some Historians among which were Freherus, Rinberus and Pistorius Collections, and Naucerus, Sabellicus, Thuanus, Jos. Scaliger de Emedat. Temp. &c.; But Goddus I kept by me (as borrowed) and many more which I could not spare: and the Fathers and Councils and Schoolmen I was stop'd from sending. Now whether I was unacquainted with those that partly stand yet at my Elbow, and which I had read so long ago, must depend on the Credit of my Memory; and I confess my Memory is of late grown weak, but not so weak as to think that Marquardus Freherus was not one man, and a Palatinate Councillor, though it be names that I most forget; why I gave not the Christian names of Rinberus and Pistorius, whether because I forgat them, or because I minded not so small a thing, not dreaming what would be inferred from it, I remember not. But when I wrote that abridgment, I made use of none that I thought the Papists would except against: For the first ages I gathered what I remembred out of the Fathers, and out of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Evagrius, Theodoret, the Tripartite, Nicephorus, Liberatus, Brev. Victor Urs. Beda, and such others as are by them received: Besides which I principally followed and Epi omized Binius, and Crab, and partly Baronius, with Plutina, Onaprius Panarius, Stella, Petavius, and others of their own. And I resolved I would not so much as open Goddus, or any Protestant Collector, that they might not except against their Credit, and reject them as malicious cursed Heretics, as Latbe both Melobior Goddus and almost all such others as he mentions; and as Greifer, Sanders, and other Papists commonly do. Therefore even those Histories which
be in Goldajlm, I would not take as out of him, but some of them from the books published by others, and some as cited by Binnius, Petavins, or other such. And this is now the proof of my Vanity.

§ 2. It is a mistake if he think that I intended (as he speaks) to be a Compiler of General Church History; When I professed but to acquaint the English Reader with the true matter of fact out of the Papists themselves, what the ambitious part of Bishops and Councils have done, and by what degrees the Papacy sprang up, and whether subjection to the ascendent exert Prelacy be absolutely necessary to Concord and Salvation.

§ 3. As to his saying [ I am the first that ever reckoned Nazianzen among Historians, ] I take the writings of the Fathers, especially Justin, Clemens Alex. Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Basil, Nazianzen, Hierom, Chryfotom, Augustin, to be the best part of Church History, especially their Epistles. And of this opinion I am not the first.

CHAP. V.

Of his Accusation of my citing Hanmer and other Translators, and being deceived by Binnius and such others.

§ 1. He accuseth me for not using Valesius his Edition of Eusebius and those Editions of the Councils which he accounteth the best: To which I say,

1. I am not Rich Enough to buy them, nor can keep them if I had them. Must none write but Rich men? The French Councils would cost more than many of us are worth: We have had no Ecclesiastical maintenance these 19 years, and we cannot keep the books we have. Luther wrote his book de Conciliis when it seems he had never read many of the Councils Acts, but as related by Eusebius Socrates, Sozomen, and the Tripartite History.

2. Dr. James hath long ago warned all Scholars to make much of Crab and other old ones, ( and the Fathers as Printed at Basil by Erasmus, Amerbachius, &c.) and not to trust much to new Editions, as coming through untrustly hands.
3. Is Valefius a man of so much credit with you? Do you believe what he faith of Grotius as being in judgment for the Papal Church, and only in prudence delaying his visible Communion with them, that he might draw in many with him? (Valef: in Orat. de Petavio:) If he lye in this, and the success of Petavius on Grotius, why should he be more trusted than others? If not, I need not tell you what to think of those Bishops and Drs. who profess to be of the same mind and Church as Grotius; nor again to tell you who they be.

4. My design led me not to make use of Criticks, but only to tell the world, what the Papists themselves confess, such as I have throughout cited.

§ 2. As for my using Hanmers Translation of Eusebius and Socrates, my case was as before described: Valefius I had not! Grineus I made use of heretofore. But since I was by constraint deprived both of my books and money to buy more, when I wrote that Abridgment, I had only Hanmers Translation left me. And if that sort of men that forced me to give away my books, to keep them from being disreined on, will make use of this to prove me ignorant of them, the matter is very small to me.

If you say, I should not then have written, I answer, could they so have silenced us in the Pulpit, they had more answered their own judgment than mine. I had no use for Criticks, nor for any thing in Eusebius and Socrates that depends on the credit of the Translator.

§ 3. As to his oft noting that in Translations, and sometime in Chronology I err by following Binnius, I answer, had I written a full Church History, I should better have examined him and others. But I lay no stress of my cause of any of Binnius his Translations, nor will I undertake for any Historian that I cite: My business was but to tell those that believe Binnius and Baronius, and such other, what they say. Nor do I yet intend to bellow any time, in examining whether he wrong Binnius or not, it being nothing to my cause nor me, whether he mistook a year, or the meaning of a word of the Authors whom he citeth.

§ 4. He faith I use an old uncorrect Edition of Binnius 1606. Anf. It is that which is in most common use, entituled, Recogni-
ta, Audia, notis Illustrata, dedicated to the Pope, and to C. Bar-
onius, ejus monitu scripta, qui veterem illam, mendosam, mutandam & confusam compilationem mille locis illustravit, &c. commonly preferred
Preferred before Crab, Surius, Nicolinus, &c. But any quarrel serveth some men.

CHAP. VI.

Of his Accusations of my own Mistranslations and Mistakes.

§ 1. Of these there are two real Oversights which he nameth, committed by too much haste and heedlessness: The one is, that I misplaced \[Vere\] in the Translacion of a Speech of Theodorest; a gross oversight I confess: The other, that I put \[Episcopi\], as if it had been the Genitive case, when it was the Nominative plural; which also was a heedless oversight. And about the death of Stephenus, he noteth my mistranslating Calami; and I imagine yet he is scarce certain what it signified himself. As for his note of my use of \[Scripture\] about the Ephesine Council, I purposely kept to the literal Translation, that none might say I did mistranslate it; but I never said that by the Scriptures was meant the Bible.

§ 2. This Accuser puts too great an honour on such a History as mine, which goeth through so many Ages and Acts, in noting so few, and such little things. I never pretended to be as good an Historian as he is; yet I do not think that it was any thing but a slip of memory that made him put \\[softhimus\] instead of \\[Elavian\], as kick to death at Ephesin. And methinks he that thus begins his \[Errata\] of his own Book \[The faults that have escaped are almost infinite\] should not for one false Comma of the Printers, have passed the foresaid cenfure of me.

But doth not this Learned Historian know, how ordinarily the greatest of them do charge one another with manifold Errours, and of far greater moment than these forementioned. How few Historians do not this? Yea what bitter cenfures doth he pass himself on no lower Historians than Socrates and Sozomen? It would be tedious to give you the Instances, that every such Book afforded. I see he valueth \[Labbe\] the Jesuite. How oft doth he accuse Historians of Errour, Ignorance, Malice, &c. e. g. \[de Anastasio Biblioth.\] So eminent a Writer of the Popes Lives, yet \[Errat Vssius & sigui alii cum Anastasio Presbytero, &c.] And even...
even of that famous History of the Popes, [ Omnphrifu Panum- 
ius, Gerh. Vossius, & plerique alii ultimam consent effe ab Ana-
stoio scriptam, Nicolai 1. Papa Vitam, & a Gulielmo S.R.E. Bib-
liothecario aditas fuisse Haer. 2. & Steph. 6. P. Vitae : Verum 
Cardinalis Baronius iis fragatuir eodemque autliori omnes illas 
ascribit; sunt quoque qui a Damafo Papa, &c. Here the greatest 
Hicetoriens differ about one of the most noted Histories. 

Of Auguftin's Works (To. 1. p. 129.) he tells you that Bella-
mine tells us not what Edition he used: But it's certain he used 
not the Antwerp, or Plantinian Edition, which was the best, and 
the Original of all the rest.] 

P. 132. River and Perkins are derided for disowning some 
Epistles. 

P. 135. Erasmi, Riveri similiunque ridetur a doctis censura 
(viz. de lib. Continens.) And I profess my self less skilful in such 
matters than Erasmus. 

Et ibid. Erasmi & HeJius Italiano opus illud tr-buere-videntur, 
Pamelius tantiun incerti Authoris allegat: Nos cum Lovaniem-
sibus Bellarmino, alisque Catholicis Augstini esse censemus, nec 
trice Riveri deterrent. 

P. 136. Quaest. Vet. & Novi Test. non sunt Augstini ut facile 
omnes consentiant : Quareos sub ejus nomine citata reperiantur ab 

Of Augustus the Poet, p. 171. he faith, [Quam falsa sint qua: 
de eo scripto to. Trithemius quivis vel ex ipsa letione intelliget. 

Of Augustus the Poet, p. 173. [Ex Trithemii encomio hac abio procul 
omni obliteranda: [Quo metro Virgilium, Ciceronem prosa aequat, 
ne dicam superar.] Sunt enim falsissima iis qui gustum aliquem la-
tinitatis habent. 

Of Beda, p. 184. See what he faith of Will, Malmsbury, Mat. 
Westminfi. Vossius and Baronius. 

Of Boccldius, p. 204. Hontorius Augustod.--ubi salso narrat 
Medioliani interjectum suffici- 
P. 217. Plura adversus Leunclaviun, primun eorum editorem de 
clamavit fac. Billiani (de Cafario.) 

De Claudio Scoto, p. 228. Tho. Dempsternus multa pro more suo 
indigesta effudit-- 

De Gerfaniue, p. 565. Erat post Posevinum Maraccimus qui Ioan. 
hunc Monachum ordinis celestii--asserit--Idem quoque ex Patro-
logo eradendum.
See what he faith de Julio Africano, that the Annotaciones eruditiss. in Euseb. Eccles. Hist.—Opinioni nostra in plerisque adversantur.] I suppose he means that Valesius which I wanted.

And de Justino Mart. Scaligerum errasse, &c.] Et p. 833. (insigne mendum ex Trithemio, Gesnerio, Simlero, Sexto, Posevino, Bellarmino, Miræo, aliiisque propagatum—)

To. 2. p. 361. Smiragdos duos in unum conferunt, Trithemius, Sixtus Senensis, Posevino, Bellarminus, Miræus alii questum—] Abundance such charges tell us how much greater Errors are charged on the greatest Historians, than Mr. Morrice chargeth on me, with the least shew of probability.

How many score of Historians doth Blondell cite, who he thinks have falsely told us of a Pope Joan?

What abundance of faults would Causabon have found in Baronius, if he had lived to go through him as he began? And I profess my self much more ignorant in History than Baronius.


§ 3. As to his notes on my Titles of some Councils, it's past my memory, whether it was my carelessness, or (as I think) the Printer's Error, to put [a Council at Aranfican, Toletan, Regiense, for Concilium Aranficanum, Toletanum, Reginfene.] If it was my act, I forgot that I had first put the Substantive in English. But he may oft find the same names used to his mind: And sure it is no falsification of the History.

§ 4. But
§ 4. But he hath a far greater charge against me, that I did not apprehend the mind of the Council at Tours; why so? The words are [Nos vero signos Lex perimi jubet, si capient ad vitam, volumus ut convertantur ad vitam: Nam perimendi sunt oris gladio & communione privandi si relieta fbi seniorum decreta observare voluerint, &c. Here he faith the meaning is, [The Ecclesiastical Laws do punish such with perpetual Excommunications, yet this Council thought fit to mitigate it,&c.] The Question is, Whether [Quos Lex perimi jubet, significat Death, or Excommunication?] I take it to be Death, and that the Council faith [Though by the Law such are to Die, if they will hear the Preacher, we will have them converted to Life: But so that if they will not be separated, the Church Sword of Excommunication shall cut them off instead of Death.] My Reasons why [Lex perimi jubet] signifies Death, are from the express foregoing words, [Quia etiam Lex Romana constituat, ut quicunque sacratam Deo Virginem vel Vidnam fortasse rapuerit, si postea eis de conjunctione convenerit, capitis sententia feriatur. Item si quis, non dicam rapere, sed attentare matrimonii conjugendi causa, sacram Virginem ausus fuerit, capitis sententia feriatur. Cum etiam in Chronicis babeatur de Virginibus Gentilium tempore, quae se dea Vesta sacraverunt, postmissa proposito & corrupta virginali gratia, Legales sententias vivas in terra suisse desossas. If none of this signifies Death, I confess I understand not Latine. I thought the Council meant Death by [Lex perimi jubet,] but they would be more merciful; which I blamed them not for, but noted here what many other Canons instance, where they also punish murder but with keeping men from Communion, that this agreeeth with some Sectaries Opinion. I leave Mr. M's. great skill in expounding Councils here to any equal Judge. But if I ignorantly mistake in all this, and neither [Capitis sententia feriatur] nor [Vivas in terra desossas] signifies Death, but Excommunication, yet many other Canons after cited fully tell us of the Bishops Clemency.
Mr M's. Exposition of Church History tried by his Exposition of my own words: And 1. Of his false supposition that I am only for a Church of one Congregation meeting in one place.

§ 1. If so many repetitions of my Opinion cannot save Mr M. from so untrust a supposition of my self, I must not too far trust him, of the sense of those that he is as distant from as I. Yet this supposition running through all his book, shews that he wrote it against he knew not whom or what. His foundation is because I define a single Church by Personal present Communion.

§ 2. I do so: And 1. Dost he think there is no such thing as Christians conjoined for assembling in God's ordinary worship, under the Conduct of their Proper Pastors. I will not censure him so hardly as to think he will deny it. 2. Are these Churches or not. I suppose he will say, Yea. 3. But is there no Personal Present Communion but in publick worship. Yes sure Neighbours who worship God in divers places, may yet live in the Knowledge and conversation of each other; and may meet for Election of Officers, and other Church businesses, and may frequently exhort, reprove and admonish each other, and relieve each other in daily wants; and many meet sometimes by turns in the same place, where they all cannot meet at once: We have great Towns, (like Ipswich, Plymouth Shrewsbury, &c.) which have many Parishes, and yet Neighbourhood maketh them capable of [Personal Communion in Presence] as distinct from [Communion by Letters or Delegates with those that we neither see nor know.] And we have many great Parishes which have several Chappels, where the People ordinarily meet yet per vices some one time and some another come to the Parish Churches. Have these no Parochial Personal Communion?

To the well-being of a Church, I confess I would not have a single Church of the lowest species have too many, nor too few: No more than whose Personal Communion should be frequent in God's publick worship. Nor so few as should not fully employ more Ministers of Christ than one. But to the Being of a Church, I only
I only require that the End of their Association be Personal Communion as distinct from distant Communion by Letters and delegates. And by [Communion] I mean not only the Sacrament.

§ 2. It is in vain therefore to answer a book that goeth on such false suppositions, and a man that will face down the world that I plead for that which I never owned, and so frequently disclaim.

CHAP. VII

Of his false supposition that I am against Diocesan Bishops, because I am against that species of them which puts down all the Bishops of single Churches, and these Churches themselves.

§ 1. This supposition goeth through almost all the book: In his preface he saith [The superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is acknowledged by Catholicks, and Schismatics & Hereticks, &c. and yet this Church history would have us believe the Contrary.] And so throughout.

§ 2. And yet to shew that he knew the Contrary in one place he confesseth it, and described part of my judgment, and faith that none will be of my mind in it, but it is singular to my self: Yea I had in my Disput. of Church Government, which he taketh on him in part to answer, and in my Treat. of Episcopacy which he also pretends to answer in part, told them of more sorts of Bishops than one that I oppose not, no not A. Bishops themselves: And one of them hereupon notes it as if I differed but about the name, submitting to Diocesans so they may but be called A. Bishops. To whom I answered that A. Bishops have Bishops under them, so that though I over and over even to tediousness tell them it is the depositing of all the first or lowest Species of Bishops and Churches, and Consequently all Possibility of true Discipline that I oppose, and submit to any that oversee many such Churches without destroying them and their privileges instituted by Christ.] I speak still in vain to them: These true Historians face down the world that I write whole books to the clean contrary.
CHAP. IX.

Of his supposition that I am an Independent, and yet that I plead for the cause of the Presbyterians.

§ 1. His is also a supposition that is part of the Stamina of his Book; and how far he is to be believed herein judge by the evidence following.

1. He knew what I said before for three sorts of Bishops.

1. *Episcopi Gregis*, Overseers of single lowest Churches, as of Divine Institution: 2. For *Episcopi Episcoporum*, or Presidents. Bishops ejusdem Ordinis, non ejusdem Gradus, in the same Churches, as of early Humane Institution, which I resist not. 3. *Episcopi Episcoporum*, Overseers of many Churches, which I suspect to be Successors of the Apostles, and of such as Timothy, Titus, &c. in the continued ordinary part of their work, (exercising no other Power than they did:) Inasmuch that Dr. Sherlock would be thought to much less Episcopal than I, as that he faith, *It is Antichristian to assert Episcopos Episcoporum.*

§ 2. And Dr. Parker hath newly written a Book for Episcopacy, which I hear many despise; but for my part I take to be the strongest that I have ever written for it these twenty years; but to no purpose against me; for it is but for Episcopacy in general, which I oppose not. It excellent well improveth the Arguments of the K. and Bishops at the Isle of Wight; even that one Argument that a Superiority of some over others being settled by Christ and his Apostles, that Form must be supposed to continue, unless we have clear proof of the Repeal or Cessation. I have oft said the same; I could never answer that Argument: But this will not justify the depoing of thousands of Bishops and Churches, and of their Discipline, to turn them all into two or three Diocesans.

§ 3. Also he knoweth that I have written these 35 years against Lay Elders; believing that the Colledge of Elders which of old assisted the Bishops, were none of them Lay-men, nor unordained, but of the same Order, though not Degree, with the Bishop himself.

§ 4.
§ 4. And I have also written that Synods of Bishops or Presbyters are but for Concord, and have not as such by a major Vote a proper Government of the minor part or absent: Much less that Classes, and other Assemblies, are the stated Church-Government which all must obey: And are the Presbyterians of any of the three forementioned Opinions?

§ 5. I ever held a necessity of manifold dependance of all Christians and Churches. As all depend on Christ as their Head, so do all the People on the Pastors, as their authorized Guides, whom they must not Rule, but be Ruled by, 1 Thes. 5.12. 13. Heb. 13. 17. 24. And all these Churches depend on each other for Communion and Mutual Help, as many Corporations in one Kingdom. And frequent Synods well used, are greatly helpful to these ends: And the Command of doing as much as we can in Love and Concord, both bind all the particular persons to concur with the Synods in all things that tend to the Peace and Edification of the Church, or are not against it. And more than so, if the general Visitors or Bishops that take care of many Churches, do by God's Word direct, instruct, reprove, admonish the particular Bishops and Churches, they ought with reverence to hear them and obey them. And if Independents really are for all this, why do these Accusers represent them odiously, as if it were no such matter, but they were meerly for Church-Democracy? Either you are not to believed in what you say of them, or of me.

§ 6. I know we have men that say, that on pretence of acknowledging all this Episcopacy, I put down all, because I take from them the power of the Sword, and leave all to despise them if they please. Ax: This indeed is the power that under the name of Episcopacy now too many mean. Bishop Bilson knew no Power but Magistrates by the Sword, and Ministers by the Word. But why name I one man? It is the common Opinion of Protestants, and most sober Papists, that Bishops as such have no power of force or Body or Purse. But we deny not the forcing Power of the Magistrate. 3. But we heartily wish that they would keep it in their own hands, and never use it to force unwilling men into the Church, or to Church Communion; high Priviledges which no unwilling person hath any right to. This is my Independency.
CHAP. X.

Of his Accusation, That I make the Bishops the Authors of all Heresies and Schisms, as distinct from Presbyters, Monks and People.

§ 1. This also runs throughout his Book; and must such Books be answered or believed? I never denied the guilt and concurrence of others with them. I only say, That as Bishops were the Chief, so they had the chief hand, as far as I can yet learn, in Heresies and Schisms, since they came to their height of Power, and specially in those grand Heresies and Schisms, which have broken, and keep the Churches in those great Sects and Parties, which in East and West it consists of to this day. I never doubted or denied but that 1. The Heresies that were raised before the Church had any Patriarchs, or the urgent sort of Bishops, were certainly raised without them. 2. And afterward sometime a Presbyter began a Heresie. 3. And the Bishops were but as the Generals of the Army in all the Church Civil Wars. But I never denied but the Prelatical Priests, Monks, and multitude were their obsequious Army.

§ 2. Mr. M. faith, That those Bishops that were Hereticks, were mostly such, or inclined to it before. Answ. 1. Was there then a good Succession of Ordination, when the World groaned to find it self Arian? Were all these Arians before their Consecration?

Answ. 2. Were they not all Prelatical Presbyters that aspired to be Bishops, and so as they say had a Pope or Bishop in their bellies. I never thought that Prelatical Priests that studied Preferment, and longed to be Bishops, had no hand in Heresies nor Schisms, no more than that the Roman Clergy are innocent herein, and the fault is in the Pope alone. What a deal then of this man's Book is lost and worse, on such suppositions?
CHAP. XI.

Of his confident Accusation, that I mention all the faults of the Bishops, and none of their Goodness, or Good Deeds.

§ 1. This also is a chief part of the Warp or Stamen of his Book. In his Preface he saith, ["This History of Bishops is nothing else but an Account of all the faults that Bishops have committed in the several Ages of the Church, without Any Mention of their Good Actions, of their Piety and Severity of their Lives, or of their Zeal for the Faith, &c."]

Answ. 1. Whether this Fundamental Accusation be true or false, let the Reader who loveth Truth see 1. In the very first Chapt. from § 41. to the end. 2. Through all the Book where I oft praise good Bishops, good Councils, and good Canons, and good Books and Deeds. 3. In the two last Chapters of the Book, written purposely to hinder an ill use of the Bishops faults.

In the first Chapter ["Very many of the Bishops themselves were humble, holy, faithful men, that grieved for the miscarriages of the rest: Though such excellent persons as Gregory of Neocelea, Greg. Nazianz. Greg. Nyssen, Basil, Chrysoftom, Augustine, Hilary, Prosper, Fulgentius, &c. were not very common, no doubt but there were many that wrote not Books, nor came so much into the notice of the World, but avoided contentions and factious stirrs, that quietly and honestly conducted the Flocks in the waies of Piety, Love, and Justice. And some of them (as St. Martin) separated from the Councils and Communion of the prevailing turbulent sort of the Prelates, to signifie the disavow of their sins."]

Of the Antients before the world crowded into the Church, I never made question: Such as Clemens, Polycarp, Ignatius, Irenaeus, and the rest.

How oft I have praised holy Cyprian, and the African Bishops and Councils, he sometime confesseth.

What I say of Atticus, Proclus, and other peaceable Bishops, you may see p. 17. and very oft. Yea of the Bishops of many Sects, much of the Albigensies, &c. p. 17, 18.
Yea of the good that was done by the very worldly fort p. 18, 19, 20. Yea of the Papists Bishops that were pious p. 20. § 46.

And § 47. I vindicate the excellency of the Sacred Office. And § 53, 58, 59, 60. I plead for Episcopacy it self in the justifiable species of it.

§ 2. But perhaps he will say, that at least I say more of their faults than their virtues: I answer, of such good Bishops as Cyprian, Basil, Greg. Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustin, Hillary, Martin, &c. I speak of their virtues and nothing at all (that I remember) of their faults. Of such as Theophilus, and Cyril Alexandri. and Epiphanius, &c. I speak of their virtues and some of their faults (as the scripture doth of many good mens.) Of the more ambitious, turbulent fort, I speak only or mostly of their faults: For I profess not to write a History of their lives, but to inform the ignorant what Spirit it is that brought in Church tyranny and divisions. I denied none of their virtues, though it was not my work to record them.

While I am confuting the Errors of your book, do I wrong you unless I write a Catalogue of your good works. Morney, Illyricus, and many others have gathered a Catalogue of old witnesses for Protestant Verities. And Bishop Morton hath cited multitudes of Papists against their party: Have they wronged them because they have not also cited all that the same said for the Roman cause? I have mentioned the virtues of some of the Popes, even of Greg. 7. but of many others I have only mentioned their vices: This is not to deny any good that is in them: Nor do you accuse your selves of any injustice when you tell the world how bad men the Parliaments have bin, and how bad Cromwell and the Armies, and how bad the Nonconformists are, and I in particular, without naming any of their good deeds or virtues: Because it is not your business.

CHAP.
CHAP. XII.

Of his Accusation that I do all in Spite and malice against Bishops, and as using ill language of them.

§1. Ans. 1. Spite and Malice are heart sins: If the same effect may come from other Causes, how know you that these are the Cause?

Ans. 2. Is it from Spight and Malice that Protestants commonly describe the vices of the Popes, such as Greg. 7. Sergius, Alex.-andr. 3. Bomsface 8. Job. 12. and 13. & 22. & 23. & Eugen. 4. &c. And also that they so hardly speak of the Jesuites, Yea and Papists commonly? Sure it may come from some other cause.

Ans. 3. Is it from Spight and Malice that you recite the tumults of the German Anabaptists, the faults of those at Munster, the Errors of David George, the many Enthusiastic Sects described by Beckman Exercit. (of whom many as Thaulerus, Kemphis, Behmen had much very commendable; and Grotius praised Job. 44.) Is it from Malice that the Familists, Seekers, Quakers, Anabaptists, &c. are usually by your party described by their faults, without any mention of their goodness?

Ans. 4. Is it from Spight and Malice that your Party have written what they have done of the great faultiness of the Non-conformists, both former and latter; and that Calvinists are so odiously represented, that the Reformation by them is described by Heylin and others as Rebellious? That such books are written as Heylin's Aerius Redivivus, H. Fowlis, the Evangel. Armatum, The Eccles. Polit. the Friendly Debate, the Counterminer, the Vindicat. of Dr. Stillingfleet, the pretended second part, (which is a continued Calumny against my self, so full of particular falsehoods as are not to be without a tedious Volume answered: And a multitude such written to render the Nonconformists odious and unsufferable. If all these be not written in Malice, how know you that mine were?

Ans. 5. And whereas some pretending moderation accuse me of too bad provoking language, 1. Is there any Comparison between the language of any of these books, or yours and Dr. Sherlock's
Sherlock's and mine? Read but Learned Godly moderate Bishop Downam his Defence of his Visit. Sermon, his frequent charges [of shameless, impudent Lying, and much more] against a Non-conformist that gave him no such language. Read but the ordinary Writings of such as Bishop Bancroft, Dr. Surcliff, and most others against the Old Nonconformists; and of the Lutherans against the Calvinists, even men that I am persuaded meant honestly, but by Faction were exasperated, as Hunnis, Brentius, Morinus, Morbachius, Snepsus, Wigandus, Heshusius, Andreas, Selnercorus, Heerbrand, Calovius, and many such. Read but our Grammarians, such as you may find in the many Volumes of the Collections of Janus Gruterus, even those of Cramer, and Phil. Panaus, and others against himself; where Fools, Knaves, Lyars, Sets, and worse, make up much of the style.

Read but our Old Grammarian Reformers against the Popish Priests, and Schoolmen, I mean Erasimus, Hutten, Faber, and the rest, what Scorns their Writings do abound with.

I will not refer you to the Queen of Navarre, and Stephanus his World of Wonders, against the Priests, lest you think I approve of the excess.

Yea read but the Writings of our famous Learned Criticks, lul. and Joseph Scaliger, Heinsius, Salmasius, &c. from whom the railing Jesuite Labbe took advantage to say, Tom.i.p.820. ["Rivo vero praeverat Josephus Scaliger, homo utique modestissimus, qui Editores S. Iranai vocat, clamosos, maledicentissimos. Cercopas, Tartareos, Pyriphlegetontas, virulentia & probrorum concionatores, & editionem coloniensem, cloacam Sopaphantiarum, latrinam convitiorum, & stabulum infestia.] Through God's great mercy, while Malignity is the Complexion of the Serpent's Seed, and Lying is their Breath, and Murder is their Work, the names of all these sins are odious in the world, and guilt is impatient, and cannot endure its own name.

Should I but mention the Language of Papists, how they represent the holiest Protestants as Lyars, Deceivers, Devils, intolerable, whom it is as lawful to kill as Dogs, Foxes or Toads, it would concern none but those of you that use to say, I had rather be a Papist than a Puritane, or Presbyterian; or those that renounce Communion with us, and own it with the Church of Rome; who are, alas, too many. Such Language as Labbe's, Vol. 1. p. 819. is, of the sweeter sort, viz. "Quisquis es salutis..."
Honest Thuanus is amiable and honourable for Speaking well of all that deserved it, without partiality: But Gehr. Vossius is put to defend his Father-in-law Junius against his unjust cenure. Indeed Junius was a man of Eminent peaceablenes and moderation, (I would Arminius and he had been the utmost prosecutors of that Controversie, notwithstanding Dr. Twisses undervaluing his skill in School Divinity) And few men were more unlike Thuanus his ill Character than Junius: But Dr. Manton hath told me that he hath been fully informed that it was not Junius that Thuanus meant but another that dyed that year (which Junius did not) and that by some ill chance a wrong name was put in Contrary to Thuanus intent.

§ 2. Dr. Burnet is a man whom I much value and honour, and pleadeth much for peace and moderation, and therefore much the more amiable to me: I thank him for his reproof of me to my face; but because he goeth on to vend it as just behind my back, where I cannot answer him, I must do it here. He saith that [I began and that with unchristian, provoking language against the Conformists in my first Plea for peace, which caused all the succeeding heats.]

Ans. 1. I have to him and oft in print appealed to humanity and common sense whether one that was seventeen years silent, & communicated in the Parish Churches, and under scorns, and ejection, imprisonment & multip' did peaceably continue communion with them without reply or self defence, and never wrote against them, till they had long called out to him to give them an account of the reasons of his Nonconformity, and then durst not provoke them by a dispute, but barely named the matters which we judge unlawful, professing not to be the Accuser of Conformists, but only to answer the Call of Parliament-men, Bishops, and others that urged us, and threatened us if we would not tell them what we stuck at; and made this the Justification of their prosecution of many hundred men: I say, whether such a

L. man
man had a Call to speak? When the King Licensed us, I had
before briefly defended our Preaching as Licensed: But being
thus summoned by our Prosecutors and Superiors, I told them
what we judged unlawful; and was this a beginning of the
Flame? Was Seventeen years Poverty, Prohibition and Prose-
cution, and all this Importunity, no provocation or call to speak?
Did this begin? If he were in the House of Correction, and were
beaten but Seventeen years, or Seven years, to confess the
Cause for which he suffer'd, and at last confessed it, and one
should say, This was the beginning of the strife, Would he take
this for a good Historian? And if he had written History, would
this report advance the credit of it?
§ 3. But the second thing accused, is the unchristian Language
of that Book. Answ. Doth a general Accusation signifie more
ill of the accuser, or of the accused, if it be not proved by par-
ticular Instances? I urged him to name the unchristian words,
and I remember but two Instances he gave me.
The first is, that I use the word [untruths] against my Accu-
sers. And 1. I think the Reader will very rarely find that
word in that Book. 2. Is this so harsh as the common charge
of Lying, used even by the most Learned sober Conformists?
3. I thought it had been a modest word: What shall a man say
when such Volumes of Slander are published against him and
others, as tends to preach all their Neighbours into hatred
and persecution of them? Alas! Doth it increase our crime
to say, It is untrue? How shall we then answer for our selves
at any Bar? Is it tolerable voluminously to tell the World
down-right falsehoods of us? and is it railing for us to say, [They
are untrue?] What's this but like him that run a man thorow in
wrath with his Sword, and indicted him for crying, oh? This is
the Church Justice even of our moderate Historians.
§ 4. But he saith, I should not call it [a falsehood, or untruth]
but a mistake. Answ. This is a sharper word; for it signifieth
the fault of the mistaker usually; whereas by speaking de objecto,
that it is false, I leave it to others how far the reporter is to
be blamed. But sure most Logical Disputations are Railings, if
the words [saltem] and [sallacia] be such.
§ 5. About a month or six weeks ago the Observator, the
Churches Advocate published, That ["a Captain of Horse of
the King's, had the fortune to be dismounted, wounded and
"stript,
"strip, and a Chaplain (naming me before) cut from about his neck a Medal, which the King had given him, and the Soul-diers spared in the heat of blood. I sent him word how false this was: I never saw the man in my life that I know of; much less ever medled with him: But was in a House where a Soul-dier brought a small silver-guilt Medal, about the bigness of a big Shilling, and said, he took it from about the neck of one Captain Jennings, whose Life he spared: He offered it to sale, and no one offering him more, I gave him eighteen pence for it in 1643, as I remember: And about 1648, hearing where Captain Jennings was, supposing it might be of great use to him, I sent it him as a gift by one Mr. Sommersfield. And this slander is all the thanks I had. The Church-Advocate wrote me back, that he had it formally attested. I craved as a favour of him to tell me if Captain Jennings be living, how I might write to him. He answers me, that one was out of the way that he must first speak with, and I should shortly hear from him. The next I heard was as a second part of Dr. Stillingfleet, the foresaid Book full of cruel falshood, taken from my having been for the Parliament, and from many distorted words of mine: Now when this Book renders me worse than a Jew, or Heathen, and unfit to live, some I fear will tell abroad that I am a Traitor, for saying, that [It is slanderous or untrue.]

§ 6. His second Instance was these words of mine ["Pardon me for saying, I think that Mr. Tombs hath said more like truth for Anti-baptistry, the late Hungarian for Polygamy, many for Drunkenness, Stealing, and Lying, in cases of Necessity, than ever I yet read for the Lawfulness of all that I have here described."]

Answ. 1. Is there any Railing or unchristian Language in these words? which be they?

Answ. 2. Do I here speak of any but myself and the Non-conformists? Do I not protest against accusing others, and only say, what it would be to me, should I conform? And must I not, when importuned by Bishops, Priests and Rulers, say what I fear, lest others should think it intimateth their guiltiness? Can I help that?

Answ. 3. Did that man ever understandingly consider the matter, who can doubt of the truth of what I say?

1. On the one side how heinous and many the sins that we fear are, if we should conform, I must not again name, for that's it that provoketh. L 2 II. Now
1. Now as to the Comparison; I'll appeal to Learned Bishop Barlow whether Mr. Tombs hath not made the Case of Anabaptistry more difficult? Let them that deny it confute him better than I have done.

2. And why doth none answer the Hungarians book for Polygamy if it be easier done than the task in question. I have known the man that maintained, that if a King had a barren wife, and his Kingdom like to be undone by a destructive successor, he might as lawfully take another wife, as Adams Children might marry incestuously. And indeed the many unreproved instances of Polygamy in Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Solomon, &c. will allow men more pretence for it, than ever I saw brought for all (I say, but For all) that I have named in that book.

3. And many Physicians have said so much (though amiss) for the lawfulness of a Drunken Cup instead of a Vomit & a Cordial in some diseases, as have made it a harder case than ours seems to me: And I say not what it seems to others.

4. And de necessario concebibu legantur qua a medicis dicuntur de furor uterinio.

5. And for stealing nothing but present food to save life, he that Considers what God allowed a man to take that went through an Orchard, Vineyard or Corn-field, and what the Law of nature is, and whether the Kings Army on whose strength the Safety of King & Kingdom depends, may not violently take food without the owners consent rather than perish, will find it harder to justify the denying Christendom and Communion to godly Persons that scruple our sort of God Fathers, Crossing and Kneeling, &c. than to confute the aforesaid stealing, or that which is meerly to save life.

6. And as for Lying in cases of necessity, No less men of their own party than Grotius de Furie Belli and Bishop Fer. Taylor in DufT. Dubit. have written for it. And though I be against it, and many Conformists for it, yet I will not deny but if the Life of the King might be saved among Enemies by a Lie; or the Life of a Patient by his Physicians deceiving him by a Lie, much more may be pretended for it, than for all the heinous sin which I fear.

§ 7. And if these words be uncharitable Railing, what means have we left to give them that demand it, the Reasons of our Nonconformity?
What if we had gone further, and taken it for a crying Church Crime, and called all the Clergy to Repentance? If that which we judge sinful be not so, let them confute us: If it be so, and as great as we fear, is it not our duty to bewail it, and mourn for it? Ezek. 9. 4. Zeph. 3. 17, &c. And is not mincing and extenuating great sin, an implicit hardening men against Repentance? Should one Preach against Adultery, Fornication, Perjury, Murder, as about a doubtful Controversie, or a small thing, and say but [Good men are on both sides; I dare not say it is a sin, though I dare not do it myself: Or if it be one, it is but such as good men are ordinarily guilty of: We must not judge one another.] What were this but (worse than Eli to his Sons) to cherish Sin, and Preach Impenitence, and serve Satan against the Evangelical Preaching of Repentance?

§ 8. For my Judgment, I profess it to be the duty of me, and all men, to use no Language of Good mens faults, no, though they turn Persecutors upon some particular Error, but what is consistent with true Love to the men, and to cover their faults that are private, and meerly personal, as far as lawfully we may; but not to make light of publick, aggravated Crimes, such as those of Hophni and Phinehas; nor to shew indifferency towards Buyers and Sellers in the Temple; nor to strengthen the Sin which threatens a Land. If I thought that hundreds or thousands of Christ's faithful Ministers in any Country were unjustly hunted and forbidden to Preach the Gospel to a People that truly need it, and this to the unavoidable dividing of the People, and the plain making way for a Forreign Jurisdiction, I should take my self as a guilty hinderer of Repentance, and Enemy to the Publick Safety, if I should say only [This is a doubtful Controversie between Good, Wise, and Learned men.]

Labbe ends his To. 1. as justifying his bitterest Reproaches, with the Authority of Christ, Peter, Paul, John, Jude, Ignatius. And if he had only given great and publick sins, the true names necessary to mens knowledge of them, for Repentance or Preservation, those Texts, and many more would have justified him.
Of his Supposition that I speak against all Bishops Councils.

§ 1. This is not so. 1. I write oft for the great usefulness of Councils. 2. I justly praise no small number of them, especially before the great Rising of the Bishops, for the first 300 or 400 years: He once acknowledgeth it of the African Councils: And he might have seen the like of many Spanish, and some French and Germane Councils: The English I little medled with. 3. The First General Council at Nice I justly honour; yea and the Three following, and many more than three, for the soundness of their Faith, and as having many very laudable persons in them; though I shew the ill effects of their contention and ambition.

I have heard some Conformists confess the great Learning and piety of the Westminster Synod in 1642. and of the Synod of Dort, where we had Delegates: and yet sharper I speak against the Acts of both by far, than I have done by any such pious Persons. Even they that have honoured Bishop Carlton, Bishop Hall, Bishop Davenant, Dr. Ward, &c. that were there, have yet bitterly reproached the Decrees which they subscribed. And how many as well as Dr Heylin have written and spoken ill of A. Bishop Uzbek, of A. Bishop Abbot, A. Bishop Grindal, A. Bishop Parker (yea of A. Bishop Whitgift for the Lambeth Articles which I justifie not) who yet have a great honour both for Bishops and their Councils.

§ 2. But I confess I am much of Nazianzen's mind, and I think I am no more against them in the general than he was. And I am against our subjection to the Jurisdiction of Forreign Councils, and the use that the Pope and ambitious Clergy have made of them, to become Masters of Princes and of the world: I am not for Ebbo's French Council which deposed Ludov. Pius, nor for making them either the Popes Army, or the Army of Patriacks against each other or of such Princes as Constantius, Valens, Theodosius junior, Anastasius Philippicus, Justinian, Irene, &c. to fulfill their own mistaken wills, how honest soever the men might
might be. Much less am I for such work as the Council at Lateran sub Innoc. 3 made, no nor that at Florence.

§ 3 And I take it for an Act of great Prudence in this my accuser, while he is vindicating Bishops Councils, to go no further than the four first General, when it is many hundred that I have mentioned. And is it not really an intimated accusation of them to vindicate so few of above 400. And those such as for their faith we all own.

And yet a man would think by the stren of his style and language that it were at least the greater part of Councils that he were pleading for. I say still as Bishop Bilson and other Protestants: Well ordered sound Councils we owe great respect and honour to, for Counsel, strength and Concord, but subjection and Obedience, faith he, We owe them none, (lave as we are bid, be all subject one to another, and serve one another in Love.)

§ 4. And now I leave any impartial man to judge what answer such a book deserved, which goeth upon all these forementioned untrue suppositions.

---

**CHAP. XIV.**

**Some mens Credit about ancient Church History, may be conjectured at by their Reports of the History of the time and place that we live in.**

§ 1. By their History of late and present things we may conjecture at the Credit of not Mr. M's, but others of the Clergy-acusers and Prosecutors of their Brethren. Almost all that I remember that write against me, agree in such misreporting matters of fact, yea the most publick, of the persons, place and time, which our senses have given us notice of, that we must believe them with as great difficulty as we must believe Transubstantiation, even in opposition to all our senses and experience. And whether those men be fit Vindicaters of the Bishops and Councils above a Thousand years ago (which are blamed by the Historians of their own Age, and by their own Confessions, and by their most fervent Defenders) who notoriously misreport the persons, and actions of their own Place and Age; I think it is not hard to judge.

I will
I will instance in Twenty particulars of publick notice; for those against particular persons, even myself, are not to be numbered.

I. It is now commonly taken for true, that the present Nonconformists, who gave in their Desires for Concord 1660, are of the same Judgment as those called Nonconformists heretofore; and whatever can be raked up out of Christ, Goodman, Knox, Kilby, or is reported by Bancroft, is partly chargeable on them, when as their proposed Desires yet shew the world that they never made any motion against many things by those aforesaid scrupled, in Doctrine, Worship, and Ceremony.

And it is commonly supposed by them, that the present Conformity is but the same as the Old, and the Case no harder to us: And this notwithstanding all the still visible Acts and Alterations, and Additions, which attest the contrary to all the world.

II. In most of their Invectives the present Nonconformists are argued against, as if they had been in the Civil War against the King; or had been guilty of it more than the Conformists. And that War is made a Reason of their Silencing; whereas so few of them had any hand in it, that I have many times told them, that if they will Silence none but those that they can prove guilty of any War, or Rebellion, or Sedition, the rest of us will give them a thousand Thanks, though we suffer our selves. Few of the present Nonconformists were then in the Ministry, and of those few that were, few now living meddled with War.

III. They are so confident that the Parliament and Army that began the War in England, were Nonconformists, yea Presbyterians, and not of the Church of England, that Mr. Hinkley, &c. here Mr. Motrice, make a renouncing of their Sensés or Understandings necessary to the believing of it. And yet they might as well tell us, that they were all Turks or Papists. Are not a Parliament and an Army things publick enough to be known in the same Age? When we name to them the Chief Lords and Commons, and Chief Commanders, yet (and lately) living, who are known still to live in their own Communion; and when we challenge them to name Three Presbyterians that were then in the House of Lords, or the House of Commons; or many that were at first Commanders in the Army; and we name them the Men that then Commanded, who were commonly known...
to be Conformists of the Church of England. And if they will not believe their present practice and profession they may yet go to them and be satisfied from their own mouths what were their former Principles. I have told them of a most credible Member of that Parliament yet living, who hath oft profeft to me that he knew but one Presbyterian in the House of Commons when the war began, and I have named that one man to them, to try if they can name another. I expect not that they should believe me, or such other concerning those whom we knew: But they may believe the men themselves yet living, & their most familiar Friends.

Yea the Records of many foregoing Parliaments, with Land's Life written by Dr. Heylin fully theweth them that the difference arose 1. About the fear of Popery, (and Arminianism as they thought tending towards it) 2. About Property, Loanmony, Knight-mony and after Ship-mony, &c. 3. About Imprisonment of members and other Gentlemen. And these were still the quarrel.

But faith Mr. M. How then shall we believe our senses. Ans. See Reader, whether his most confident Errors about past things be any wonder. He is not so sure of what he faith of the old Prelates, or the Nestorians, Eutychians, &c. as he is that he must believe his Senses: And his very senses tell him that a Parliament, even Lords, Commons, and an Army, many of whom are yet living, were of another opinion in Religion than ever they were then acquainted with, and which was known to very few in England till afterward. And this contrary to their Profession and practice and the senses of their acquaintance. Lords are Persons of so publick notice that they may easily yet be informed of the living and the dead: In the Army the Chief Commanders were the E. of Essex, the E. of Bedford (yet living) Sir John Merrick, the E. of Peterborough, Delibere, the E. of Stamford, the Lord Hastings (E. of Huntington) the Lord Rochford (E. of Dover) the Lord Fielding (E. of Denbigh) the Lord Manevile (E. of Manchester) the Lord Roberts (now Earl of Radnor and President of his Majesties Council) the Lord St. John, (killed at Keinton Fight.) Only the Lord Say, and Lord Brook were known Independents; and whether the Lord Wharton (yet living) was then for Bishops or against them I know not; but all the rest were of the Church of England. And so were the other Collonels, Sir Henry Cholmley, the late Lord Hollis, Col. Will. Bampfield, Col. M

But faith Mr. M. [I. It’s well the Bishops had no scare in it] Ans. Let Heylin tell you what hand the difference between A. Bishops Church of England and Laud’s then little Party had in the preparations. 2. And was the A. Bishop of York no Bishop, who afterward was a Commander for the Parliament.

But faith he, [I pray where were the Presbyterians when the Parliament took up Arms: Were they not then in being?] Ans. An excellent Historian! that maintaineth Parliament and Army were such, as he knows not whether they were then in being. Yes Sir, they were in Holland, and France and Geneva, and Scotland; and in England there was one John Ball, and one Mr. Langley, and a few more such old Nonconformists that never were in Arms, and old John Dod, and one Mr. Geeve that was against the war and dyed for grief of the King’s death: But among those called Puritans,sfew knew what Presbytery was, till the Scots afterward brought it in. Much less did Lords, Commons, and Army know it. In your sense Sir they were not then in being, and therefore could not fight.

It appears by Bancroft and others that there had been once Presbyterians in England: But they were dead, and few even of the few Nonconforming Ministers succeeded them in the Study of that point.

But faith he, [Were they none of them in the house] Ans. Yes, one [or did they protest against the proceedings of the Episcopal and Erastians?] Ans. That one went with them. And Non entis non sunt accidentia.

But faith he [Can Mr. B. believe (or think any one else so weak as to be imposed on in a matter so notorious) that it was a Parliament of Episcopal, and Erastians and not Presbyterians that began the war?]

Ans. Thus youngmen that know not whom they talk of can controle the most publick matter of fact by their conjectures. Go ask the worthy Master of the Rolls Sir Harbottle Grimston, whose Speeches were then printed: Ask Sir Job. Maynard His Ma-
justes Sergeant at Law who was one of them; or any other of them yet living. Ask them whether they knew themselves and their companions better than you, who it seems knew them not.

But faith he [Were they Episcopal that voted down Episcopacy Root and Branch before the war begun] Anf. 1. Have you proved that they did so? 2. Do you think that a contradiction? 1. They had got a belief that Bishop Laud had got such men into the Seats as were for a Syncretism with the Papists (described by Heylin) and against the Subjects Property and Liberty. And it was the Men and not the Office that offended them. 2. But because they were willing of the favour of the Scots, and those Londoners who were against the Bishops, they pleaded them by voting down the present frame, intending to set up a moderate Episcopacy in its stead; Yea long after this when many Learned Divines in the Assembly declared themselves for Episcopacy, but not for Deans, Chancellors, &c. They altered the Covenant so as to describe the present frame only: And when the House of Lords took the Covenant, Mr. Coleman (an Erastian) gave it them openly, declaring that it was not meer Episcopacy that this Covenant renounced, but only the English described Complicate form. And could they have had such Bishops as Abbot and the old Church of England, they had never gone thus far. 3. And they thought not Episcopacy itself so necessary, (though if moderate the best sort of Governments) as to hazard all for it, which they thought had been in danger. Even in 1640 July 17. They Voted a Diocesan in every County, with Twelve Divines to Govern:

But, faith he, [Were they Episcopal that Petitioned the King at York for Reformation in Discipline and Worship then? i.e. for abolishing Episcopacy and Common-Prayer?] Answ. 1. Reforming is not Abolishing. 2. I answered that as to the last. When they feared that the Old House would fall on their heads, they were for pulling of it down, and building a New one, after such a Model as Bishop Usher after gave, and the Germans, Swedish, and Danish Churches have; which they called the Primitive Episcopacy: But before they could do it, they needed the Scots help, who brought in the Covenant, which they chose rather than to fall into the hands of those of whom they had such thoughts and fears, as I need not now describe. Prin's History of Laud's T ryal describeth them.
I would ask this confident Historian (whose senses tell him what Religion men were of contrary to their daily practice of communicating in the Parish-Churches conformably) whether the Longest Parliament of all, which made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation and Vestry Acts, the Two Acts against Conventicles, the Militia Act, &c. were Presbyterian or Episcopal? Verily, if these were Presbyterians, I am none, nor ever will be: We shall then have a strange definition of a Presbyterian, such as will take in Bishop Sheldon, Bishop Morley, Bishop Gunning, and such others. If not, did not the fear of Popery make that very Parliament begin to look so lowly on the Clergy, as produced that which I need not tell you of? And did not most of the same men meet in the next Parliament after, and look yet more suspiciously on the Clergy? And the next yet more? And doth it follow that they were not Episcopal but Presbyterian? But some men are confident against the Sun-light, and the most notorious Publick Evidence. But I must confess that such have shaken my belief of the meek Moral Evidence of most History, and left me only certain of that which hath Evidence, which is truly Natural, in the Natural Impossibility of Conspiracy in a Lie.

There were men heretofore that would swear that man was a Puritane, who would not swear and drink with them, and would pray in their Families, and read the Scriptures on the Lord’s Day, while others were dancing. And the word [Puritane] is now vulgarly changed into [Presbyterian] (by the Clergies Conduct.) And there are some Clergy-men that will say, a man is a Presbyterian, who reproves them for Drunkenness and Swearing, and other Crimes, specially if he would not have Nonconformists ruined and laid in Gaol with Rogues. In this sense I deny not but Lords, Commons and Army, had many Puritanes or Presbyterians among them, who yet never knew what Presbyterian was.

But, with Mr. M. [Were they Episcopal who pray the King at Oxford to abolish A. Bishops and Bishops, &c. that entered into a Solemn Leagne and Covenant against Episcopacy, and for Reforming the Church after the Presbyterian Platform, and set up Presbyterian by so many Ordinances?] Answ. Distigue tempora is none of this Historians Principles. How long after the War begun was this Petition at Oxford, this Covenant, and these Ordinances? He proveth them Presbyterian.
byterians at first when they knew not what it was, because they were for Presbytery a year or two after: *Negatur Sequela.* The *Scots* taught afterwards the Assembly, and them that which they never knew before. 2. And all these Petitions & Ordinances shew'd not what they preferred as best, but what they preferred before expected ruine. The issue proved this, and *Heylin* confesseth it, and faith, they never set up Presbytery in any one place (which yet is not true, though they did not force it.)

3. Do you not know now living, those Episcopal Conformists, who refuse no part of your Conformity, and are much against Presbytery, who since the Discovery of the Papists Plot, are so much afraid of Popery, and so confident that too many of the Clergy are prepared for it, that a little more would turn them from you, though they love Presbytery as little as they love your selves.

In a word, The Old Clergy and the Parliament Men agreed. The New Clergy in Bishop *Land's* time distasted them; & the *Scots* Presbyterians helping them in their straits, partly turned some of them, and partly impofed on them unpleasing conditions.

But faith he, *[The Erastians and Independents were at first inconsiderable, and ailed jointly with the Presbyterians, &c.]*

*Answe.* Thus is History delivered to the deluded World! Neither Independency nor Presbytery were understood by many till the War was begun. The *Scots* Commissioners by degrees acquainted them with Presbytery, and *Mr. Burton's* Protestation Protested, and the five Dissenters with Independency: Two or three Independents were in the House of Lords, and some few in the House of Commons: It was Episcopal-men that made up the main Body: These were of two sorts: The one sort thought Episcopacy of Divine Institution, but not Chancellors, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, Officials, &c. The other sort thought that Episcopacy, not rampant, was the best Government *jure humano*; But that the Magistrate being Chief, might set it up, or take it down, as he see most for the common good. These were called by some *Erastians*: And that these at first were inconsiderable, is History written in despight of Evidence. Let any man 1. Read what Parliaments formerly said; 2. And what many English Divines wrote for the *Ius humano* against the *Ius Divinum*; and what Testimony *Prin* hath given of it; 3. And what Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath produced for it in his *Irenicon*;
4. And how commonly it was owned by Conformists then in Conference; 5. And how commonly the Lawyers were for the Humane Right; 6. Yea and the Civilians themselves; and then let him take this Historian's word, if he tell Posterity that the Parliament and Army were not English men.

IV. These Historians candidly tell the world, that the Nonconformists, who offered their Desires for Concord 1660, were Presbyterians, and so are most of the Nonconformists now. Whereas they never made one motion for Presbytery, for Lay-Elders, for Ruling Classes or Assemblies, nor against Episcopacy; but only offered the Paper called A. Bishop Usher's Reduction of Episcopacy to the Primitive Form; wherein neither A. Bishops, nor Bishops, nor Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, were taken down, or any of their Revenues, Lordships, or Parliament-Power. This is Presbytery with these Historians.

V. They make the world believe that the main Body of the Conformists, are such as suffered for the King, or complied not with the Directory and Times of Usurpation: Whereas it's publickly notorious, that there are about 9000 Parish-Churches in England, besides many hundred Chapels, & many Churches that had more than one Minister. And almost all these complied with the Times or Directory, as the Nonconformists did: And of all these, it was but about 2000 that Conformed not; so that 7000 or 8000 of them that had kept in, did on a sudden turn Conformists. And divers that had been in Arms for the Parliament: Yea, some that had written for the Engagement when I wrote against it; yea some that had spoken or written tautum non a Jusification of the Killing of the King. And of those that joyned with us in our Proposals for Concord, Dr. Worth, and Dr. Reignolds were made Bishops, and divers others did Conform.

VI. These Historians would make the world believe that the Present Church, and such as they, did more than the Parliamentarians, and Presbyterians, and Nonconformists, to restore the King; when it is notoriously known, how oft their Attempts were defeated, and what the Scots Army under Hamilton underwent, to say nothing of the next; and of the Lord Delamore's Attempt, and what the Restored Parliament did: But sure I am, that the Old Parliament Souldiers, and Presbyterian Commanders and Souldiers in General Monk's Army, with those in England and Ireland that joyned with him, and Sir Thomas Allen Lord
Lord Mayor, with the Londoners, at the persuasion of the Presbyterian Ministers, drawing General Monk to join with them, did the main work, which the Council and Parliament after finished. When most of these men that will not endure the oblivion of Discords, nor the Reconciling and Union of the King's Subjects, do but start up to revile others, and blow the Coals again, and reap the fruit of other men's labours, that desire but to live in Peace.

VII. That there are able worthy men that Conform, we are far from denying; and we earnestly desire their Concord, and the success of their Labour, and I hope love them as our selves: But whereas the History of this Party doth proclaim how much better and able Ministers than the Nonconformists are generally put into their Places, that are no Novices or Ignorant Youths, no Drunkards, nor scandalous, but more laborious, skilful Labourers, I will say nothing, but let the Countries judge.

VIII. And whether it be true that there is no need of the Nonconformists Ministry, but the Churches are sufficiently supplied without them, both as to the number and quality of their Teachers, I have in my Apology enquired; and with godly men it's easily judged.

IX. And whether it be true, that it was only for the Kings or Bishops cause that the Parliament put out all, or most of them that were heretofore removed, I leave to the Witnesses and Articles against them. I am sure I and my neighbour Ministers petitioned that none that were tolerable pious Ministers, might be put out for being for the King or Bishops.

X. It is commonly now recorded and reported that the Presbyterian and those that now conform not put down Catechizing, and turned the Creed, Lords prayer and Decalogue out of the Church-Service. Whereas (if some few Independents did any of this, it is more than I know, but) in all our Countrey, and where I came, I remember no Churches that did not use the Creed openly at their baptizing any, and the Decalogue frequently read out of Exod. 20. or Deut. 5. and the Lords prayer frequently; as we did constantly. But some thought that we were not bound to use it every time they prayed. And the Directory commendeth all these to them. And all our Countrey agreed not only to Catechize publicly, but to take larger time on
on the week daies to Catechize every family.

X I. These Historians say that I and such others take the things which we conform not to, to be but inconveniences and not sins; And that we keep the Nation in Schisme while we confefs the things to be but Indifferent And our writings are visible in which we profefs the contrary, and laboured by many arguments to prove it and protested that we would conform if we took them or to be sins. And we gave in a Catalogue of what we judged to be sins: And this before the New Conformity was imposed: And since the fiercest displeasure is against us for telling them what we account Sin, and how great: When many years together our Rulers and the People were told that we confessed them indiffer-ent and refused them but to avoid offending our followers.

X I I. We frequently hear from them that we oppose Episco-pacy because we cannot be Bishops out of our selves: When its known that nothing could more put men out of all such hopes than the Presbyterians Endeavours that both their power and wealth should be taken down: And he that hath any desires of a Bishoprick should sure be for the keeping of them up. And the same men reprove us for refusing Bishopricks and Deanries, and say we did it to please the People.

X I V. The new Historians would make us believe that the Reformed Church of England before Bishop Laud's time were of their mind that now call themselves Bishops and Doctors of the Church of England, in holding as they do, that there is an Universal humane Soveraignty with Legislative and Judicial power over all the Churches on earth: and that this is in Councils, or an Universal Colledge of Bishops; of which the Pope may be allowed to be president, and Principium Unitatis, &c. and that he must be obeyed as Patriarch of the West; and so we must be under a forreign Jurisdiction. Whereas it is notoriously known that before Bishop Laud's time the doctrine of this Church was quite Contrary, as may be seen at large in the Apology, the Ar-ticles of Religion, the writings of the Bishops and Doctors; Yea they writ copiously to prove that the Pope is Antichrist, and put it into their Liturgy. And Dr. Heylin tells us that the Reason why Bishop Laud got it out was, that it might not offend the Papists and hinder our reconciliation with them; And the Oath of Supre-macy sweareth us against all forreign Jurisdiction.

X V. The same Historians would make us believe that these mens
mens doctrine is now the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable to it. Whereas the Oath of Allegiance is still in force, and so are the Homilies, and the Articles of Religion and the Laws and Canons for the Kings Supremacy against all foreign Jurisdiction. And there is no change made which alloweth of their doctrine: And the Church doctrine must be known by its publick writings, and not by the opinions of new risen men.

X V I. The new Historians make the Nonconforming Ministers to be men grozly ignorant, preaching false doctrine, of wicked principles and lives, and not fit to be suffered out of Gaols. And yet these 19, or 20, years how few of them have been convict of any false doctrine? And I have not heard of four in England that have ever been convict since they were cast out, of being once drunk, or fornicating, cheating, swearing, or any immorality, unless preaching and not swearing, Subscribing, &c. be such, nor for false doctrine.

X V I I. The new Historians have made thousands believe that the doctrine or opinions of the Nonconformists is for sedition and rebellion; And that it is for this that they refuse to renounce the obligation of the Covenant as to all men besides themselves and that they refuse to subscribe that it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against any Commissioned by the King. Whereas we have at large in a second Plea for peace opened our judgments about Loyalty and obedience, and none of them will tell us what they would have more, nor where our profession is too short or faulty. Nor have they convict any of my acquaintance of preaching any disloyal doctrine.

X V I I I. Yea they have by writing, preaching and talking made multitudes believe that the Nonconformists or Presbyterians have been long hatching a rebellion against the King, and have a Plot to take down Monarchy under pretence of opposing Popery. And how far these Historians are to be believed, true Protestants by this time partly understand.

X I X. Yea these Historians have made multitudes believe that the Parliaments that have been dissolved here of late years have been designing to change the Government of Church and State, under pretence of opposing Popery. As if that Parliament that did that for them and against us which is done, and made all the Acts which are for the Renunciation of the Covenant, and for all the Declarations, Subscriptions and Practices Imposed, and for Fining us 20l. and 40l. a Sermon, and laying us in Gaols,
had been for Nonconformists, and against Episcopacy; and they that made the Militia Act, and such other had been against the King; or his Prerogative: Or the other following had not been of the same Religion.

X X. But the boldest part of their History, is their description of the two sorts of the People in England, those that are for the present Nonconformists, and those that are against them. Those that are against them, they account the most Religious, Temperate, Chaste, Loyal, Credible, and in a word, the best people through the Land (for of our Rulers I am not speaking.) And those that are for the Nonconforming Ministers, they defame as the most proud, hypocritical, treacherous, disloyal, covetous, false, and in a word, the worst people in the Land; or as Fowlis faith, the worst of all mankind, and unfit to live in humane Society. How long will it be ere the sober people of this Land believe this Character? One would think that the quality of the common Inhabitants of the Land should not be a Controversie, or unknown thing. All that I will say to this History, is, to tell the Reader the utmost of my observation and experience from my Youth up, concerning these two sorts of men.

Where I was bred before 1640. (which was in divers places) I knew not one Presbyterian Clergy-man, nor Lay, and but three or four Nonconforming Ministers. Nay till Mr. Ball wrote for the Liturgy and against Can, and Allen, &c. and till Mr. Burton Published his Protestation protested, I never thought what Presbytery or Independency were, nor ever spake with a man that seemed to know it: And that was in 1641 when the War was brewing. In the place where I first lived, and the Country about, the People were of two sorts: The generality seemed to mind nothing seriously but the body and the world: They went to Church and would answer the Parson in Responds and thence go to dinner, and then to play: They never prayed in their families, but some of them going to bed, would say over the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, & some of them the *Hail Mary*: All the year long, not a serious word of holy things, or the Life to come, that I could hear of, proceeded from them. They read not the Scripture, nor any good Book or Catechism. Few of them could read, or had a Bible: They were of two ranks, the greater part were good Husbands as they called them, and favoured of nothing but their business or Interest in the World; the rest were Drunkards: Most were Swearers, but not equally: Both...
fors seemed utter strangers to any more of Religion than I have named; and loved not to hear any serious talk of God, or Duty, or Sin, or the Gospel, or Judgment, or the Life to come: But some more hated it than others: The other sort were such as had their Consciences awakened to some regard of God and their Everlasting State; and according to the various measures of their understanding, did speak and live as serious in the Christian Faith, and would much enquire what was Duty, and what was Sin, and how to please God, and to make sure of Salvation; and made this their Business and Interest, as the rest did the world. They read the Scripture, and such Books as The Practice of Piety; and Deut’s Plain Man’s Path Way; and God on the Commandments, &c. They used to pray in their Families, and alone; some on the Book, and some without: They would not Swear, nor Curse, nor take God’s Name lightly: They feared all known Sin: They would go to the next Parish-Church to hear a Sermon when they had none at their own; would read the Scripture on the Lord’s Day, when others were playing; These were, where I lived, about the number of two or three Families in twenty; and these by the rest were called Puritane, and derided as Hypocrites and Precifians, that would take on them to be Holy: And especially if they told any one of his Swearing, Drunkennes, or Ungodliness, they were made the common Scorn. Yet not one of many of them ever scrupled Conformity to Bishops Liturgy or Ceremonies; and it was godly, Conformable Ministers that they went from home to hear: And these Ministers being the ablest Preachers, and of more serious Piety, were also the Objects of the Vulgar Obloquy as Puritane and Precifians themselves; and accordingly spoke against by many of their Tribe, and envied for being preferred by godly men.

This being the Condition of the Vulgar where I was, when I came into the acquaintance of many Persons of Honour and Power, and reputed Learning, I found the same seriousness in Religion in some few before described, and the same daily scorn of that sort of men in others, but differently cloathed: For these would talk more bitterly, but yet with a greater shew of reason against the other, than the ignorant Country People did: And they would sometime talk of some Opinions in Religion, and some of them would use some of the Common-Prayer in
their Houses, and some of them would swear, but seldom, and small Oaths, and lived soberly and civilly; but serious talk of God or Godliness, or that which tended to search and reform the Heart and Life, and seriously prepare for the Life to come, or to awaken Souls to a care of their State and Salvation, they would at least be very weary to hear, it not deride as Puritanical. Mr. Robert Bolton a Conforming, hath fully opened all this of both sorts in his Discourse of True Happiness, and Directions for walking with God: And how the name Puritan was then used.

This being the Fundamental Division where I came, some of these that were called Puritans and Hypocrites, for not being Hypocrites, but serious in the Religion they professed, would sometimes get together, and as Drunkards and Sporters would meet to drink and play, they would (in some very few places, where there were many of them) meet after Sermon on the Lord's Days to Repeat the Conforming Ministers Sermon, and sing a Psalm, and Pray. For this, and for going from their own Parish-Churches, they were first envied by the Readers, and dry Teachers, whom they sometime went from, and next prosecuted by Apparitors, Officials, Archdeacons, Commissaries, Chancellors, and other Episcopal Instruments: For in former times there had been divers Presbyterian Nonconformists, who earnestly pleaded for Parish-Discipline (as Bucer also did in Oper. Anglic.) And to subdue these, divers Canons were made; which served the turn against these Meetings of the Conformable Puritans, and going from their own Parish-Churches; though the Old Presbyterians were dead, and very few succeeded them. About as many Nonconformists as Counties were left; and those few most stuck at Subscription and Ceremonies, which were the hinderance of their Ministry; and but few of them studied or understood the Presbyterian or Independent Disciplinary Causes.

But when these Conformable Puritans were thus prosecuted, it bred in them hard thoughts of the Bishops and their Courts, as Enemies to serious Piety, and Persecutors of that which they should promote: Suffering bred this Opinion, and Aversion. And the ungodly Rabble rejoiced at their troubles, and applauded the Bishops for it, and were everywhere ready to set the Apparitors on them, or to ask them, Are you holier or wiser than the Bishops? And their Accusations were readily entertained
tained: This much inclined them to hearken to them that were averse to Conformity, when such rose up, and to such as were more against the Bishops, than there was cause; so that by this time, the Puritans took the Bishops to be Captains and the Chancellors, Archdeacons, Commisaries, Officials and Puritans, their Officers, and the Enemies of serious Godliness, and the vicious Rabble to be as their Army, to suppress true conscientious Obedience to God, and care of men's Salvation. And the cen-
sured Clergy and Officers took the Censurers to be Schismat-
ticks, and Enemies to the Church, unfit to be endured, and fit to be prosecuted with reproach and punishment; so that the said Puritans took it to be but the common Enemy that since Cain's daies hath been in the world, between the Serpent's and the Woman's Seed: And when the persons of Bishops, Chancellors, Officials, Apparitors, &c. were come under such a repute, it was easy to believe what should be said against their Office. And the more the Bishops thought to cure this by punishment, the more they increased the Opinion, that they were persecut-
ing Enemies of Godliness, and the Captains of the Prophane.

And when such sinful Beginnings had prepared men, the Civil Contentions arising, those called Puritans, mostly were against that side which they saw the Bishops and their Neighbour En-
emies for: And they were for the Parliament the rather, because they seemed desirous to Reform the Bishops, and Restore the Liberty of those whom they prosecuted for the manner of their serving God. Yet they desired, where-ever I was, to have lived peaceably at home: But the Drunkards and Rabble that formerly hated them, when they saw the War beginning, grew enraged, and if a man did but Pray, and Sing a Psalm in his house, they would cry [Downs with the Roundheads] (a word then new made for them,) and put them in fear of sudden violence, and afterwards brought the King's Souldiers to plunder them of their goods, and they were fain to run into holes to hide their per-
sons (Martin Crasius in his Theso-Gracia describeth much the like Case of his Father.) And when their Goods were gone, and their Lives in continual danger, they were forced to fly for Food and Shelter: To go among those that hated them, they durst not, when they could not dwell among such at home. And thus thousands run into the Parliaments Garrisons, and having nothing there to live upon, became Souldiers.
We had an honest very Old Arminian (Mr. Nayler) in Coventry, that was against the Parliaments Cause; and he would say, \([\text{The King hath the best Cause, and the Parliament the best Men.}]\) And that he wondered how it came to pass, that the generality of sober Religious men, should be all in the wrong, and the most Irreligious and Prophane, and Debauched be, in the right.] But he knew but the Vulgar, and not the Grandees, who no doubt were many of them men of very laudable accomplishments.

And as the feud of the Bishops and their Officers and Curates against the aforesaid exercises of Religion occasioned this sad Division, so did the sense of this in the minds of those called Puritans continue too long. Many a time have I seen abundance in great Perplexity, saying \([\text{We believed them that professed that they took not Arms against the King, but to execute the Law on Delinquents and defend themselves and the Kingdom from them: We abhor the Regicides and Usurpers: We would restore the King, if we were stronger than the Army. And yet we are in doubt how far we should actively contribute to our own calamity: For though the King deserve more than we can do, we doubt not but the Bishops will increase our Burdens and make greater havock in the Church than heretofore.}]\) And many late still on this account, and as far as ever I could discern, next the Power of the Army, the fear of the Bishops was the chief delay of the Kings return.

I knew not all England; but according to the Extent of my acquaintance, I have truly told you the quality of those then called Puritans and of their Common adversaries.

And on which side now proportionably are most of the most understanding, sober, charitable, conscionable, and seriously religious Persons, and on which most of the contrary (not speaking of any Magistrates) I think it neither my work, nor our New Historians to tell: For people that live among their neighbours, will believe their senses and experience, what ever either he or I shall say. And I am well assured that this argument (which I think was not found) \([\text{We cannot believe that God will suffer the Generality of the Religious to be deceived in so great a case, and the most of the debauched ignorant haters of serious Godliness to be in the right,} \) did prevail with very many that could not try the Cause by the Laws and constitution of the Kingdom.

§ 2. If I should recite the particular unjust reports of multitudes
titudes of these Writers it would be tiresome and loathsome: Yea all the mistakes of this Eminent Historian are too many to be named: But I will here name one which seems at once to finite and smile.

Pag. 227. ["There is a temper which Mr. B. is acquainted with that, is not to be prevailed on, either by threats or promises from the Magistrate; and seems to hate nothing so much as compli-
cence with Superiors: There are some that scorn to preach by the Licence of the Government, and place the Kingdom of Christ purely in opposition to Law and Magistrates."]

Answ. Note the credibility of this Historian. 1. Doth their accusation of my flattering the Usurpers (whom I more openly disowned than most of his Fraternity) agree with this?

2. Did my long and earnest Petitioning to be accepted but in a poor Curates place, though I Preach for nothing, yea if it were but in some ignorant obscure Village, and only to preach over the Catechism, agree with this?

3. Doth my large profession of Subjection in my Second Plea for Peace not yet blamed by them herein agree with this?

4. I willingly took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and an Oath to be true to the King as his Chaplin in ordinary, and had this any such signification?

5. Did my begging in vain a Licence from Bishop Morley, and craving and obtaining one of Bishop Sheldon, signify this?

6. But the smile is that one would think by these words, I might have preached by the Governours Licence and would not. And is that true? Did I not preach by the Kings Licence, and the Clergy blame me for it? And as for the Bishops Licence I do profess that it's yet in force, and I do preach by it. If I mistake it is not my refusing it. If he intimate as he seems, that by the Bishops Licence I might have had leave to preach in the Parish Churches, it's now too late: But I would I had known how to get it. I confess one Summer in the Countrey about 25 miles off, I did venture upon the Credit of my Licence (at Amersham, Chesham, Rickmersworth; &c.) But it was too pleasing work to me to be continued: One Church in Southwark I was once let into, but no more in or near London. I once craved leave of the moderate Bishop that now is, that without putting down the meeting where I was in that great Parish of St. Martin's, I might preach sometime there and once a day at the Chappel which
which I built, which the Parish Incumbent useth, and that he would quiet the Justices to that end, and thought I had had his consent: But the Constables and other Officers stood from that day about a quarter of a year together every Lord's Day at the door of the former place of Assembly, to have apprehended me by the Justices warrant if I had gone. And never could I hear of a man in London that was willing I should come into his Pulpit; but the best have refused it. Nor did I much desire it here: For it is not to preach to them that have no need that is my request; but to such as cannot come into the Parish Church or otherwise truly need our help. Once I did try to have got leave two miles out of the City to have preach'd a Kinwomans Funerall Sermon on the right of my License: But the Minister said, He must first ask the Bishop, and then denied me.

Reader, these are the Historians that Charge me with misreport of ancient History, visible in the most partial Authors on the other side: Judge of them by their Report of the History of our Place and Age.

CHAPEL XV.

Mr. M's. way of getting belief, by a Magisterial condemning the most credible Historians, and authorizing whom he please.

§ 1. If we had not Eusebius, Socrates and Sozomen, how naked should we be left, and much unacquainted with the case of the Church from the Apostles; (Besides Theodoret's History) till 440. And what a shake is given to the Credit of all these by Mr. M. and others of greater name?

Though Eusebius himself be by Petavius and many other Papists accounted an Arian, yea and seemingly proved such, and by Bellarmine de Script. Eccles. its said that Athanasius so calls him, and Jerom calls him the Arian Signifer and Prince, and the 7th General Council so judgeth him, yet Socrates vindicateth him, and thinks he is wronged: And indeed though his own Epistle written to his Flock be not justifiable, incautelous and unjustifiable words were too Common before his daies (as Petavius hath too fully proved) with those that we must not yet call Arians. But while Bellarmine and Mr. M. charge Socrates and Sozomen
Sozomen as Novatians that is Hereticks themselves, they deprive Eusebius of much of their defence, and render his History the more suspicious.

§ 2. And though I know Mr. M hath more partners herein, I never saw yet any credible proof that either of them were Novatians: Good Christians are not ashamed nor afraid to make profession of their Religion. And they are so far from professing it, that they oft speak of the Novatians in disowning words. But they praised them for the good that is in them! And would not any impartial Historian do the like? Must a man rail at any party, or hide their Virtues or else be taken to be one of them? I confess that such as Mr. M do fully acquit themselves from the suspicion of being Presbyterians or Nonconformists. But so did not A. Bishop Grindall, Bishop Jewel, A. Bishop Abbot A. Bishop Usher, and many more such. Sure Candor and Impartiality is Laudable in Historians; And Thuanus is most honoured for that. And notwithstanding Mr. M's assertions of the contrary, I profess myself a lover & honourer of the worth of many of the aspiring Bishops that corrupted the Church, and of many Popes, and of many that continue Church corruptions in the height, even many of the Papists Cardinals, Schoolmen and Jesuites. Who will not love and praise the excellent Learning of such as Suarez, Vasquez, Victoria, Petavius and abundance such? Who will not praise the piety of such as Gerson, Borromaeus, Sales, and many others, though we nevertheless disown their Popery? For my part I highly value the Clearenness, of multitudes of the Schoolmen, and that they have not in whole loads of their volumes so much malicious railing as the Jesuits and many of our late Conformists have in a few sheets. Doth it follow that I am a Papist because I praise them, or that Socrates or Sozomen were Novatians because they speak well of their faith and piety.

There are abundance of Malignants, that acknowledge the Good Lives of those they call Puritans (and if he had not had the late Wars between King and Parliament to fill all Mouths and Books against them, the Devil by this time might have been at a loss with what Accusations to reproach them. For he was put to use the Voices (no names) of [Roundheads, Whigs, &c. when their Revilers were called Drunkards, Sweaters, Dam-me's, &c.] But they that confess the Good, reproach them as Hypocrites that do but counterfeit it. Doth this acknowledgment
knowledgment prove them Puritanes. I suppose Mr. M. knoweth that no small number of Historians and Fathers confess the strictness of the Novatians Lives, and yet were no Novatians. And Constantine's words to Cæsarius imply that he thought him singularly strict. And Mr. M. faith Pref. [The Novatians, faith the Author, did not suffer much by this Edict, being befriended by the Emperor, who had an esteem for their Bishop of C. P. upon the account of his Holiness.] And may not an Orthodox man confess the Pity of others?

§ 3. But Mr. M. is so Magisterial as to say, Pag. 322. The story of Theophilus, and the Monks of Nitria, no reasonable man can believe, as it is related by Socrates and Sozomen, without loving a malicious Lie.] So that Socrates and Sozomen either believed not themselves, or else Loved a malicious Lie.

And Page 319 he faith, [The story of Theophilus his charging Isidore with double Letters, that whoever was Conquerour, he might apply himself to him in his name, is of the same piece with the rest of Socrates his story concerning that Bishop; and in all probability an invention of one of the Monks of Nitria.]

It seems this Historian believeth Old Historians, as the matters seem probable or improbable to himself. And so we may take him for the Universal Expositor of History: It is not the Old Historians that we must believe, but his Conjectures. And thus he deals with divers others.

§ 4. For my part I profess, that before I had any Engagement in these Controversies, since I first read them, I took Socrates and Sozomen to be two of the most credible Historians that the Church had till their Times, and of many an Age after them. I said of them, as I use to do of Thanaus, A man may trace the footsteps of Knowledge, and impartial honesty, and so of Veracity in their very Style. And there are few of the judicious Censurers of Historians, but do tell us of far more uncertainties in Eusebius, and after in Nicephorus, and most that followed, (as far as I am acquainted with such Censurers) than in these two. And if their History be shaken, our loss will not be small. And I doubt not but the Anathematizing and Condemning Spirit hath done hurt, which hath made Eusebius an undoubted Arian, and Theodoret, first a Nestorian, and after at the fifth General Council condemned some of his Writings, and imposed it on the whole Christian World to condemn them, though many never heard of them
them, and that made Ruffinus (and Chrysostom) Originists, and Origen a Heretick, condemned also by a General Council; and Socrates, and Sozomen, Novatians, Epiphanius an ignorant credulous Fabler, Sulpitius Severus, and Beda, two pious credulous Reporters of many feigned Miracles, and one a Millenary, Nicephorus a Fabler, Anastasius Bibl.full of Fallhoods, Philoferius an ignorant Erroneous Hereticator, Cassianus a Semi-Pelagian, Cassiodori Chronic, est farrago temulentiae inquit Opurhrius Pan. Pen. nunquam cum Eusebio convenit inquit Vossius, &c. I say, Though it be no wrong to the Church to take them for fallible, and such as have mistakes (which the English Articles say even of General Councils) yet, it wrongfully shaketh all our belief of Church History to call their Credit in matters of fact into question for their Errors or opinions fake, without good Evidence that either they were ignorant, mis-informed or wilfully lied. But if the Novatians were more strict & precise than others, it’s rather, like that they were more and not less credible than others, and made more or not less conscience of a lye. Certainly that which the rest named are charged with is somewhat more as to Historical Credit than to be Novatians: So that if these men had been Novatians, I should yet say by the Complection of their History: that They are two of our most useful and credible Church Historians.

§ 5. But when it serveth his turn he can gather out of Sozomen that even in Constantine’s time, Constantinople was [Altogether a Christian City] because he mentioneth the great Enlargement of it; and great encrease of Christianity: When as no man that lived could be a fitter judge of the number of Christians in his time than Chrysostom: And he that considered that there and every where Constantine left all the Jews and Heathens uncompeled to be Christians, yea and used them commonly in places of dignity and Government in City, Provinces and Armies, and that they continued in such power under many Emperours after him, will hardly believe that in Constantine’s time C. P. had half or a quarter so many Christians as were in the time of Arcadius and Chrysostom; And yet then Chrysostom conjectureth the Christians to be an hundred thousand, and all the City poor half as many, but the Jews and Heathens not to be numbred. See him one Act 4. Hom. 11. When he is making the most of their estate and numbers, faith he [I pray you tell me]: How great a number of all sorts of men hath our City? How many Christians
will you that there be (That is will you grant, or do you think there
be?) Will you that there be New presbyters, an hundred thousand? But
how great is the Number of Jews and Ethnicks? How many pounds
of Gold have been gathered? (or Myriads?) And how great is the
Number of the Poor? (that is, of the whole City?) I do not think
they are above fifty thousand (Commelin. hath put an hundred
thousand, as Erasmus Translation, I suppose by the Errour of
the Press.) Now if there was in Chrysostom's daies but an hun-
dred thousand (which many say is not near so many as there be
in two Parishes here, Martins and Stepney) it is not like that in
Constantine's Time they were half so many at most. And yet I
am far from thinking that there was then no more than usually
met in an Assembly, or could so meet.

§ 6. The Jesuites, Valefius and Sirmondus, I am no fit per-
son to censure. But I am not satisfied why their Credit should
go as far with me as it doth with him: I have before spoke of
Valefius's Recording Grotius as one that designed to bring many
with him into the Roman Church. And Grotius himself said,
That many of the English Bishops were of his mind, as Bishop
Bromhall, and many Doctours by defending him seem to be: And
yet when I wrote my Christian Concord, and The Grotian Religion,
how many cenfured me as a Slanderer, for saying less than Va-
lesius doth. Yet I am false with this Historian, and Valefius is a
credible Jesuite.

And he vouchsafeth to tell us the Judgment of Valefius, that
Eusebius Nicomed, was no Arian, pag. 332. where he saith [Eu-
sebius of Nicomedia was no Heretick in the Judgment of Valefius:
But if he were, he was not an Heretick, because he did not begin
the Arch-Heresie, but followed Arius.]

What the meaning is of the latter words I know not [If he
were (an Heretick) he was not an Heretick] I conjecture it is one
of the almost Infinite Errata's of the Printer: (But he supposeth
my Printer's to be mine own:) But that Eusebius Nicomed.
should be no Heretick, whom all the stream of credible Histo-
rions make to be that Arch-Heretick (I say not the first) who
corrupted Constantine his Court and Son, which introduced the
prevalency of Arianism in the almost Ruine of the Orthodox
Church, is a thing which he that believeth Valefius in, must pre-
fer the Credit of one Jesuite that lived above a thousand years
after, before the whole current of the best Historians of the
same,
fame, and many following Ages. And did I ever so discredite the whole stream of Church-Historians, as on the word of one Jesuite, to bring them under the suspicion of such a Lie? But I confess I am more inclined to believe a Jesuite, and a Prelatist, when they excuse any man of Heresie, than when they accuse him.

§ 7. In the Preface he tells us that["Had I consulted Sirmond's Edition of the French Councils I must have wanted several Allegations for the Congregational way, which are nothing else but corrupt readings of the ancient Canons of the Gallican Church, Nor can we suspect Sirmond as too great a favourer of Diocesan Bishops, since it is well known how he is charged by the Abbot of S. Cyran under the name of Petrus Aurelius, for having falsified a Canon in the Council of Orange to the prejudice of the Episcopal Order] Jesuites care as little for Bishops as our Protestant Dissenters can do. Answ. I doubt not but Sirmond was a very Learned man, and had not the Conformists divested me of all Church-maintenance. I had been like to have bought his French Councils. In the mean time, that notice which others before him gave of the Acts and Canons of Councils, sufficed to my furniture, fully to prove the Cause I maintained: But I confess his pretended reason no whit induceth me to give more credit to a Jesuite than to another man. Though Albaspinus was a Bishop, there is so much Judgement and Honesty appears in his Observations, that I would sooner believe him about Episcopacy, than a Jesuite that you say is against it.

But it's as incredible to me, as the rest of his spurious History, that the Jesuites care as little for Bishops as our Protestant Dissenters can do. Sure many of those called Presbyterians and Independents, would have none at all. If this be true, then 1. The Jesuites would have no Bishops of Rome, though they be his sworn Servants. 2. Then they would have no Bishops to be subject to the Pope. 3. Then they would have all particular Churches to be without Bishops, or to be unchurcht. 4. Then they would have Ordination without Bishops. 5. Then they think not that an uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Ordination is necessary to Church or Ministry. 6. Then they think that Bishops should not confirm. 7. Then they are against the Councils of Bishops, General or Provincial. 8. And against Diocesans Government of the Parish Priests. And yet is a Jesuite a Papist?

Wonderful!
Wonderful! that they will venture their Lives in endeavours for the Church of Rome, and that they write so much of and for Bishops Councils, and yet are quite against them.

But if really this be so, you that take me for incredible, who am against but the Corruption of Episcopacy, do allow me to take Sirmondus and Valesius, and the rest of the Jesuites for incredible, who are as much against the very Office as our Dissenters can be? But what will not some Historians confidently say?

CHAP. XVI.

Mr. M's Observations on my Notes of credible and incredible History, Examined.

§ 1. Because I suppose that common sound Senses are to be trusted: He 1. Infers that I was asleep, & thought that I saw all that I relate; that is, He that faith he must believe sense, implies that he seeth all that he reporteth: I am one of the unlearned, and this Logick is too hard for me: Let it be his own.

2. He concludes, That we must not believe our senses, if they were not Presbyterians but Episcopal that began the late War (in England:) As if he had seen not only the Parliament (Lords and Commons) then, and the Army then (forty years ago almost) but had seen their Religion, or heard or read them then so profess it: Whereas I cannot learn yet whether he was then born, or of capable understanding, and hath neither sense nor reason for what he faith. The Case that we are in is very sad, when both sides say they have the Evidence of Sense it self against each other; what hope then of Reconciliation? They that are yet living, that were Lords, Commons, and Commanders, say their internal Sense and Self-knowledge told them that they were no Presbyterians, but Episcopal; and their daily converse told them, that their Companions were mostly of the same Religion and Mind. But Young Men that never conversed with them, know them all better, and that infallibly by sense it self.

§ 2.
§ 2. II. Because I say, the History of the Gospel is certainly credible; it is ground enough to say, That All is not Gospel that I write; as if I had said it is.

§ 3. III. Because I say, Prophets were sure of their Revelation, he faith. It may be Mr. B. heard a Man scriptse; As if I had pretended to be a Prophet.

§ 4. IV. I said that History is certain even by Natural Evidence, when it is the common Agreement of all men of most contrary Interests, &c. in a matter of fact and sense to all that knew it. To which he saith, [The Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is acknowledged by Catholicks, and Schismatics and Hereticks], men of very contrary minds, dispositions and interests; and yet this Church-History would have us believe the contrary.

Answ. This is our credible Historian.

1. He doth not tell us in what Ages it was so acknowledged; when those who doubt of the matter of fact, doubt but some of 100, some of 150, or 200 years: Doth any doubt whether it be so now?

2. He tells us not either, what Species of Bishops the question is of, nor what Species of Presbyters, nor what the Superiority was.

3. He speaks without distinction or Exception, and so must be understood to say, that this Church History would have us to believe that even President Bishops Ejusdem Ordinis had de facto no Superiority at all over Presbyters in the same Churches and of the same order with them, which is an untruth so gross as is no Credit to our Historian. I have named both more than one ranck of Bishops whose Superiority de jure I deny not: & Popes, Patriarchs, Primates, Diocefans who deposed the Bishops of single Churches, whose Superiority de facto I fully enough affirm, in the ages and degrees in which they did ascend.

If he say that he meant it [Even from the Apostles time, and that of such Diocefans as have scores or hundreds of true Churches and Altars without their particular Bishops, or any Presbyters that were Ejusdem Ordinis with the Bishops, and were Episcopi Gregis, and that had such Power of the Keys over their flocks, as ours have not: or that had so many such Assemblies that were no true Churches;] if he will be proved a Historian worthy Credit, Let him give us any proof that all men described by him agreed de facto that there was so long, such a superiority of such Bishops. But these men
men deride distinguishing, and banish Logick, that is Reason, from their History.

§ 5. V. The next Evidence of certainty which I mentioned, was from [continued Existent visible Effects which prove their Causes.] And here this undistinguishing Historian is at it again. The Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is proved by the Laws and Customs of all Churches. This hath the same answer, which I will not repeat. Either it falsly reporteth my denial, or it falsly affirmeth that all Churches in all ages have left us visible Effects of the foresaid Species. And I would he would help us that are ignorant therein with such History and Evidence from the beginning of the Churches in Scotland, and in the Southern and Eastern Countries that were without the Empire.

§ 6. VI. I said, that History is credible which speaketh contently against the known interest of the authors; and therefore I named few testimonies of the sins of Popes and Councils but of those that are their most Zealous Friends. To this he saith that my Characters of ancient Bishops are taken from their profession Enemies, [as my account of Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril, and divers others.]

Ans.: 1. My account of Athanasius is almost all, if not all, in his praise; and is not an enemies testimony there valid. If I mention the displeasure of Constantine against him it is not any Character of him, but of Constantine the Agent: Nor do I think Constantine, or Eusebius Caesar; meet to be nimbred with his Enemies; why did he not instance in some words of mine?

As to Theophilus and Cyril, I do not believe that he can prove that Socrates and Sozomen, and the Historians that Concur with them, were their Enemies. And if in reciting the Acts of the Councils I recite their Enemies words, so doth Surius, Nicholaus, Binnius, Baronius and all just writers of those acts. And I do not find that Chrysostom himself, or Isidore Pelusiota had any Enmity to them, nor Pope Innocent neither. Of the rest before.

§ 7. VII. The next degree of credibility that I mentioned is that which dependeth on the Veracity and fitness of the reporter. Of which I named nine things requisite.

Here he supposeth me one that is unfit; and particularly faith [Whether any hath raied with greater intemperance, and less provocation.] Ans.: I, I am not the Author of the History of the mentioned Councils or, Popes or Bishops, but the Transcriber. Let me
me be as bad as you, or any of your tribe have made me, that proveth not that Socrates, Sozomen, Theodorite, Nicephorus, &c. or Binnius, Baronius, &c. have misreported what they write. If I have misreported these authors in any material point, prove it and I will soon retract it.

As for my railing, I expect that title from all such whose faults I name, and call them to repentance: He that calls men to Repent, calleth them sinners, and that is Railing be it never so great.

His first instanced railing is Pag. 19. [A few turbulent Prelates Persecute good men.] He faith thus I call the present Bishops of the Church of England; Doth he mean All or some? If All he is an untrue Historian: He may see many named before my Apology whom I except: And if I have named two I have annexed the proof.

The next is Pag. 46. [silencing destroying Prelates] Anf. Are there none such? Were not about 2000 here silenced? Do we not continue so and impoverished almost 20 years? Have none perished in prisons or with want? Do men call out for the execution of the Law, and plead for our Silencing as a good work, and take it for railing to have it named? Doth not Conscience recoil in these men when in Pulpits, preists and Conference they maintain it to be a good work, and tell the world how sinful a thing it is for rulers to suffer us out of Gaols? What, are you now ashamed of your meritorious works? Sure they are scant good if it be railing to name them. You will not say I rail, if I call you Preachers. And why do you say so, if I call you Silencers, if that be as good?

The next railing is Pag. 73 [If all the proud, Contentious, ambitious, hereticating part of the Bishops, had been of this Christian mind (to endure each other in small tolerable Differences) What sins, Scandal and shame, what Crimes, confusion and miseries had the Christian world escaped?] And is this railing? Hath the Christian world had no such Bishops these 1000 years? Have not whole Kingdoms been forbidden all Gods Publick worship by such, even France and England among the rest? Is it railing to tell for what little things they not only Silenced men, but burned and murdered many thousands? Were they not proud ambitious Prelates that deposed and abused Lud. Pius, and those that in Council decreed the digging all the dead Bishops out of their graves to be burnt as Hereticks, who were for the Em-
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11. The 46th doubted of the diversity of Heavens.
12. The 47th being ignorant that there is another Common Earth invisible, which is the Matrix of all things, do think that there is no Earth but this one.
13. The 48th thought that water was the common matter, and was always, and not made with the Earth.
14. The 49th Heresiæ denied that the soul was made before the body, and the body after joined to it: and believed that Gods making them Male and Female first was to be understood of the bodily Sexes: Whereas (faith he) it was the Soul that was made Male and Female, And the Soul was made the Sixth day and the body the 7th.
15. The 50th Heresiæ thought that not only Grace, but also the Soul itself, was by God breathed into man.
16. The 51st is Origens (that thought our Souls were first celestial Intelliges, before incorpore (as Mr. Glanvile and many now.)
17. The 52d thought that brutes had some reason (as Mr. Chambre.)
18. The 54th thought that Earthquakes have a natural Cause.
19. The 55th Heresiæ learned of Trismegistus to call the Stars by the names of Living Creatures (as all Astronomers do.)
20. The 56th thought that there were not many languages before the confusion of Babel.
21. The 57th Heresiæ thought that the name of a [Tongue] proceeded first of the Jews or of the Pagans.
22. The 58th Heresiæ doubted of the years and time of Christ.
23. The 59th thought (as many Fathers) that Angels begat Giants of women before the flood.
24. The 61st was that Christians were after Jews and Pagans.
25. The 62d Heresiæ faith that Pagans are born naturally, but not Christians, that is, that the Soul and body of men are not daily Created by Christ, but by Nature.
26. The 63d faith that the number of years from the Creation was uncertain and unknown.
27. The 64th thought that the names of the days of the week (Sunday, Monday, &c.) were made by God first and not by Pagans, and were named from the Planets.
28. The 66th was that Adam and Eve were blind till God opened their Eyes to see their nakedness.
29. The 67th Heresiæ imputeth the Sins of Parents to their Children.
30. The 68 Heresie was of some troubled about the Book called Deuteronomy.

31. The 69 thought that those sanctified in the Womb were yet conceived in sin.

32. The 70th Heresie thought that the World had been first divided by the Greeks, Egyptians, and Persians.

33. The 71 thought there was a former Flood under Deucalion and Pyrrha.

34. The 72 faith that men are according to (or under) the 12 signs of the Zodiac, not knowing that those 12 signs are divers climates, and habitable Regions of the Earth.

35. The 74 Heresie is that Christ descended into Hell to offer Repentance there to sinners.

36. The 75 doubted of the nature of the Soul, thinking it was made of Fire, &c. (as many Greek Fathers did.)

37. The 77 is of Gods hardening Pharaoh, &c. where he describeth the Dominicans.

38. The 79 is that the Psalms were not (all) made by David: and it denieth the equality of the Psalms, as if they were not all written and placed in the order that the things were done.

39. The 80 Heresie thought: that Gods words to Cain [Thou shalt rule over him] were properly to be understood, whereas the meaning was [Thou shalt rule over thy own evil Thoughts that are in thy own free Will.]

40. The 81 Heresie did not well understand the reason of Gods Words to Cain, giving him Life.

41. The 82 Heresie thought that the Stars had their fixed place in Heaven, and their course, not understanding that the Stars are every night brought out of some secret place, and set up for use, and at morning return to their secret place again, Angels being Presidents and Disposefrs of them,) (that is, as servants bring Candles into the room at night and take them out again.)

42. The 83 doubted (as some Episcopal Commentators) of the Book of Canticles, lest it had a carnal Sense.

43. The 85 Heresie thought, that the Soul of man was naturally Gods Image before Grace.

44. The 87 Heresie thought, that really four living Creatures mentioned in the Prophets praised God.

45. The 88 Heresie thought that the Levitical Feasts were literally to be understood, not knowing that it was the 8 Feasts of the Church that were meant.

46. The
46. The 90 Heresie preferred Aquila's Translation before the Septuagint.

47. The 91 preferred a Translation of thirty men before the Septuagint.

48. The 92 preferred another Translation of six men before it.

49. Another Heresie preferred the Translation of Theodotion and Symmachus before it.

50. The 94 Heresie preferred the Scriptures found in a Vessel after the Captivity before it.

51. The 96 thought that Melchizedeck had no Father or Mother, not knowing that it's spoken of him as learning that which his Father and Mother never taught him.

52. The 97 hold that the Prophet Zachariah of Easts, is to be properly understood; when as it is but for the four Easts of the Church, viz. for Christmas, Easter, Epiphany, and Pentecost.

53. The 98 Heresie holdeth, that Solomon's great number of Wives and Concubines, is literally to be understood; whereas it is meant but of diversity of Gifts in the Church.

54. The 100 Heresie thought that the Measuring Cord in Zachary, was to be understood of measuring Jerusalem literally whereas it meant the choice of Believers.

55. The 101 Heresie not understanding the Mystical Sense of the Cherubim and Seraphim, in Isaiah, are troubled about it, and in doubt (And here he Mystically tells you the Mystical Sense.)

56. The last Heresie thought that one of the Cherubims came to Isaiah, and with a Coal touched his Lips, and that it was an Angel or Animal with Fire; whereas it is the Two Testaments, and the Fire of God's Grace.

To these you may add if you please the Heresie of holding Antipodes, determined by Pope Zachary, by the Mediation of the holy Bishop Boniface, I think an English man. And of what peril it is for Christians to eat Fays, and Rooks, and Badgers, and Hares, and Wood horses: And Lard must not be eaten before it is dried in the Smoak, or boiled on the Fire: Or if it be eaten unboiled, it must not be till after Easter: And there must be three great Lamps set in a secret place of the Church, after the similitude of the Tabernacle, which must be kept burning; and at Baptism others lighted by them.

Reader, remember 1. That Philaemius as well as Epiphanius, was a Bishop; 2. Yea and a Saint; whereas very few Bishops of
of all the Councils had the honour to be Sainted.

Therefore if you say that all these were not Anathematized by Councils; I answer, 1. All these are Regarded as Hereticks. 2. And they held (as Mr. Dodwell and his Company here do) that he that communicateth with Hereticks, is to be judged a Heretick. 3. And that Hereticks are no parts of the Church.

And forget not above all the Henrician Heresie, which determineth not only our King, but many Papist Princes to be Hereticks, for claiming Investitures.

And now Reader, I unsignificantly hate uncharitableness, and therefore deny no good that was in such Bishops: But I must no more be indifferent between Good and Evil, than between Heaven and Hell; nor may I judge Christ a Railer, for saying to his prime Apostle, [Get thee behind me Satan; thou art an offence unto me, &c.] If the name of Hereticators that is, too rash pronouncing men Hereticks be railing, I will give thee no Character, censure or name of the aforesaid practice, for I can devise no name which may not be called Railing. But judge of it and call it what you see cause.

And again, if you say, These are not the Decrees of Councils, I answer, These are but Flea-bittings to the wounds that the Church hath received from Councils, by Anathematizing.

The next Instance of Railing in these words, which he half repeated [Either credible Socrates and others were gross Lyars, or this Patriarch and St. was a downright Knave.] Ans. He himself is so far from denying this, that he makes Socrates and Socrates not only Lyars, but Lovers of a Lie; for what they say of St. Theophilus: And who is it then that is the Railer? Read the Story.

The next Instance is, p. 95. that I call Bishops the Firebrands of the World.] Ans. The words are these [I take them to be the Firebrands of the World, and unworthy the regard of sober men, who pretend to know men's judgments better than themselves, and allow not men's own deliberate professions to be the notice of their Faith.] If they will say, that you are Hereticks in heart, though your Tongue and Life profess sound Doctrine, what means hath any man to clear himself against such, and keep from their Inquisition Racks or Flames? Is this Railing?

The next Instance is the Word [Self-conceited Bishops] P. 98. Having mentioned the many Logical Niceties necessary to decide
cide the Question between the Nestorians, Eutychians, and the Orthodox, I said [Is it not pity that such Questions should be raised about the Person of Christ, by self-conceited Bishops, and made necessary to Salvation, and the World set on fire and divided by them?] Reader, remember the Division made by it continueth to this day, to the Separation and Condemnation of a great part of the Christian World! And is the name [self-conceited] in describing the cause of this a railing? How much worse railers are they that will call a Drunkard a Drunkard, or a Fornicator a Fornicator? Read the fadder words of Ludolphus.

The next railing is [mercifless, furious Bishops, pag. 196.] Ans. There is no such word: When I find where it is I shall see the occasion of it. Italy, Piedmont, Ireland, &c. have tried that there have been such.

The last is pag. 183. [The Confounders of Churches.] Ans. I thought I had merited of them by my impartiality and lenity: As after I commend the Wisdom & peaceableness of Pope Honorius, (though a General Council even for that made him an Heretick,) so I here justly commend the Wisdom and Peaceableness of Pope Vigilius, who advised the Council to leave aed men to God (Theod. Mops. Theodore and Ibis] and not damn them when God hath judged them already, and yet not to admit any of their wrong opinions.] I say [This was the right way: If they had all dealt as wisely and Christianlike, Councils had not been the Confounders of the Churches:] Is this railing? At last they forced Pope Vigilius to subscribe to them, and it so confounded the Churches, that a great part of Italy itself forsook the Church of Rome for it, and set up another head against the Pope an 100 Years. Was not this confusion? And must it not be known?

Reader, as far as I understand them, the Paraphrase of these mens words, is [If we kindle a fire in the Church, name it not, much less call any to quench it: or else we shall say it's you that kindle it: say not you are excommunicate or silenced when you are, though it be by Thousands: else we will prove that you are railers: If we lay you in Gaols and take all you have, do not say, you hurt us, much less you wrong us: take not on you to know or feel when you are hurt: else we will have an Action of railing against you.

§ 8. That which followeth I answered before: But after he finds a notable piece of my ignorance. The Pope inviting the
King of Denmark to conquer a Province of Hereticks, I know not who they were unless they were the Waldenses: Well guest, faith Mr. M. WALDO was in 1160, 80 Years after. Ans. This will serve for men willing to be deceived. It was the Persons and Religion, and not the name that I spoke of. Doro not he know that Rainerius himself, faith, that those Persons (called Albigenenses, Waldenses, and other such names) professed that their way of Religion was Apostolical, and they derived it down from Silvester, that is Constantines time? If I did not guess well I wrong no Bishops by it: and I confessed my Ignorance that I knew not whom the Pope meant: And why did not this callent Historian tell us who they were?

§ 9. Next he hath met with my Ignorance for saying Vienna near France] which is in the Borders of France. A f. 1. Is that any flander of Bishops or Councils? 2 Truly I had many a time read in Councils, that Vienna was in France, and had not forget it, if Ferrarius and Chenu had not also told it me; And whether it was the fault of the Printer, or of my Hand, or my Memory, that put near for in, I leave it freely to his Judgment, for I remember it not.

And if the manner of Binus naming it made me call Ordo Prophetarum in Gelias a Book, it's no wrong to Episcopacy.

---

CHAP. XVII.

His Censure of my Design, and Church-Principles, considered.

§ 1. AS to this his first Chapter I have before shewed how falsly he reporteth my design. He faith he never saw any thing which more reflecteth on Religion: Lucian and Julian have left nothing half so scandalous in all their Libels against Christians, as this Church-History has raked up: Here is nothing to be seen in his Book but the Avarice, Ignorance, Mistakes and furious Contentions of the Governours of the Church.

Ans. How false that is the Reader may see in all the beginning, the two Chapters in the end, and much in the midst, which are written contrarily to obviate such false thoughts. 2. Is the ascendent sort of Prelates that were growing up to maturity till Gregory
Gregory the Seventh's daies, the whole Church of God? Are there no other Christians? Is all that is written against the Pope and such Ascendents, written against Christianity? Did Christ speak against Christianity, when he reproved them for striving who should be greatest? or Peter, when he counselled them, as 1 Pet. 5. And Paul when he said, I have no man-like minded; for they all seek their own things, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's? Or when he said, Demas hath forsaken me; &c? Or John, when he said, Diotrephes loved to have the preheminence? Or all those Councils of Bishops which condemned each other, far deeplier than I judge any of them?

What have I said of Fact or Canons, which Binnius and their other Flatterers say not? Was it not there extant to the sight of all?

And that I Recorded not all their Virtues, 1. The History of Councils faith little of them. 2. Must no man shew the hurt of Drunkenness, Gluttony, &c. and so of Ambition and Church-corruption, unless he will write so Voluminous a History, as to contain also all the good done by all the persons whom he blameth? I have oft said, that I wondered that instead of so greedy gathering up all the scraps of Councils, the Papists did not burn them all, as they have done many better Books which made against them.

§ 2. I was about to answer all his first Chapter, but I find it so useless a work, that I shall ease my self and the Reader of that labour. 1. He takes on him to answer a Piece of a Disputation written about 23 years ago, whereas I have lately written a Treatise of Episcopacy, with fuller proof of the same things, which he nameth, and takes on him to answer some part of it, and answers not: Till he, or some other, shew me the mistakes of that, let them talk on for me in their little Vellitations.

2. Most that is considerable which he faith, is answered already in that Book: As his fiction that Unum Altare in Ignatius, signifieth not an ordinary Communion Table, &c. And much more out of Ignatius, and many more is added, which he faith nothing to.

3. I have before shewed that he goeth on false Suppositions, that I am only for a Bishop of a single Congregation, or against all, and many such; when yet he himself confesseth the contrary,
contrary, yea derideth me for making Twelve forts of Bishops, and being for such as no Party is like to be pleased with.

4. The contradictions and mistakes are so many as would tire the Reader to peruse an answer to them.

And when he hath all done with the numbering of Churches, (over-passing the full proof of the Primitive Form of them which I gave as before) he confesseth that even his great esteemed Jesuite Valesius, [believes that the City Church was but One even in Alexandria, and in Dionysius's time, p. 64.

And while p. 65. he makes Petavius and Valesius so much to differ, as to gather their contrary Opinions from the fame words, and consequently one of them at least understood them not, I that profess my self not comparable to either of them, specially Petavius, in such things, am taken for a falsifier, if I misunderstand a word that concerneth not the matter of the History.

This therefore being not about Church-History so much as against my Opinion of the Antient Government, when he hath answered the foresaid Treatise of Episcopacy, if I live not, some one may reply, if he deal no better than in this.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of his Second Chapter.

§ 1. Pag. 78. He would have men believe that it is Discipline against real Heresie, that I find so much fault with, and ascribe all mischief to--

Answ. Utterly contrary to my most open Profession: It is only making those things to seem Heresie that are none (either Truth, or meer difference of words, or small mistakes,) or curing Heresies by rash Anathema's, without necessary precedent means of Conviction, or by Banishment or Blood.

§ 2. Is this it that you defend the Church for, and we oppose it for? When we would have none in our Churches whom we know not, and that have not personally, if at Age, profess understandingly their Faith. And what is the Discipline that you exercise on Hereticks? It's enough that you know them not,
not, and so never trouble them. Your Talk and Pamphlets truly complain what swarms of Hobbits, Sadduces, Infidels, Atheists, are among us: Do they not all live in the Parishes and Dioceses? Doth the Bishop know them? Are any of them Excommunicated? I could never learn yet how to know who are Members of your Churches: Is it all that dwell in the Parishes? Then all these aforesaid, with Jews and Papists, are in it: And then why are ten parts of some Parishes suffered without Discipline to shun the Parish Church-Communion? Is it all that hear you? Then 1. Ten parts in some Parishes, and two or three, or half in others are not of your Church, and hear you not, and many Nonconformists hear you. 2. And any Infidel may hear. Bare hearing was never made a sufficient note of a Church-Member. 3. And how can you tell who all be that hear you in an uncertain crowd? 4. And why doth not your Discipline meddle with constant Non-Communicants?

3. Is it only all that Communicate with you? 1. These are yet fewer, and so the far greatest part of many or most Parishes here are let alone to be no Church members at all, when they have been long Baptized, and no confute by discipline past on them. 2. How know you your stated Communicants, when any stranger may come unquestioned: The truth is, it is Parish discipline which you will not endure. No wonder if you named it Issachar's burden. Bucer in script. Anglic. and all the Nonconformists after him long strove for it in vain. It is the hated thing. Were it possible to prevail with you for this, we should have little disagreement about Church Government. But the Popes that have been the greatest enemies of it, have yet gloried in a Discipline to set up their power over Princes and Peoples, and to have their own wills, and tread down all that are against them.

§ 2. To extenuate Anathematizing (so very Common with Councils) he tells us P. 81. that ["Let him be Anathema im- "ports no more than that we declare our abhorrence of such doctrines, "and will have nothing Common with those that profess them."]

Ans. 1. We may declare our abhorrence of every known sin and Error, in such as must not be anathematized. 2. By (nothing) I suppose you mean not [not the same King, Countrey, Earth, Air, &c.] but [not the same Church, the same Christian Communion, familiarity, love, &c.] Whether you mean [not the
I know not you think the Anathematizing Bishops so unreasonable, as to renounce all Christian Communion with men and not tell why? Or to give no better Reason than [We abhor their doctrine:] How few Churches or men have nothing worthy to be abhorred, that is, No Error or Sin? And must we renounce Communion with all the Christian world? No, they were not so bad: You use them hardlier than I. They took them to be no true Christians, as wanting something of that faith which is necessary to Salvation, and Essential to a Christian, and so to have made themselves no Church-Members, and therefore are to be sentenced & avoided accordingly.

And how ordinarily do they expound [Let him be Anathema] that is [Cut off from Christ?] Not only Hildebrand so expounds it often, but many before him: Whereupon they commonly agree that an Anathematized Heretic is none of the Church, nor can be saved without repentance.

And indeed to renounce all Communion with Christ's true members not Cut off from the Church, is a greater sin than I charge on them. Though familiarity and specially Communion may be suspended, while delay of repentance makes the Cape of a sinner doubtful.

§ 3. Pag. 82 He begins himself with blaming Bishop Victor, "for Endangering the Peace of the whole Church upon so light occasion. Valelius is of opinion, that it was but by letters of accusation."

Answer. I think it could be but by Letters of Accusation, Renunciation, and persuading others to renounce them. For Bishops were not then come up to their Commanding Power over one another. But doth not Mr. M's. here rail upon a Bishop, in saying the same of him that I did, if my words were Railing? Thus you shall have him all along confessing much of that faultiness by them, which he takes the mention of by me to be so bad.

§ 4. He nameth many Councils, which he saith I pass lightly over; then sure I say no harm of them. He thinks it is because I could not, as if he knew it were my will. And so I am never blameless.

§ 5. But he hath a notable Controversie against Baronius, who thought Novatus had been a Bishop (such Errors as Baronius was guilty of by Ignorance, are excusable in one so far below him in History as I am.) But I congratulate Mr. M's discovery,
discovery, that he was but a Presbyter: But all confess that he, Ordained Felicitissimus Deacon: And here is a Presbyter Ordaining: But it was irregularly! Let it be so: He faith, that he ought not to have Ordained, but with Cyprian, or by his permission. I grant it. But 1. If Cyprian's permission would serve, then it was not a work alien to a Presbyter: If a permitted Presbyter may Ordain, a Bishop's Ordination is not necessary ad esse Officij ; and so that which is a disorder is no Nullity. 2. And it seems by Novatus's Act, that the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination was not universally received. And I have not yet met with any that make it more necessary ad esse Presbyteratus quam Diaconatus.

§ 6. Next he mentions another Carthage Council, where one Victor dead, is condemned for making a Priest Guardian of his Child, and so entangling him in worldly Affairs. And he tells you, that all that I can say against this, is the rigour of the Sentence; but he dissembleth, and takes no notice that I mention it in praise of the Bishops of those Times, who were so much against Clergy-mens meddling with Secular Affairs: What odious Puritanism would this have been with us? What I cite in praise, our Historian cannot understand.

§ 7. And that you may need no Confuter of much of his Accusation of me but himself, who so oft faith, I say nothing of Bishops and Councils, but of their faults, &c. he here faith as followeth.

["After this he gives a short Account of Councils called on the Subject of Rebaptizasion of Hereticks: And here, to do him right, he is just enough in his Remarks: The generality of the World was for Rebaptizing Hereticks: And considering what manner of men the first Hereticks were, it is probable they had Tradition as well as Reason on their side. However, Mr. Baxter endeavours fairly to excuse these Differences, and speaks of the Bishops with honour and respect, allowing them to be men of eminent Piety and Worth. Had he used the same Candour towards others, &c.

Anfw. 1. If this be true, a great deal contradictory is untrue:

2. He greatly misreporteth the Controversie: It was not whether Hereticks should be Rebaptized, but those that were Baptized by Hereticks, and taken into their Churches. If a Heretic had been Baptized when found by a found Minister, and after
after turned to Herefie, he was to be restored by Repentance without Rebaptizing: and I think they all agreed in this. But I imagine this was but a lapse of his memory in Writing.

3. But the Question is, Whether the Bishops, whose faults I mention, were of equal Worth and Innocency with those whom I honour and praise? Let the proof shew.

I would he would freely tell us, Q. 1. Whether he think at this day the generality of Bishops (in Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Poland, the Greek Church, Moscovy, Armenia, Syria, &c.) are so commendable, as not to be notably blamed? Q. 2. If not, When was it that he thinks they ceased to be generally so commendable? Was it in Hildebrand's Time, or any time before? Q. 3. Can you believe that the generality turn from good to bad just in one Age? Or rather that they degenerated by degrees? If they were mostly bad in a thousand, or nine hundred, or eight hundred, can you think that they were not drawing towards it and near as bad a little before; Q. 4. What was it think you in which the Corruption of the Clergy did consist? Was it not most in a proud, domineering worldly Spirit? Is it not that that you blame the Popes for? Was not their Ascent their Corruption? Sure you all agree of that. Q. 5. And did the Papacy Spring up in a year? Did not Leo begin to arrogate, and others after him (to say nothing now of those before him) rise higher and higher by degrees as Children grow up to manhood, till in Greg. 7. it came to Maturity? I know no Protestant that denyeth this? Q. 6. And can you or any sober man think that in so many hundred years it was only the Bishop of Rome that was sick of this disease, and that all or most of the other Bishops were Free? Were they not commonly for ascending with them: Did not they in the East strive to be greatest? And the Bishops of the West strive to rise with, and by the Pope? Were they not, and are they not as his Army? And did he prevail against the Primitive Purity and Simplicity without them? Did not his Councils, and Prelates, as his Armies, do his greatest works? Yea, have they not oft out-done him, and over-topt him in Mischief (as in the deposing of Ludov. Pius against his will? say good Historians.)

Tell us then at what Age just we may begin to dispraise the Bishops. And from that time forward, will you not be as great a Railer as I, and scandalize Christianity more than Lucian or Julian?
§ 8. But I somewhat marvel that he is again at it (reciting Dionysius's words which he thinks I mistook for Eusebius's) That he does not condemn the rebaptizing of Hereticks which was a Tradition of so great antiquity: I judge more Candidly of him than he doth of me: Though he so oft repeat it, I will not believe that he knew not, that it was not the baptizing of Hereticks as such, that was the question: but only of those that were baptized by Hereticks. Yet I confess Eusebius phrasing it, might tempt one to think so that had not read Cyprian and others upon the questions. But when Eusebius and Dionysius mention [rebaptizing Hereticks] they mean only those that were by Hereticks baptism entered into the Societies and Profession of Hereticks. If the worst Heretick, yea or Apostate, had been baptized, by the orthodox, Cyprian and all the rest were agreed against Rebaptizing such when they repented. This Dionysius telling Xyfrus Rom. of an ancient Minister that was greatly troubled in Conscience that he had been falsely Baptized by an Heretick (being himself no Heretick) and doubted whether he should not be Rebaptized, yet faith, He told him he durst not Rebaptize him that had so long been in the Church and Communicated, but bid him go on Comfortably in Communion (Much like a forementioned case put to me, by some that never were Baptized, but in our undisciplined Parish Churches had been without knowledge or question admitted long to Communion, whether yet they should be Baptized at all: And Dionysius's Reasons against it I cannot answer.

§ 9. And here I may take notice how our new Church-men (such as Thorndike, Mr. Dodwell and all their partners) who nullifie sacraments delivered by one that hath not Canonical Ordination by a Bishop of uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles, do make themselves Hereticks in the sense of the Roman Church which they allow: For 1. Baptism is the first and most necessary Sacrament in their own opinion. Yea Austin and too many of old, but specially too many now, take it to be necessary to Salvation; 2. If therefore Baptism be a nullity all that are Baptized in England, Scotland and all the Protestant Churches by such as had no such Ordainers, must be Baptized again or be damned. 3. If they say, They may be saved without it, then 1. they confess Mr. Dodwells Doctrine to be false, that faith none have a Covenant right to Salvation, who have it not by a Sacrament
ment from such hands. 2. And they renounce the Doctrine of
the Necessity of Baptism to Salvation. But if they are for Re-
baptizing all such Protestant Countries, as necessary to Salvation,
they are uncharitable that do not speak it out.
§ 10. He passeth by Bishop Stephens Excommunicating all
the Oriental Bishops of Cappadocia, Cilicia, Galatia, and Repro-
bating their Synods, for Rebaptization: Doth he think that
even then some Bishops did not rise too fast?
§ 11. The man that is so angry with me for telling of the
faults of Bishops and Councils, is pag. 87. angry with me for
not saying worse against Secundus his Council of Bishops at Cirta;
and faith, I have not done right to the Catholick Church: I
perceive the question is not, whether I may Rail at Bishops, but
what Bishops they be that I must Rail at.
As for the Council at Sinuessa, I believed the being of it no
more than he doth: And when I am but naming the common
Catalogue, he might pardon my modesty for saying that the be-
ing of it is a Controversie.
§ 12. Of the Council of Illiberis he faith but contrastedly the
same that I do, that It hath many good Canons, and some that need
a favourable Interpretation, and is very severe in some cases. This
measure of just praise and dispraise, is practisd by him that is
condemning it in me.
§ 13. As to his Controversie, whether Bishops, or such as
strive to be Bishops, were the very first movers of the Dona-
tists Controversie, who should be Bishop, it's not worth the
turning over one Book to search, as to my business.
§ 14. Next he that accuseth me of Railing at Bishops, accus-
seth me for saying (from some good Authors) that a Bishop of
Carthage, Donatus, was a good man, who he faith was bad. It's
little to me whether he were good or bad.
§ 15. Next he noteth that I Err with Binnius and Baronius
as to the year of a Carthage Council. I undertook not to ju-
stifie all the Chronology or History that I transcribe: Whether
Optatus, or Binnius and Baronius hit on the just year, little
care I.
§ 16. I praised a Donatist's Council of 270 Bishops at Car-
thage for Moderation, agreeing to communicate with penitent
Traditores, without Rebaptizing them, and so doing for 40 years.
2. What was these mens Heresie?
He faith, This looks liker a piece of Policy than Moderation, for it had no tendency to peace, but to strengthen the Schism.

Ans. Who knows how to please men? When they exclaim against Separation if men Communicate with them, they judge it but Policy, that hath no tendency to peace. 2. And who is it now that most raileth at Bishops? I am confuted for praising the moderation of 270 of them, and he is their cenfurier even when they do well, and their moderation with him is but Policy. Even as they say, of me, that I constantly Communicate with their Parish Churches to undermine them: Near or far off, all's one with this sort of men, if you stick at any thing that they bid you say or do.

But he will not believe that this Council of Orthodox moderate Donatists were so many as 270. "Because 1. we have only the "Authority for it of Tychonius a Donatist. 2. It's improbable after "Constantine's suppression of them that Schism should so suddenly "spread. 3. Left it should prove the Churches to be too Small: Yet "he saith, These Schismatics set up Churches in every City and "Village."

Ans. 1. It's said Tychonius confesseth this Council, because the later Donatists would fain have buried the memory of it: But that it depends only on the Credit of Tychonius, I think depends only on your Credit: 2. Augustine that reports it, honoureth this Tychonius, and reciteth an Exposition of his of the Angels of the Churches, Rev. 2. and 3. which I suppose displeaseth you more than his Donatism. 3. It seems you would have believed some stranger that knew it not, rather than a Donatist that speaketh against the will and interest of his party. 4. It rather seems that the Donatists were the greater number of Christians there before Constantine's time, and like the Papists therefore counted themselves the Catholicks and the others the Schismatics. Constantine's Prohibition did not suppress them. 5. Therefore the numerousness of their Bishops and smallness of Churches, rather sheweth what was the state of the Churches before worldly greatness swelled them to that disease, which was the Embrio or infancy of Popery.

§ 17. Whether the Donatists be like the Papists or the Separatists (much less to the Nonconformists) if the Reader will but peruse what I have said and what Mr. M. hath said, I am content that he judge without more words.
§ 18. He passeth by divers Councils because he could not say that I blame them: And he passeth by Constantine's Epistle to Alexander and Arius, which raileth at them more than I do (in his sense.)

As to the Council of Laodicea, it is not two or three such words as his that will make an impartial man believe that the Churches were like our Diocesses, when every Convert before baptism was to say his Catechism to the Bishops or his Presbyters: Or that the Command that Presbyters go still with the Bishop into the Church, and not before him, do not both imply that they were both together in every Church.

But he will have it confined to the Cathedral; And when I say, There were long no Churches but Cathedrals, he saith he will not differ with me whether they shall be called Churches or Chappels. But the difference is de re: They say themselves that a Bishop and a Church were then Relatives: And when they have put down many hundred Churches under the Diocesan, forsooth they will gratifie us by giving us leave to call them Churches. As if they put down an hundred to one of the Cities and Corporations, and then give us leave, to call them Corporations when they are none. Yet blush they not to make the world believe that they are that Episcopal party (who put down a thousand Churches and Bishops in some one Diocese) and I am against Bishops.

Yea when they have not the front to deny but that every City then had a Bishop (that had Christians,) and that our Corporations are such as they called Cities, Yet when we plead but at least, if they will have no Chorepiscopi, they will restore a Church and Bishop with his Presbyters to every such City with its adjacent Villages, hatred, scorn and derision goeth for a Confutation of us; Though we do it but to make true discipline a possible thing; Which they call Issachar's burden, and abhor it, and then say, It is possible and practised.

§ 19. As to the Roman Council which he believeth not, he might perceive that I believed at least their antiquity as little as he: But the Canons are so like those of following Councils that such it's like were sometime made.

And whereas I noted that their condemning them that wrong timed Easter, would fall on the Subscribers to our English Liturgy, where 2000 are Silenced for not Subscribing, the man had
had no better answers to give, than these. That I should have said the Almanack-Makers. As if he would have had men believe that Falshood, that it was the Almanack Makers and not our Liturgy changers that were deceived.

2. [Alas! one year they mistook.] As if he would Persuade men that their rule faileth but one year, which faileth off.

3. The Silenced Ministers have little Reason to thank him or any body else, that giveth this Reason of their Separation. It's strange this should trouble their Consciences that Care no more for Easter than for Christmas, but only that it Falls upon a Sunday.

Here see his Historical Credibility. 1. Would he persuade men that we give this Reason alone? Or why may it not be one with twenty more?

2. He intimateth that I give them as reasons of Separation: As if to be Silenced, were to separate, and to be passive were to be active.

3. He intimateth that as Nonsubscribers I and such other are Separatists, which is false; While we live in their Communion.

4. He taketh on him to know our judgment as against Easter (but for Sunday) when we never told him any such thing.

5. He intimateth that it's no credit to us that we make Conscience of deliberate professing Assent to a known untruth in open matter of fact: And if the Contrary be their Credit, I wish they may never be Witnesses against us.

6. He intimateth that a man that is not for keeping Easter, is the less excusable, if he will not Profess a known Falshood about the time of Easter. If Conscience stood a man in no stead for greater Ends than worldly wealth and ease and honour, who would not be a Latitudinarian Conformist?

§ 20. Next when I deny belief to these Councils, he blames me for making advantage of the History of them. As if he saw not that I do it, but ad hominem to the Papists who record them as if they were really true. For it is principally the Papists (from Infancy to Hildebrands Maturity) against whom I write.

§ 21. He next comes to the Novatians as my Favourite sect. And [Favourite] may signifie to the Reader a truth or a Falshood.

1. Doth not every Christian Favour them that have lesser Errors more than them that have greater?

2. Do I not as oft as he professes my great dislike of every sect, as a sect?

R 2 3. Do
3. Do I not disclaim this Novatian sect and their opinion; and own the Contrary?

4. It seems he taketh me to be too Favourable to some Bishops and their followers: The question is but who they be that must be favoured? I may come to be taken for a Novatian by such men as well as Socrates and Sozomen.

§ 22. Here (without railing) he bedawbs Novatus and Novatian to the purpose with horrid Crimes, a Pharisaical Saint, Perjured, and what not? But what! Were they not Episcopal? Yes, he doubts it not: It was for to be a Bishop that Novatian wrought his Villanies: (what if I had thus bedawbed the Episcopal?) But yet the very word [Puritan] is of use to him. This, faith he of Novatus, was the tender Conscience of the author of the Ancient sect of the Puritanes? Can you tell who the man aimeth at? Is it Nonconformists? Novatus & Novatian were Prelatifs, and never scrupled more Ceremonies than our Prelates impose. Who then can it be but men that in general, though Episcopal, do profess Tenderness of Conscience? And there I leave them, without the application.

§ 23. But this Defender of Surgent Prelacy, sticks not to disgrace those whom he seemeth to defend. It was three of the Catholick Bishops that Consecrated Novatian, and (without railing) he calls them Three plain ignorant Bishops. These good men suspecting no trick, and overcome with his good entertainment, with too much Wine and persuasions, were forced at last to lay their hands on him and Consecrate him Bishop.] 1. Ignorant Bishops; 2. Overcome with too much Wine, and entertainment: 3. And with persuasion: 4. To do such an Act as to Consecrate so bad a Bishop, & that in such a city as Rome, and that without the Churches choice or Consent. How much worse have I said of Bishops? But, yet [they were good men.] But if they had been Nonconformists, what names had been bad enough for them? No doubt if they had been sequestr'd and cast out (for their too much wine and such ordination) how odiously might the agents have been described as enemies to the Church and Persecutors of good men.

§ 24. Yet further this New Bishop engageth men to him by Oaths, enough to strike a horror in the minds of the Reader, faith he:

See what a man may do for a Bishoprick? It reminds me of many good Canons that forbid Bishops swearing their Clergy to them: And of our Et Cetera Oath in 1640 never to Consent to any
any alteration, (to say nothing of our times) and the old Oath of Canonical obedience. It strikes horror into mens minds now that we scruple these.

§ 25. He maketh the Novatian doctrine blasphemous (without railing) and me too Favourable in representing it. As to that I suppose he is not ignorant how great a Controversie it is what they held, even among the greatest Antiquaries, and Enemies of Schism and Herefs. And I use in accusations to meet with most truth in the most Favourable interpretations.

And here I will tell our Historian, that while I take leave to dissent from his accusation, it shall be but by the authority of those whom I judge as well acquainted with Church Writers and Customs as any that ever Mr. M. or any of his Masters read, not excepting more knowing men than Valesius.

The first is D. Petavius in Epiphan. de Cath. Where first he tells us that no less nor later men than most of the ancient Fathers, and Specially the Greeks, mistook Novatus and Novatian for one, or thought the sect had a single Author; naming Euseb. Theodoret, Epiphan. Nazian. Ambrose, Austin, Philaetius, yea and Socrates. Yet half as great a mistake in me would have been scorned.

2. Against Epiph. and Theodoret he saith [Nov. ea Novatiani Opinio suite, eos qui gravioris peccati noxam contraherent, ab omni spe consequenda salutis excludi: Nam & illos ad capessendam pœnitentiam hostari solebant: Et ut Divinam clementiam lachrymis ac fœdibus elicerent identidem admonebant: Sed hoc unum negabant; ad Ecclesiam fidelem Communionem reciprocam amplius oportere: Neque pene Ecclesiam reconciliandi jus solum ac potestatem esse: Quippe uniam illum peccatorum indulgentiam in illius arbitrio versari, quæ per Baptismum obtinetur; quæ he proveth out of Socrates, Ambrose. And he saith, that they were not counted Hereticks for wronging the lapsed, by denying them Communion, but for wronging the Church Power, by denying the Power of the Keyes for their Restitution. (Like enough.)

The other shall be that excellent Bishop Albaspineus Observ. lib. 2. Observ. 20, 21. p. (mihi) 130, 131. [Advertant Novatianorvm errorem non in eo postum, quod dixerent neque lapsum, neque excommunicatum in morte a peccatis liberandum; sed hæreticosideo habitos, quod opinarentur Deum ipsum Ecclesiam neque remittendorum neque retinendorum peccatorum capitalium poestatem copiamque
copiamque fecisse: Atque hoc in eo fuit vigutique eorum baresis, qui quanquam illud consequeretur ex eorum falsa Opinionie, ut ab
solutionem non largirentur, tamen hoc eorum factum non baresis no
mine afficiendum erat, neque ad baresin accedebat ob aliam cauam
quam quod ab fonte illo & quas capit baresin olentem dixerat at, eo
maxime quod Novatiani crederent id Ecclesiae a Deo non suisse pra
stitum & concessum; qua causa sola fuit cur praxis illa eum discip
line Novatianorum ratio baresis nomen notionemque non effugeret.

The Clergy felt their own Interest, and the Novatians denied
their Power to retain, as well as forgive capital Crimes, and
thought their Keys extended not so far.

And that the Case of the lapsed was it that they began with,
Epiphaninus himself and others agree.

And Observ. 19. he shews that Novatianus did this against
his former Judgment, in Envy and Faction against the Bishop, be
cause he mist of being Bishop himself. A Bishoprick was it that
provoked him to deny this Pardoning Power in Bishops.

And Albaipinus hath in many antecedent Observations
shewed how little, if any thing at all, the Novatians differed
celse from the Antient Church in the strictness of their Commu
nation, and avoiding sinners: So that he thus begins his fifth Ob
servation [Incredibilia prope sunt, qui bis capitibus dictam samus:
se tamita vera & certa, & quae enuresque animam summam in
admirationem vapiant, Ecclesiain primitis temporibus nulla vel le
vissima labe inquinatam suifse; quin ita illibatam imnctamque ut
emini ratione, cur & solicitudine prospexerit, filii ut sui quam à
Baptismo hauerent puritatem eam nulla aspiremat viti alicujus
macula & fœditate conservarent. Imo ea se veritate adhibita ut
suiiendum sibi detestandumque peccatum, quovis terrore proposito
putaret. Non solum autem multa crimina peccataque numero
rabantur, quorum Autores artificiosque abolutionem omnum desp
rabant, sed & ea quoque quibus ignoscet poenitentiam concessi opor
tere consuerat, peccata a ulcis cerebat, ut non nisi semel eis qui ea
commisisset, unius poenitentiae copiam saceret Ecclesia, hoc est si post
Baptismum lethaler peccaret. Quod si cum Ecclesia reconciliatus
in idem aut aliiui mortale peccatum iurum prolaberetur, ita
in perpetuum tribus primis saculis ab Ecclesia repulsam forebat, ut
non nisi poenitentia & in morte precum que reliqua erant subsidia
expectanda sibi ducerent, nulla absolutione data qua in spem venia il-
lam erigeret. ] And he adds, that many that cannot deny his
proofs,
proofs, yet will not believe that ever such a Discipline was used.

But this was in the three First Ages: After, when Prosperity and Wealth ticed the ungodly into Bishops Seats, and into the Church, the Case was altered, and as he shews, Observ. 6. the Case was so altered to the loose extreme, that Criminals were admitted toties quoties. And in his Notes on Tertullian he sheweth, that this was a difference between the Orthodox and the Hereticks, that the Orthodox did div multumque deliberare quos in societatem ejusdem Ecclesiae, & corporis recipere debeant; but the Hereticks were ready to take all that came. Yet I suppose not near so loose as those Diocesan and Parochial Churches that know not who comes, but without question take all that will but come to the Rails and kneel: And when by the magnitude of Dioces and other means, they have secured themselves against the trouble and possibility of Pastoral Discipline, the Priest wipes off all guilt with a word, and faith, If they were Atheists, Hobbits, Sadduces, Whoremongers, common Blasphemers, Drunkards, it’s no fault of mine, I know it not; and no wonder, when he knoweth not who in the Parish are his Flock.

That Eusebius himself and others named by Petavius mistook the Novatians is no wonder to those who read the volumes of palpable Falshood written against the Nonconformists in this present age, and hear witnesses at the bar swear those Plots and Conspiracies & Treasons against men, from which grave and conscionable Juries quit them.

But me thinks when Mr. M. had said that Socrates is an Historian of good Credit and acquainted with them] he much forgot his own ends when he recited these words as his [Some took part with Novatian, and others with Cornelius; according to their several inclinations and Course of life: The looser and more licentious sort Favouring the most indulgent discipline, the other of more austere lives inclining most to the Novatian severity.] Good still, I now see that the Novatians indeed were Puritans, though Episcopal, and I accuse not our accusers of any such Heresie. But I confess that I shall believe a Novatian Historian, who being so strict against sin must be strict against a Lie, rather than those that Scorn such Puritanism, and deride the Person that cannot swallow a bigger Pill.

And when Mr. M. labours to shew out of Socrates that it was
was not only Idolatry that they censured, he labours in vain: It was the beginning of their Schism that I mentioned, and not Socrates his Age.

As to the judgment of the Council of Elberis and all the three First Ages, I have told you what Albaspine faith before. If you can confute him, do; I am not engaged to defend him; but I believe him.

§ 26. I conclude this and the former Chapter with this Counsel to the Scorners of Puritanes: Never trust to your Titles and Order, how good soever, without a careful holy obedience to the Supreme Law-giver, either for Concord on Earth, or Salvation in Heaven. True Parish-Reformation is the way to satisfy godly persons better than either Violence or Separation. But if you still obstinately resist Parish-Discipline and Reformation, you must have Toleration of such as will not consent to your Corruption, or else persecute the best to your own ruine. Theophilus Parochialis hath said more for Parish Order against the Regulars, and Priviledged, than you have done against the Separatists. And yet the Confraternity of the Oratorians set up in every Parish, was the best way he could devise to recover the state of lapsed Parishes: As the priviledging of Fryars was the Pope's last Remedy instead of Reforming his corrupted Church.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Council of Nice and some following.

§ 1. This Historian having put himself into a military posture seemeth to conceive that every word proceeds from an Enemy. And first he feigneth me to make Constantine judge that [the Bishops and Councils were of little use] when I had no such word or thought, but the contrary.

§ 2. Next he himself confesseth that which I blame those Bishops for; Even those Libels which they Contentiously offered against one another; to have raised Quarrels instead of Peace, and which Constantine cast altogether into the fire without reading them. And when he confesseth what I say, is he not a Railer at the Bishops as much as I in that?
As to his excuse that [It is no wonder considering their great
diffentions in Religion, &c.] I easily grant it: But in this excuse he
faith yet more against them.
§ 3. Because I said that Athanasius differing from Constan-
tine about the reception of Arius his repentance [Caused much
Calamity] he feigneth me heinously to accuse Athanasius which
I intended not: Even a jest action may [Cause Calamity] as
Christ faith his Gospel would bring division. All his labour in
justifying Athanasius fighteth but with a spectre of his own ima-
gination. And yet I am inclined to think that if an Hypocrite
Arius had been convinced at to please such an Emperor, the death
of Arius would have left the Church quieter than it did; though
he here thinks greater rigour had been safer: And I think mul-
titudes of Sadduces, Infidels and debaucht Persons in one of our
Diocess, yea or Parishes, is worse than one Arius while Hy-
pocrifre restrained him from Venting his opinion.
§ 4. And here he that dreamed I accused Athanasius, really
accufeth Constantine as imposed on by a Counterfeit Repentance and
restoring the incendiary to opportunitieS of doing mischief, and being
against the means that might have ended that fatal mischief. But I
confefs Constantine was no Bishop, and therefore this is not an
accusation of Bishops or a railing at them.
§ 5. Next when I had fully opened the Case of the Meletians
out of Epiphanius on pretence of abbreviating, he leaves out that
which he likes not, and tells us how the Nonconformists have
advantaged the Papists: If I thought the man believed himself
I would try to undueceive him: In the meane time I desire him to
think again which party most befriends the Papists; "They
"that are for a reconciliation with them on these terms, that
"there may be acknowledged an Universal supreme human
"Power over all the Church on Earth, and the Pope to be Prin-
cipium Unitatis and Patriarch of the West, and he shall abate us
"the last 400 years Impositions, and all be accounted Schifma-
ticks that unite not into this Church; and that all the
"Preachers in England shall be silenced that will not swear, pro-
mise, profess, and practise all that which is here imposed on
"them, though they think it heiron's sin, and others think it but
"matter indifferent, and all the people shall be prosccuted that
"hear them; and that this Division shall rather weaken the
"Kingdom, and advantage the Papists, than the Consciences
"of
of men, as wise and faithful as themselves shall be eased of such Impositions, or they suffered to Preach the Gospel of Christ: Or those that being condemned to such Silence, Priests and Ruine, had rather be delivered, though a Papist be delivered with them, than be destroyed. Methinks we are used by these Church-Fathers, as if they should determine that a great part of the Protestants who are most against Popery, shall be hanged, unless the Papists will beg their pardon, or cut the Rope; which if these Protestants accept, they shall be said to be the Promoters of the Papists.

§ 6. As for all his Exceptions against Epiphanius, they are nothing to me, who did not undertake to justify his words, but transcribe them; nor think it worth my labour now to examine the Case of so small concernment.

§ 7. When some have blamed me for condemning the Arians too much, he faith, that I say somewhat very much to the disadvantage of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but he was so gentle as not to tell what it was, unless it be telling what Petavius the Jesuite faith: About that I am wholly of his own mind. But the express words which Petavius de Trinit. citeth out of all those Old Fathers, cannot be denied: And verily they are so many, and so great, that unless his Argument satisfied me, viz. [The Votes of the Council of Nice shewed what was the Common sense of the Church, better than the words of all those Fathers.] I should think as Philostorgius in point of History, that there were no sufficient confuting of the Arians from these Fathers, though sometimes they have better words. Visible words cannot be denied, even where they must be lamented. That's the difference between Mr. M's Opinion of History and mine.

§ 8. As to the Arians, I recite but Epiphanius's words, who in other cases is greatly valued by these Accusers: They will believe what he saith of Aerus. And as to what he saith to the contrary out of Theodoret, he may see that he saith all by hearsay, and saith, that They bid that which he accuseth them of, and were Hypocrites, professing too much strictness, l. 4. c. 9. which is still the common way of accusing the best, against whom instead of proveable faults, they turn their strictness into a crime. Epiphanius is much more particular than Theodoret in the story.

§ 9. The rest which he noteth of my words of the Council of
of Nice, have nothing needing a reply. Petavius hath fully proved that the Chorepiscopi were true Bishops. But now we are odious Presbyterians if we would but have a Bishop in every City, that is, Corporation, Desiring only that Discipline might become possible. And for this we are proclaimed to be against Bishops; that is, faith this sort of men; They that would have but One Bishop over a thousand, or many hundred, or score Churches, are for Episcopacy; and they that would have every Church have a Bishop, as of old, or at least every great Town, and so would have twenty, or forty, or a hundred for one, are against Episcopacy: And that which is strange is, These men are believed.

§ 10. I praised the Council of Gangra for condemning some Superstitions, and his faith, I have nothing against it: Whether it be a Common Mistake that Arius was here received to Communion, I'll not stay to examine.

§ 11. When he hath weighed all he can for the Synod at Antioch, he is forced to confess that they were a packt company of Bishops, that complied with Constantius and Eusebius's Contrivance. And what do I say worse of them than he? As to the Canon against Priests or Deacons not gathering Assemblies against the Bishops will, I am for it as much as he, if the Bishops and Churches be such as they were then; but not in France nor Italy.

He faith, I leave my sting behind me, and end very angrily; for these only words [This is their strength] mentioning the Councils (that was against Athanasius) suppressing Dissenters as sedition by force. I see angry men think others angry when they are, and are stung if we do but name their stinging us: As if Prisons and Ruine were not so sharp a sting as these four words. If it be not their strength, why do they so trust to it, as to confess that their Arguments and Keyes would do little to uphold their Prelacy without it. In the days of the Usurpers I moved for a Petition, that when they granted Liberty of Conscience for so many others, they would grant Liberty for the full exercise of the Episcopal Government to all that desired it. But the Episcopal Party that spake to, would not endure it, as knowing what bare Liberty would be to their Cause, unless they could have the Sword to suppress those that yield not to their Reasons.

§ 12. Next he faith, I spare my Gall for about a dozen times,
times, not regarding how it contradicts his former Accusations.

But whereas I recite the horrid Accusations of the Council at Philippopolis against Athanasius, Paulus and Marcellus, of open Matters of Fact, as Murder, Persecutions, Burning of Churches, Wars, Flames, Dragging Priests to the Market-place with Christ's Body tyed about their necks, stripping Confecrated Virgins naked before a concourse of People [and offering to send messengers on both sides to Try the Fact, and to be themselves condemned if it prove not true] he is offended that I seem staggered at this, Athanasius having detected before so many Subornations, &c.

Answ. I did not say that I was staggered, much less doubted which of them did the wrong: But that a Reader may by such a Temptation be astonisihed, and confounded whom to believe. But did I ever rail more at Bishops than he here doth? What 1. So great a number of Bishops, 2. Deliberately, in Council,
3. To affirm so vehemently, 4. Such matters of open Fact,
5. And offer it to the Trial of Witnesses of both sides; and all this to be false, 6. And to be but the consequent of former Subornations and Perjury; can you name greater wickedness?

Obj. But they were Arians. Answ. But they were Bishops.
The worse for being Arians. 2. Yet called but Semi-Arians, and renounced Arian, and pretended Reconciliation. 3. And they were the Oriental part of the Council at Sardica, called General by the Papists. 4. And they were believed against Marcellus by Basil and Chrysostom: But all that I cite it for, is to tell the Reader what a doleful case the Church was fallen into, by the depravation of the Bishops. Did none of these professors before to be Orthodox? I do not say that it was quatenus Bishops that they did all this, but that multitudes of Bishops were then become the shame and calamity of the Church.

§ 13. Next he scorningly accuseth me for giving too soft a Character of the Circumcellians; and faith, My Moderation and Charity may extend to John of Leyden. And he calls them The Most barbarous and desperate Villains that ever defamed Christianity by assuming the Title.

Answ. 1. This is the man that faith I rail. I named so many and great sins of theirs, that I little thought any Reader would have thought that I spared them too much. 2. Yet they were Donatists, and of them Optatus himself faith, lib. 5. \["Apud vos \]
And faith Optatus, lib. i. [Nequiss dicit me inconsiderate eos fratres appellare, qui tales sunt. Librns & illi non negent & omnibus notum sit, quod nos odo habeamur, & exerceretur, & nolunt se dici fratres nostros; tamen nos recedere a timore Dei non possimus—sunt igitur sine dubio fratres quamvis non boni: Quare nemo misertur eos me appellare fratres, qui non possunt non esse fratres.

Obj. But the Circumcellians were worse than the rest.

Answ. They were of the same Religion, but the unruly furious part in their practice: And Optatus faith, Though they would rail in words [sed unum quidem vix invenimus cum quo per literas, vel hoc modo loquatur.] And so goes on to call Parthenian his Brother. And it's worth the consideration how much Albaspini includeth in Fraternity; note first, & in Observat.

3. And they were Orthodox fierce Prelatists, doing all this for the preheminence of their Bishops. And what if some Prelatists now should hurt their Brethren more than the Circumcellians did, must I call them therefore the most barbarous Villains that ever desimated Christianity. Augustine faith, They made a Water of some Salt or sharp thing, and cast in mens Eyes in the night in the streets: No man can think that this barbarous action was done by the most, or any but some furious fools: They say that they would wound themselves to bring hatred on the Catholicks, as if they had done it, or drove them to it: He that knoweth what Self-love is, will believe that this was the case but of a few; and an easier wrong than some that abhor them do to their Brethren. And must we needs rail indeed against such numbers of hurtful Prelatists? What if any rude persons of your Church should be Whoremongers, Drunkards, Blasphemers, and seek the Imprisonment of their Brethren, yea their Défamation and Blood by Perjury, should the Church be for their sakes so called, as you call them? I speak them no fairer than Optatus did.

§ 14. When p. 57. I commend the many good Canons of the African Councils, and the faithfulness of the Bishops, he noteth none
none of this, because it proveth the untrust of his former Accusations.

And when I name twenty five or twenty six more Councils of Bishops, some General, and some less, which were for Arianism, or a compliance with them, he defendeth none of them, but excuseth them, and faith, that [they were not much to the honour of the Church: Yet the evil Edicts and Consequences of them are rather to be charged on the Arian Emperour, than the Bishops.]

Answ. 1. This is the same man that elsewhere so overdoes me in accusing the Arians.

2. The Emperour was Erroneous, but said to be otherwise very commendable. And is it not more culpable for Bishops to Err in the Mysteries of Divinity, than a Lay-man? And for many hundred to Err, than for One Man? And do you think that the Bishops Erring did not more to seduce the Flocks, than the Emperour's?

But he faith, that [If many fell in the Day of Tryal, they are rather to be pitied, than insulted over, for we have all the same infirmities, &c.

Answ. I wrote in pity of them and the Church, without any insulting purpose. If any now to avoid lying in Prison, and starving their Families, by Famine, should surrender their Consciences to sinful Subscriptions after a Siege of Nineteen years, I shall pity them, and not insult over them. Nay, if I speak of those that lay the Siege, and call out for more Execution, I do it not insultingly, but with a grieved heart for the Church and them.

But when I largely recited Hillary's words of them, he faith, [The Account is very sad] (and what said I more?) But, faith he, yet such as shews rather the Calamity, than the Fault of the Bishops.]

Answ. Nay then, no doubt, it's no fault to Conform. Hillary then, and all that kept their ground, were in a great fault for so heavily accusing them. And so the World turned Arians in shew (as Hierom and Hillary speak) is much acquir, and the Nonconformists are the faulty Railers for accusing them. It had been enough to say, It was no Crime; but to say, no Fault, is too gentle: for the same man that so talked of Perjured Arians before.

§ 15. Yet because he is forced to confess that it was most by far of all the Bishops, even in Councils (he of Rome not excepted)
cepted) that thus fell, he must shew how it offended him to be forced to it, by telling the world how contentious I have been against all sorts and sects (the first is false, and he knows it I think, and the latter is true formally of a sect as such; even his own sect.) And some judge me such a stranger to peace, as to need a moderator to stand between me and the contradictions of my own books.

Answ. Yes, the Bishops Advocate Roger L'Estrange, where nothing but gross ignorance, or malice, or negligence, could have found contradictions, were the whole places perused. And where I am sure my self, that there is none; I have somewhat else to do than to write more, to shew the calumnies of such readers. Who most seeks peace, you, or those that you prosecute? One would think it should not be hard to know if men be willing.

CHAP. XX.

Of the first General Council at Constantinople. His Cap. 4.

§ 1. He begins with accusing me of imitating the devil; Doth God serve God for nought? because I say that [the reason why the west was freer from the Arian heresie, than the east, was not as the papists say, that Christ prayed for Peter, that his faith might not fail, but because the Emperours in the west were orthodox, and those in the east Arians: And the Bishops much followed the Emperour's will.] What, faith he, can be more unchristian?

Answ. 1. I never said that this was the only cause.

2. I proved that this privilege of Rome was not the meaning of Christ's prayer.

3. Is not this the same man that even now laid the fall of far more Bishops, even most in the world, on the Emperour, as overcoming them by force and fraud?

4. Doth not God himself keep men usually from strong temptations, when he will deliver them from sin?

5. Were not the Eastern Bishops, and the Western, of the same mold and temper? And if the Eastern followed the Emperours,
rours, had not the Western been in danger if they had the like
temptation?

6. Doth not Basilt that sent to them for help, complain of
them as proud, and no better than their Brethren?

7. Did not Marcellinus fall to Idolatry, and Liberius to sub-
scribe against Athanasius with the Arians?

8. Did not the West actually fall to Arianism when tempted
for the most part? Judge by the great Council at Milan, and
by Hillary's complaints.

9. Hath Rome and the West stood faster to the Truth since
then? What! all the Popes who are by Councils charged with
Heretick or Infidelity, and all wickedness, and those many whose
Lives even by Barouins and Genebrard, are so odiously described?
Is the West at this day free from Popery and its fruits?

10. Do you think in your conscience that if we had not here
a Protestant King, but a Papist, many of the Clergy would not
be Papists? Why then are they so in France, Spain, Italy, Po-
land, &c? And why did the most of them turn in Queen Mary's
dates? I do not insult, but lament the Churches Café, which
ever since Wealth and Honour, and too much Power corrupted
it, have had Bishops far more worldly, and less faithful than
they were the first three hundred years. Though I still say
that ever since, God hath in all times raised some serious Be-
lievers that have kept up serious Piety in the Church; And as
I doubt not but there are so many such among the Conform-
ists, as is our great joy, so I hope that, though foully blot-
ted with Superstition and Errour, there are many such among
the Papists themselves.

§ 2. Yet the faith, I do the Bishops Right again, without think-
ing of doing them Justice, while I tell how many were murdered.

_Answ._ 1. Doth he know my thoughts? 2. It's true I in-
tended not to do any other Justice; than to praise Christ's
Martyrs and Confessors, while I lament the Case of Persecu-
tors and Revolters? Is the praise of Confessors any honour to
the Hereticks?

But perhaps he means, I right the Order of Bishops. _Answ._
Did I ever say or think that there were no Bishops that kept
the Faith? Do I say All fell, when I say Most fell? The Man
speaks as his imagined Interest leads him, and so interpreteth
my words to his own sense, not as written. And if that be the
right
right way, I think he will grant that there were more Martyrs and Sufferers under Valens, Constantius, Hunnericus, and Genesius, in the East, and in Africa, by far, than were when their Tryal came in all the West that is now subject to the Pope. And what moved the man to dream that when I so describe and praise their constancy in Suffering, I did it as at unawares?

That the greater part of the Bishops of the Empire were Arians, I will not offer by Testimony to prove, when it is so commonly by Fathers, Historians, by Papists and Protestants agreed on. How many of them were Bishops before, and how many but Presbyters or Deacons, I'll not pretend to number. The turning of multitudes all agree on. The Constancy of many he fallsly intimateth that I deny, and faith, I injuriously represent them, and cannot tell a word wherein that Crime is found.

§ 3. Naming the things that were done by the Council at Constantinople, I mention both the setting up, and after the putting down of Gregory; & left any Caviller should carp at the word [putting down] I presently open particularly what it was that they did toward it; that resolving on his deposition, they caused him, though unwilling, rather to give it up, than stay till they cast him out. This great Historian had no more manlike an Exception here, than to say, that against all History, and against my own Explication, I say that [They Deposed him.] I said [They put him down] in the manner, and as far as I explained.

§ 4. While he here himself accuseth the Times then of General Corruption, and the Church of Divisions, adding, [What Age hath been so happy as not to labour under those Evils?] he accuseth me of making misufe of Gregory's words, to represent the Council in an odious manner.

Ans. It is to represent the worse part in a lamentable manner, as far as Gregory did, and no further. And as to his quarrel at my citation, I shall say no more; but if the Reader will but read Gregory's own words, I willingly leave all that Cause to his Judgment: If he will not, my words cannot inform him.

Yet he himself saith [He doth indeed in several places find fault with this Council] And can you forgive him? I think I find no more than he did. But for this you find fault with him [He did resent the Injury (And was it an Injury?)] and did not bear the deprivation of his Bishopsrick with the same generosity he proposed, which made him a little more sharp than was decent in his representation.
centration of the Bishops—What wonder is sharpened with discontent, he exclaim with somewhat too great a passion against the administration of the Church which he had been forced to quit.] Anf. All will be confess anon, when I have been accused for saying it before him: That’s his way. But it was not for leaving a high and far Bishoprick that he was grieved, but for being separated from the People that he had partly served in their lower state, and partly won from Heresie, and who came about him with tears intreating him not to forfake them. And though it were more than generosity to set light by the Honour and Wealth, it is treachery to set light by Souls: And they changed to their great loss. He resigned much to quiet the People left they should do as they did for Chrysostom after him. It is no new thing for the Major vote of the Clergy to Envy those few that are better and more esteemed than themselves, nor yet for the Godly People to be loth to leave such pastors.

§ 5. He saith [His censure of Councils that he knew none of them that have any happy End, was not the fault of the expedit, but of the men.] Anf. And what did I ever say more. It is his custom when he hath stormed at me, to say in Effect the same that he stormed at. Some Papists would persuade men, that it was only Arian Councils that he meant, but most Protestants that Write about Councils against them, do cite & vindicate these words of Gregory: And the impartial Papists confess that it was the Councils also of the Catholicks that there and else where he spake of.

§ 6. In the Case of Meletius, and Paulinus, two Bishops in a City, and the Case of Lucifer Calaritanus made a Heretick for separating from lapsed Arians, he saith over the same that I do; that good men cannot rightly understand one another, and so it ever hath been, and it’s the Effect of humane frailty and not Episcopacy. In all this I agree. But 1. If humane frailty make Bishops (well in pride and ambition, and domineering, it hath far worse Effects than in other men: 2. And Bishops are bound to excell their flocks in Piety, humility,Selfdenial, peaceableness, as well as in knowledge. If the Physicians of this city should prove unskilful, and yet confident: where they err, it is not quatenus Physicians that they are such: But if it be qui Physicians that are such, they may kill thousands, while the same faults in all their neighbours may kill few or none. If your Interest made you not smart and angry without cause, you would not cavil against such plain truth.

§ 7. About
§ 7. About the Priscillianists he faith [I all along observe this Rule, to be very favourable to all Hereticks and Schismaticks be they never so much in the wrong, and to fall on the Orthodox party and improve every miscarriage of theirs into a mighty crime.]

Anf. If all along this accusation be false, then all a long your History serves such a use. But in France, Spain, Italy, he is favourable to Hereticks that takes not the orthodox for such, or that is not for racking and burning them. And in England he is favourable to Schismaticks that taketh not the greatest lovers of Piety and peace for such, and the Church Tearers for Church-Healers: As Mr. Dodwell phraseth it, they are Schismaticks that suffer themselves to be excommunicate (for uninhous things in the Bishops account, and heinous sin in theirs; and so that are not so ripe in Knowledge, as to know all the uninhous things to be such which may be imposed.

§ 8. What would this enemy of railing have had me said more than I did of the Priscillianists? 

"Priscillianus, familia nobilis, pravides opibus, acer, inquies, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, differendi & disputandi promptus. Priscimus—vigilare multum, famem & frim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parcoffimus (Was it a crime to say so much good of him?) But proud of his Learning, set up a He-

refie, and two Bishops Instantius and Salvianus joyned with him, and made him a Bishop—At Caesar Augusta one Synod was gathered against him. The Story I before recited. Next a Synod at Burdeaux tryeth them. Saith Sulpitius ["Ac mea quidem..."
quidem sententia est, mibi tam reos quam accusatores displacere.

Certe Ithacium nihil pens, nihil sanit habuisse definio: suin echim
audax, loquax, impudens, sumptuosus, ventri & gula plurimum
impiertiens. Hic stubilitie co usque precesserat ut omnes etiam
sanatos viros, quibus aut studium erat lectiois, aut proposiitum
erat certare jejuniiis, tanquam Priscilliani socios aut discipulos in
crimen arcesseret. Anius etiam mifer est ea tempestate Martino
Episcopo—palam objectedare haresis insamiam. Imperator per
Magnum & Rufum Episcopos depravatus à mitioribus conslis de-
flexus—So he tells how many were put to death—Ceterum
Priscillian contacto, non solium non repressa est haresis—sed confirmata,
latius propagata est: Namque sectatores ejus qui eum
prinus ut sanctum houeralut, poftea ut Martyrem colere cepereunt. Ac inter nostrum perpetuum discordiarem bellum exasperat,
quod jam per quindecim annos sedis diffusionibus agitatum,
nullo modo sopiri poterat. Et nunc cum maxime discordiis Epis-
coporum turbari aut miserio omnia conterentur, cunctaque per eos
odio aut gratia, metu, inconstantia, invidia, factione, libidine,
avaria, arrogantia, somno, desidia, effent depravata: Postremo
plures adversus paucos bene consulentes, insanis consilii et perti-
nacibus studiis certarent : Inter boc Plebs Dei, & Optimus quisque probro atque judicio habeatur.] So ends Sulpitius History.

Do you not see, Mr. Morrice, that there have been Prelates and Puritane: even Episcopal Puritane: before our Times? Doth not your stomach rife against Sulpitius as too Puritanical and severe? Is not my Language of most of the Bishops soft in compari-
on of his? Yet he was so early as to live in that which you now call the most flourishing Time of the Church. Sir, I hate Discord, and love Peace; but I never look that the En-
imity between the Womans and the Serpent's Seed, or Cain and
Abel, should be ended; or that the holy Title of Bishops and
Priests should reconcile ungodly men to Saints. Sir, England
knoweth, that though some factious persons have done other-
wise, the main Body of those that your Law doth Silence, Ruine and Revile, have a high esteem of such Bishops as have been seriously godly; such as were many in Antient and late Times: And deride it as long as you will, the seriously religious
People in England are they that are most against Church-Ty-
ranny, and which Party most of the debauched and prophane
are of, hath long been known.

§ 9. But
§ 9. But the Reader shall further hear how little you are to be trusted. Saith Sul. in Vita Mart. [Apud Nemanstium Episcoporum Synodus habebatur ad quam quidem ire noluerat—(There’s another Synod.)

Et pag. 384. In Mon. Pat. ["Maximus Imperator alius vir bonus, depravat consiliis Sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem Ithacium Episcopum Priscilliani accusatorem catcrofili; illius socios, quos nominare non est necesse vi regia tuebatur.—Congregati apud Treveros Episcopi (there’s another Synod) tenebantur qui quotidie communicantes Ithacio communem fibi causam fecerant: His ubi nunciatum est inopinatus, adesse Martinum, totis animis labefacti, miffitare & trepidare coeperunt.—Nec dubium erat quin Sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulaturæ esse. Etenimunc solis oculis discernunt inter hominum genera, cum quis Pallore potius aut Veste, quam fide, hereticus estimaretur. Hae necquaquam placitum Martino Episcopì facebant.—Ineunt cum Imperatore Consilium ut missis obviarem Magistri officiis, urbem istam (Martinus) vetaretur propius accedere. (But it was not five Miles from all Cities and Corporations.)—

Interea Episcopi quorum communionem Martinus non in iabt trepidi ad Regem concurrunt, per damnatos se conquerentes actum esse de suo omnium statu, si Theognisi pertinaciam, qui eos SOLUM, palam lata sententia condemnaverat, Martini armaret authoris: Non opportuisse hominem capi memibus illis: Non jam defensionem hereticorum esse, sed vindicem (Methinks I read Mr. Morrice) Nihil actum morte Priscilliani si Martinus exerceret illius ultrionem. (These men have done nothing till they have destroy’d all that are against their Tyranny.) Postremo prostrati cum fletu (they could weep too) & lamentatione Petentatem Regiam implorant, ut utatur adversus UNUM hominem qui sua: Nec multum aberat quin cogereur Imperator Martinum cum hereticorum forte miscere.] But the Emperour knowing his eminent Holiness and Reputation, tryeth persuasion;

[& blande appellat, hereticos iure damnatos, more judiciorn publicorum, potius quam in sectationibus Sacerdotum: Non esse causam qua Ithacii ceterorum; partis ejus communem, putaret esse damnandum, Theognisium odio potius quam causa, fecisse dissentium; Eundemq; tamen SOLUM esse qui se à communione interim separavit; a reliquis nihil novatum.] You see here that M M, faith truly, that Martin separated but from the Bishops of
of Ithacius's Party: That is, All save one Theognistus (and
Iginus is elsewhere named.) Is not here a great accord of the
Bishops? ["Quinetiam paucos ante dies habita Synodus (Sy-
noeis still) Ithacium pronunciaverat culpa non teneri] no won-
der: Synods have justified the forbidding of two thousand to
Preach the Gospel.) At last when no other Remedy could
save the Lives of men from the Leeches, Martin yielded once
to communicate with the Bishops on condition the mens
Lives should be saved: The Bishops would have had him
Subscribe this Communion: But that he would never do. [Po-
sterodie inde se prorsipiens, cum revertens in viam moestus ingenif-
ret, se vel ad horam noxie communioni esse permixtum --sub-
sedit, causam doloris & fatti accusante & defendente cogitatione
pervolvens, asirit ei repellere Angelus; Merito inquit Martine
compungentis, sed aliter exire nequinti: Repara virtutem: resume
Conflantiem; ne jam non periculum gloria, sed salutis incur-
reris. Itaque ab illo tempore satis cativ, cum illa Ithaciana
partis communione misfcri. Catarum cum quodnam ex inergu-
menis, tardius quam solebat, & gratia minore curabat, subinde
nobis cum lacrymis fatebatur, se propter communiones illius ma-
num cui severa temporis necifitate, non spiritu mischfiset, de-
trimentum sentive virtutis. Sedecim postea vixit annos: Nul-
lam Synodum adit; ab omnibus Conventibus fe removit.] Now
Reader, judge how great Ithacius's Party was, that boasted but
one or two men were against them: And whether Martin sepa-
rated not from their common Synods.

Methinks I see Mr. M. here in the strait of the Pharifees,
when put to answer whether John's Baptism was from Heaven,
or of men. Fain he would make Martin and Sulpitius Puritans
and Fanatica. But the Church hath made a Holy day for Mar-
tin, and dedicated multitudes of Temples to his Honour; and all
men reverence Sulpitius and him. Yet he ventures to go as far
as he durft p. 142. against them.

§ 10. But here Mr. M. smarteth, and faith [This Instance
could become none worse than Mr. B. who in a Letter to Dr. Hill
confesses himself to have been a Man of Blood-]

Ansv. A Man of Blood is your Libertine Phrase, If you would
have published that secret Letter, you should 1. Have told the
whole, and worded it truly; 2. And have professed your self a
derider of Repentance, while you call for it. I lived in an Age of
of War, and I was on the Parliaments side, and that was enough to prove that I had a hand in blood while I was on one side, though I never drew blood of any man myself (save once a boy at School with boxing.)

But he thinks I should have imitated Martin in renouncing Communion with men of blood.

_Answ._ Martin renounced Communion with those that were for destroying even downright Hereticks. Alas Sir, I dare not renounce Communion with those that Silence thousands of faithful Ministers, and continue still to Plead, Preach, and Write for their Prosecution by Imprisonment and Ruine. I hope many do it in Ignorance, and if I do it, it may increase the distance that I would heal. Nonconformists are no Priscillianists.

And if I renounce Communion with all that were in Wars, it must be with some present Bishops, and a great part of the Land.

But I understand you; it must be with all that were in Arms for the Parliament, &c. _Answ._ The King then will condemn me by his Act of Oblivion, and by his own practice: Hath he not one of them for the Lord President of his Council? and many more in Trust and Honour? Did he renounce Communion with General Monk and his whole Army, who were long in Arms for the Parliament? Or with the Citizens, and multitudes of Commanders through the Land, who drew in, & encouraged General Monk? Or the Ministers that persuaded Sir Tho. Allen, Lord Mayor, to draw him in?

To be plain with you Sir (though you call it Railing) Men of your Faculty kindled the Fire, and let the Nation together by the Ears, and when sad experience brought them to repentance and to desire unity and peace, and those that had fought for the Parliament had restored the King, this evil Spirit envyeth the Kingdom the benefit of this concord, and would fain break us again into contending Parties, and will not let King and Kingdom have peace, while God giveth us peace from all foreign enemies. Do we need any other notice what a Contentious Clergy have still been, than the woful experience of what they are. If you would have had G. Monk and his Army, and all such that joined with him destroy’d or excommunicate for what they had done, why did you not speak out at first, but when we would all fain have peace and concord thus twenty years after cast your Wild-fire
§ 11. But his passion makes him say he knows not what, P. 142 ["I need not call Mr. B. to rememberance who compared Cromwell to David and his Son to Solomon; But this has trans- sported me a little too far."]

Ans. He faith this plainly of me afterward, to shew the credi-
dibility of his History? Did he know it to be false? If so, there's no disputing with him. If not, why did he not cite my words. Yea he after transcribes the Epiftle meant, where he saw there were no such words: But others had told that tale before him; and that was Enough. Even as one of his tribe hath written that I have written in my Holy Common-wealth, that any one Peer may judge the King. If these Episcopal Historians tell forreigners that we have all Cloven Feet and Horns, and go on four legs, yea and if some swear it, we have no remedy: They can prove our noses horns, and our hands Feet.

I again tell them, If Martinus Angel and Miracles be credible, woe to those Prelatifts that are for ruining violence, and silences against men better than the Gnofticks. If they be not true, let them not trust too much to the best Historians.

§ 12. Of the Council at Capua I said that they decreed that the two Bishops and their People should live in loving Com-
munion, Mr. M. finds me mistaken here. The words in Binnius are [Ut tam Flaviani quam Evagrii fautores in Communionem Catholicam admissantur, modo Catholicae fidei afferentes inveniantur] I thought Catholic Communion had been Loving Commu-
nion: And I thought if their fautors were to be received, so were they: And I thought Antioch had been a part of the Catholick Church, and Catholick Communion had extended to Antioch: But if Mr. M. deny these, I will not contend with him.

§ 13. He tells us, that [No man with his Eyes open ever saw the Condemnation of Bonosus by the Council of Capua] (for denying the Virgin Mary's perpetual Virginity.

Ansiv. It is Criticism and not History that the man is best at. They did it mediatly, while they referred it to them that did it. Saith Binnius ["Causa Bonosi eujusdam in Macedonia Episco-
"pe hearetici, negantis delibatem Dei generis Mariae Virginita-
tem, post partum in judicium deduxa est. Synodus cognitionem "causa Anysio Thessalonicii cum Episcopis ipsi subjecitis delegavit;" Ab
§ 14. That Savinian a Monk was called a Heretick, for Doctrines judged sound by Protestants, is no strange thing. That one not a Bishop was the Head of a Heresie, was somewhat strange then, but not before they got too high.

As to the Question, Whether Bishops were the Chief Heads and Fomenters of Heresie, I crave his impartial Answer to these Questions. 1. Do not your selves maintain that all Churches in the world had Bishops; and that the Bishops were the Rulers, and of Chief Power? If so, can you imagine that after they had such Power, Churches could be usually made Hereticks without them?

2. 2. Do not Councils, and all Church-History tell us how many Councils of Hereticks there have been that were Bishops?

3. 3. If any Presbyter broke from his Bishop to set up a Heresie, was it not one that sought to be a Bishop? Or did they not make presently him or some other their Bishop and Head? Heresie or Popery had made but small progress, had it not been for Bishops.

§ 15. When I commend the Novatians Canon, which allowed all men Liberty for the Time of Easter, as better than burning men as Hereticks, he takes it for an Immoderate Transport that I say ["as loud as I can speak, If all the Proud, Ambitious, Hereticasing part of the Bishops had been of this mind, O what sin, what scandal, and what shame, what cruelties, confusions and miseries had the Christian world escaped?] That is, had they left such Indifferent things as Indifferent.

And is this against Moderation? I would such Zeal of God's House had more eaten me up: Dare you deny but that this course would have saved the Lives of all those thousands of Albigenses, Waldenses, and Bohemians that the Papists killed: And the death and torment of multitudes by the Inquisition? And the burning of our Smithfield Martyrs: And it's like most of the Wars between the Old Popes and Emperours about Investitures? And the blood of many thoufand more. And it would have saved more Nations than ours from the Tearing and Division of Churches by the Ejecting and Silencing of hundreds or thousands of their Pastors, as the case of the Germane Interim, and other
such actions prove. And is it *immoderate transport to with all this Blood, Schism, Hatred and Confusion*, and weakening and shaming of the Church had been prevented at the rate of *tolerating Indifferent things*: No wonder if you had rather England still suffered what it doth, and is in danger of by Schism, than such things Indifferent shall be tolerated: It is not for nothing that Christ and Paul repeat, that some have Eyes and see not, Ears and hear not, &c.

§ 16. And here he again would make his Reader think it's true, that the Nonconformists pretend that their Silencing is for not keeping *Easter Day at the due Time*; as if this man that liveth among us did not know, that *it is the avoiding of deliberate Lying by subscribing to a known untruth*, which is the thing that they refuse; and they mention it only as an appurtenance of the *Imposition ad homines*, that it would bind them to *two different times*.

Whether, as he faith, our disease be a *wantonness fed by concession, and we are most violent when we know not what we would have*, those men are no credible Judges that for seventeen years would not endure us to speak out our Case; and when before we debated part of it, would not vouchsafe to answer us; and at last when we tell it them, do but accuse us with a sharper storm, instead of giving any thing that a man can call an Answer that ever knew the Case, *e.g.* to our *Plea for Peace*, and my *Treatise of Episcopacy*.

§ 17. He confesseth that I praise the *African Bishops* as the best in the world, though it contradict his former charge. As to the *Magnitude of Dioceses*, when he hath answered my Treatise of Episcopacy, some body may be edified by him.

I agree with him that Good men will do much Good in a great Diocesan. But 1. Worldly Bishops are so far bad: And worldly Wealth and Honour will ever be most sought by the most worldly men: And usually he that seeks shall find—*Ergo*—And

2. A good man cannot do *Impossibilities*: The best cannot do the work of many hundred.

Forty two years ago some wished for the Restoring of Confession.

*Theophilus Parochialis* brings copious Reasons and Orders of Princes, Popes and Prelates, that all should confess to the Parish-Priest. If you had set this up here, how many men must have gone
gone to it in the Parishes of St. Martin, Giles Cripplegate, Stepney, &c: But how much greater work hath Dr. Hammond, and Old Councils, cut out for him that will be the sole Bishop of many hundred Parishes? I have named it elsewhere.

And, if any man of consideration think I have not proved against Mr. Dodwell, that Bishops' Government is not like a King's, who may make what Officers under him he please, but depends more as a Physician's or School-master's on Personal Ability, I will now add but this Question to him [Why is it that Monarchy may be hereditary, and a Child or Infant may be King] but an Infant may not be Bishop, nor any one not qualified with Essential Ability? I have at large told you how sharply Baronius and Binnius condemn that odious Nullity of making a Child (by his Father's Power) A Bishop of Rhemes.

If I heard twenty men say and swear that one man is sufficient to be the only Master of many hundred Schools, or Physician to many hundred Hospitals, or that one Carpenter or Mason may alone build and rear all the Houses in the City after the Fire, or one man be the sole Master of an hundred thousand Families; what can I say to him, but that he never tried or knows the work?

§ 18. When I note that the Donatists took themselves for the Catholicks; and the Adversaries for Schismaticks, because they were the greater number, he very honestly faith, that Multitude may render a Set formidable, but it's no Argument of Right.

Very true; nor Secular Power neither. But what better Argument have the Papists, and many others that talk against Schism?

§ 19. He thinks the Donatists Bishops Churches were not so small as our Parishes. Answ. Not as some: But if, as I said before, Constantinople in the height of all it's Glory in Chrysostom's daies, had but 100000 Christians, as many as three London Parishes have, judge then what the Donatists had.

§ 20. His double quarrel with Binnius and Baronius, let who will mind. What I gathered out of those and other Canons of the smallness of Churches then, I have elsewhere made good: His Reviling Accusations of Envy to their Wealth, deserveth no Answer.

§ 21. He comes to St. Theophilus's Case, of which we spake before.
The Monks that reported evil of him, were, it may be, faith he, downright Knaves. The Reviling is blameless when applied to such. Doubtless they were ignorant rash Zealots: But one that reads what the Egyptian Monks were in Anthony’s daies, and after, and what Miracles and Holiness, Sulpitius Severus reporteth of them, and why Basil retired into his Monastery, &c. may conjecture that they had much less worldliness than the Bishops, and not greater faults.

§ 22. I think it not desirable or pleasant work to vindicate the credit of Socrates and Sozomen accusing Theophilus: But if his Conjectures in this case may serve against express History of such men, and so near, let him leave other Histories as loose to our Conjectures. Posthumianus Narrative in Sulpitius, is but of one piece of the Tragedy. He thinks it improbable that Origen should be accused for making God Incorporeal; and such Conjectures are his Confutation of History: But Origen had two sort of Accusers; the Bishops, such as Theophilus and Epiphanius had worse charges against him: But the Anthropomorphite Monks were they that brought that Charge against him (that God had no face, hands, eyes.) And Theophilus before them cryed down Origen in general, to save his life, by deceiving them, that they might think he did it on the same account as they did. This is Socrates his Report of the Case.

He faith, that the Impudent Mutinous Monks were not ashamed to tell all the world, that all that were against them were Anthropophites.

Answ. It was other Monks that I here talk not of, that he means: It was these Monks that were Anthropomorphites themselves, and would have killed Theophilus for not being so, till he said to them, Methinks I see your faces as the Face of God: And the name of the Face of God did quiet them. Hierem was a Party against Chrysostom; it was for not passing that Sentence on Origen, that Epiphanius would by masterly Usurpation have imposed on him, that Chrysostom was by him accused.

§ 23. Could any Sobriety excuse that man Epiphanius, that would come to the Imperial City, and there purposely intrude into the Cathedral of one of the best Bishops in the world, for Parts and Piety, and there play the Bishop over an A. Bishop in his own Church, and seek to set all the Auditory in a flame at the time of Publick Worship, and require him to say that of Origen,
Origen, which he there without any Authority imposed on him? I know not what is Pride, Usurpation, Turbulency, if not Malignity, if this be not.

But at last he faith, ["I do not intend to excuse Theophilus in this particular: (Thank Pope Innocent) He did certainly procure his Resentment too far: But he was not the only man: Epiphanias, a person of great Holiness; Hierom, and several other persons renowned for their Piety, were concerned in the persecution of this Great man, as well as he: And to say the truth, this is their weakness; for that Severity which gives men generally a Reputation of Holiness, though it mortifie some irregular heats, yet is apt to dispose men to prudence.]

But true Holiness ever sincerely loveth holy men, and specially such as are publick Blessings to the Church: And though I censure not their main State, your Holy Persecutors of the best of Christ's Servants, will never by Christ be judged small Offenders.

Alas! it's too true that Theophilus was not alone: A Council of Bishops were the Persecutors. And it's hard to think that they loved Chrysostom as themselves. When the forementioned Council at Constantinople had turned out Nazianzen, even the great magnifiers of General Councils, Baroinius and Binnius, thus reproach them, that they drove away a holy excellent man, that a man was set up in his stead that was no Christian; that it was the Episcopi Nundinarii that did it, the Oriental Bishops first leaving them, and going away with Gregory. And if the Major Vote of that General Council were Episcopi Nundinarii, what Chrysostom's Persecutors were may be conjectured. Do not these Papiists here say worse of them than I do?

§ 24. Yet though he confesses as much as is aforesaid, and bring but his Conjectures mixt with palpable omissions against the express words of Socrates and Sozomen, he hath the face to make up his failing with this Calumny ["I have dwelt so long on this, not only to vindicate Theophilus, but to shew once for all the manner of our Author's dealing with his Reader in his Church-History. Any scandalous Story, though it be as false and improbable as any in the Aani Mirabiles, or Whites Centuries of Scandalous Ministers, any Fiction that reflects with disgrace on Bishops and Councils is set down for authentick, no matter who delivers it, friend or foe."]

Ansiv.
therefore there is no great credit to be given them in these 
Relations, as manifestly espousing the Cause and Quarrel of
the Novatians.]

Answ. 1. Just as Thuanus or Erasmus espoused the Cause of
the Protestants by Truth and Peace, when others hated and be-
lied them. 2. Methinks the man revileth me very gently in
comparison of Socrates and Sozomen, the two most impartial and
credible of all our Antient Church-Historians (with Theo-
dorot.) But who can wonder that he imitateth that which he
defendeth.

§ 4. But he faith, [It may be the Novatians deserved it---and
it’s not unlikely that they were very troublesome and seditions.]

Answ. It’s not unlikely now that others will say it was so. But
mark Reader which of these Historians is most credible [Socra-
tes and Sozomen lived with those that knew the things and per-
tons: They have told us Truth in the rest of their Histories: If
they had been Novatians, Mr. M. faith, They believed sinning
after Baptism had no pardon or absolution: And were they not
like then to fear such Lying and false Accusing as paints a Saint
like the Devil or Antichrist.] On the other side [Mr. M. liveth
above a thousand years after them: He is one of the Party that
take it to be not only lawful, but a duty to say and swear all
that is imposed now, which I will not here describe: How truly
he writes the History of his own Age, even of Parliament and
Wars, and living persons, I have told you. He faith no more
against the Historians credit here, but [it may be] and [it’s not
unlikely] and [they were Novatians, Schifmaticks, Alexandrians.]
Even so their Counterminers, and many Conformists, that have many
years reported us to be Raising a War against the King, bad
their [May-be’s] and [It’s not unlikely] and [they are Schisma-
ticks] to prove it: And others soon rose up and swore it. And
when some lament their Perjury, it stops not the rest. But some
have such Free-will, that they can believe whom they lift.

§ 5. Socrates, faith he, makes it part of his charge that he
took on him the Government of temporal Affairs. This was not the
Usumption of the Bishop, but the Indulgence of the Emperour: And
he shews the Churches need of it.

Answ. That which he is charged with is, that he was the
first Bishop that himself used the Sword. And 1. Do you think
that so great a Patriarchate & Diocets would not find a conscio-

nable Pastor work enough, without joyning with it the Magistrates Office? 2. Was not the Church greatly changed even so early from what it was a little before in the daies of Martin and Sulpitius, when even Ithacius durft not own being so much as a seeker to the Magistrate to draw the Sword against gross Hereticks; and the best Bishops denied Communion with them that sought it: And now a Bishop himself becomes the striker not of gross Hereticks, but such as peaceable Bishops bore with.

I remember not to have read that Cyril had any Commission for the Sword from the Emperour: Others then had not: But I deny it not.

§ 6. He faith, that elsewhere I say [I shal not dis honour such, nor dis obey them.] Answ. I say and do so: If a Bishop will take another Calling from the King's Grant, when he hath undertaken already 40 times more work as a Diocefan than he can do, Ile honour and obey him as a Magistrate: But I would be loth to stand before God under the guilt of his undertaking and omissons.

§ 7. As to all the rest of the History about Cyril's Executions, and the wounding of Orestes the Governour, I leave it between the Credit of Mr. M. and Socrates: And he very much suspeets the Story of Cyril's making a Martyr of him that was executed for it: I leave all to the Reader's Judgment. I think I may transcribe Socrates without flanding Cyril.

Here his spleen rising, faith [There are men in the world that honour such as Martyrs for murdering a King.]

Answ. You may smell what he insinuates: I think he will not say, that he ever did more against them than thofe that they call Presbyterians have done. We Wrote and Preacht against them when he did not. I know not the Presbyterian living to my remembrance, that was not against the Murder of the King, and Prin, whom the Bishops had cropt and stigmatized for being against them, as an Erastian, was the hottest in the Parliament, for the Execution of the King's Judges: But I knew divers Conformifts that have written or spoken to justify or excuse that Fact.

§ 8. As for the Murder of Hypatia, I leave him to his scuffle with Socrates and Damascius, in which I interest not my self.

§ 9. I thank Pope Innocent Mr. M. durft not deny Cyril's faults,
faults, in his Enmity to the memory of Chryzostom; and yet he
calls my reciting the matter of Fact a reproach. He is constrain-
ted to confess [* That the Quarrel was it seems hereditary to him-
*(So is Original Sin) and he did prosecute it beyond all equity or
"decency against the memory of a dead man: This was a fault, and
* and he that is without any, or without any particular animosity,
"specially if he be in any eminent place, let him cast the first stone.] 

Answ. Thanks to Conscience: We feel your Animosities: But
is not this man a Railing Accuscer of Cyril, if I am such? What
faith he less in the main? Yea he now renues his Accusation of
his Predecessor, saying, It was hereditary. To prosecute malice
against the very name of a holy extraordinary Bishop, beyond
all equity and decency—what will Christianity or Humanity call
it? But Faction faith, it was a fault, and he that is without any, &c.
Thus talkt Eli to his Sons: So one may say, To Silence 2000
Ministers, or to hate the best men, and seek their ruin, is a
fault, a Prelatical peccadillo; and so was Bonner's usage of the
Martyrs; and let him that is without any call the first stone.
And St. John faith, He that hateth his Brother is a murderer, and
none such hath Eternal Life abiding in him; and that as Cain, he
is of the Evil One, the Devil. And I believe him.

§ 10. But he faith, I injuriously charge him with calling Alex-
ander a bold faced man, when Atticus was the first Author of that
word.

Answ. Atticus mentioned Alexander's confident true and ne-
cessary Counsel; Cyril contradicting it, calls the man, A man
of a confident face or mouth. If another Bishop said the first words
before him, do I wrong him in saying he said the second? O
tender men! His urging the keeping up the names of such as
Nectarius and Arsacius, and casting out Chrysostomus, is so like
our Canons about Readers and Nonconformists, and our Cano-
neers descriptions of their Country Parsons, and the Puritans,
that I wonder not that you defend him.

§ 11. But he faith, that It's a little unchristian to blast his
memory with the faults which he corrected in his life-time.]

Answ. 1. It's necessary to tell that truth which blasteth the
Reputation of such sin as was growing up towards Papacy.
Answ. 2. Then Christ was unchristian to tell the Jews of their very
Fathers murders of the Prophets, while they disclaimed it, and
built their Sepulchres, Mat. 23. And then it was unchristian in
the.
the Holy Ghost, to blast the memory of Adam, Noe, Lot, David Solomon, Peter, yea or Manasseh, with sins repented of. 3. History must speak truth about things repented of; or else it will but deceive the world. 4. The Honour of God, and Goodness, and Truth, must be preferred before our own Honour. Repentance, if true, will most freely confess a man's own sin, and most fully shame it.

§ 12. Whether all his far-fetched Conjectures that Cyril repented, be true or no, is nothing to me. I will hope he did, though I never saw it proved: The very last Sentence of Death might do it. His retortion is, [I know no man deeper engaged in the Contentions of the Church (than I) The writing of his Eighty Books being but like so many pitch'd Battels he has fought, and most commonly in the dark, when he was hardly able to discover friend from foe.]

Answ. It's too true, that being all written for Peace, the Enemies of Peace have fought against them. Nimis dul habitation, anima mea inter orores pacis. But pro captr Lectoris, &c. All men take not the words of such as he for Oracles. How much I have written and done for Peace, let others read and judge. I long laboured and begg'd for Peace in vain with such as he defendeth. And it's admirable if this pitiless Enemy of Sects and Errors can be for all the Sects and Errors that I have written against. Have I in the dark taken for foes by Error the Atheists, the Insidels, the Sadducees, the Hobbists, the Quakers, the Ranters, the Papists, the Socinians, the Libertines called Antinomians, the Anabaptists, the Separatists, and Sects as Sects? Be of good comfort all: These Prelatists that accuse us for too dark and sharp Writings against you, seem to tell you that they will more hate persecuting or distressing you; Yes when they agree with themselves.

His Prayer that I may have a more honorable opinion of Repentance he calls me to speak to in the End.

§ 13. Whether good Isidore Pelusiotus were a man ["very easy to take any impressions, and upon false information charge the Cyril with prosecuting his private quarrells with Nestorius under pretence of zeal for the faith"] I leave all men to believe our Accuser as they see cause. And the same I say of that which is so great a Controversie among the Critical Historians, whether Theodoret's Epistle to job. Ant. against Cyril be Counterfeit, or
were written on a false rumour of Cyril's death. Their 5th General Council hath it. Baronius and Binnius say, some Eutychian knave hath corrupted the Acts of that Council. Must Councils be the Laws of all the world, and hath the Church and Tradition kept them no better, that we know not when we have them truly? Leave us then to the universal Laws of God.

§ 14. He faith truly that [the Council of Ephesus was chiefly directed by the authority of Cyril] Anf. And so was that at Trent by the authority of the Pope And when he hath confused the credible History which tells us of the womens and Courtiers hatred of Nestorius, and proved that the Emperour and Pulcheria the Empress were but one, I will grant that the authority of the Court directed not Cyril; and that then and now Bishops neither were nor are directed by the Civil powers.

§ 15. When I spake against Nestorius his cruelty to Sectaries he asketh [What Hereticaters were better than the Presbyterians in 1646. The Inquisition is not more severe than their ordinance against Heresies, which they desired should be made felony and punished by death &c.].

Anf. Reader Judge of the mans Credit as to ancient History still by his truth about the Present age. 1. The Inquisition he faith, is not more severe. Do I need to answer this to any man of 50 years of age? It's Capable of no answer but what he will call by some name deserved by his own.

2. I can find no such ordinance: He faith It was offered? Is that all? And by whom? Was it the body of the Presbterians, or who?

3. What were the Heresies named by them? Were they not down right Blasphemy?

4. Who and how many were ever either tormented or put to death for Heresie, from 1641 till 1660: I remember not one, save that James Nayler was imprisoned and whipt, and had his Tongue bored for blasphemous Personating Christ; and that not by the Presbyterians.

5. Why are they so ordinarily reproached by the Prelatifts for tolerating all Sects here in England?

6. What if all this had been true? What is it to me or any of my mind? I never had a hand in persecuting one man, to my remembrance. How few can you name of all the Nonconformists now in England, that had any hand in the Severities you mention?
mention? I know not four in England, that I remember. And what's this to us any more than to you?

7. And was it well done, or ill? If well, why do you liken them to the Inquisition? Are you for it? If ill, why do you plead for it in others? Imitate it not if you dislike it.

For my part, as I am against all Sects as such, I am much more against the cruelty of any. I stick no more at the disgracing the Presbyterians sins, than yours: And I am readier to disgrace my own than either, if I can know them. I would cherish Errors no more than you; but I would not ruin or imprison every such of your selves as have too many. Heresie must have its proper cure. I thank God I had once an Orthodox agreeing Flock. But again I say, the Presbyterians were too impatient with Difsenters; and it's better have variety of Fish in the Pond, than by the Pikes to reduce them to special unity.

§ 16. He faith that Neftorius consequentally denied the God-Head of Christ. p. 192. Next he hath found a contradiction in my words, that the Emperor was weary of this sirs: And yet that Cyril did it to please the Court. These critical men can make their two hands enemies to each other. How came he waking to dream that this was a contradiction, when Historians tell us that the Women and Courtiers hated both Chrysostome and Neftorius? He implyeth that the Emperor and the Court were all one, or of one mind. But I am not bound to believe him, no more than of many other Emperours whose Wives kept up one party and they another. And I pray you why should we be confident that Theodosius 2. himself called an Eunuchian by the hereticating Bishops, was not against Neftorius when he called that Council, & at first Condemned both him and Cyril, and after him alone? I did but recite the Historians words, and was that forgetfulness?

§ 17. His many words about this controversy with Neftorius are the most unworthy of any answer of all his Books: sometime he faith as I, as p. 193: [It had been happy for the Church if the mysteries of our Religion had never been curiously disputed: sometime he confesseth that Neftorius spake the same thing with Cyril, that Christ had two natures in one Person: ibid. And that he expresseth himself one would think very orthodoxly. p. 202: But the Heretick dissimmbled and bid his sense. And so this man after above 1000 years knew the mans mind to be contrary to his words: whereas it's palpable to him that readeth the Histories, that the man
spake as bad at least as Nestorius. He oft confesseth (for he cannot deny it) [that he doth frequently own but one nature] p. 197, and 198. [that there is but one nature of the word incarnate] to p. 201. &c. But Cyril meant well, that is, by Nature he meant Person. And was not this Eutychian Speech as improper as Nestorius' is? Is the nature and Person to be confounded? Did the Fathers speak thus? If Nature put for Person be pardonable, why is it not pardonable to prefer a denomination a proprietate vel forma, to another? And thus you make Cyril to differ from the Eutychians, in their different meanings while they used the same words. If I had said that Christ had but one Nature I should have had a censure otherwise measured.

And though this man seem to deny it, I have cited many of his words in which he saith [Duas naturas unitas afferimus: post unionem vero tanquam adempta jam in duas distinctiones, unam esse credimus filii naturam, tanquam unius sed incumati & incarnati & ad susc. Nihil injusti facimus dicentes, ex duabus naturis factum esse concursum in unitatem: Post unionem vero non distinguimus naturas ab invicem. But I have cited enough before.

The sum and truth is, to judge no one but my self, I must be blind by ignorance or partiality if I be not past doubt, 1. That unskillful explication was their difference. 2. That Cyril's words were Eutychian. 3. That Nestorius' words were orthodox in the main, but not sufficiently yielding to a tolerable phrase. 4. That they both meant the same thing. 5. That all their war was managed, 1. For want of distinguishing fully the Abstract [Deitatem] and the Concrete [Deum]; 2. For want of distinguishing [Qua Deus] from [Qua Deus] and a strict formal expression from a more lax that's tolerable. And 3. For want of distinguishing [division] from [distinction] of natures. 4. For want of explaining the various sorts and senses of [Unity] and [Plurality.] I cannot but know this to be true, though Mr. M. scorn me for it.

What [I that understand not the language they wrote in to pretend to know better than the Council?] Ans. 1. So say the Papists: what? will you pretend to know more than the Church and Councils? If it be implicite faith that they are bringing us to, let them tell us which Councils we must so believe when they condemn each other? 2. I thought I could make shift to understand their language, though I be no critic in it: But if he know me
me better, I strive not for the reputation of Learning; not only Baronius and Binnius, and all the rest that he nameth that had no skill in Greek, but most of the Schoolmen, seem to me without it, far more Learned than he. I can tell him of Lads whose Learning I admire not, that shall vie with him in Languages Oriental and Occidental, and give him odds; And when he scorns Derodons distinctions, telling us it's making two bad Groats by sitting a Sixpence, &c. I leave him to glory in his Confusion: But I suspect the Fox that speaks against Tails is like enough to want one himself.

But when he hath shewed in all this History of Neftorius, Cyril, and the Council, little but that partiality which can talk confidently to the ignorants for any cause, without any shew of confuting Derodons justification of Neftorius, or my Conciliations, his craft or passion attempts to divert the Reader by the art of the times, and as if it must stop our Mouths from lamenting the sin of Hereticators, and misery of the Church thereby, he tells us how men in these times call them Papists that are none.

Anf. If it be ill done, why condemn you your self by defending those that did the like? If it was well done in Bishops Councils, why not in them? 2. But what's this to me, if it be not me that he means? If it be, 1. If you will read but the last part of my Cathol. Theolog. judge of the mans front. 2. It is none but those that are for a humane Sovereignty over all the Church on Earth that we judge Papists: And if you judge them not such, we will thank you to tell us what a Papist is in your own sense.

§ 18. His saying p. 225. that [John Comes that gives a sad account of the Council is much to be suspected, &c. doth but tell us that he would have your belief of History guided by the Interest of his Cause.

§ 19. As to his scorn against my translating the words [the Scripture and Sacred] which mean that imperial Scripture, I did think a litteral Translation could not have been judged a misunderstanding or mistranslation: Why may they not be called in English what they are called in Greek? And he had a strong imagination if he thought that Hausers Translation of Eusebius, &c. afforded me such materials as these.

§ 20. His conclusion of some that scorn to preach by the Licence of the Government I before mentioned. The Truth and ministerial
ministerial Honesty of it, is much like as if Thousands should petition the Bishop, that their sick families may have licensed Physicians, and he reje&eth all their Petitions, and prevaileth with the Parliament to do the like: At last the King pittheth them, and licenseth the Physicians, and the Bishop and his Clergy are offended, and get it revoked, and the Physicians praftife at their peril without lence: And our credible Historian fhou'd record it, that they scorned to praftife as licensed by the Government, even while still they make all the Friends they can to the Clergy to be licensed, and are not able to prevail. But the ages that knew not them and us, that are to come, may possibly believe these men as they believe their Predecessors.

§ 21. To conclude, Reader, if now thou have any fense of Christian Intereft, Unity and Love, judge of the whole cafe impartially, and begin with notorious matter of fact.

1. We find at this day a great Body of Christians, called Neftorians, inhabiting the Countries of Babylon, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Parthia, and Media, yea, spread Northerly to Caraya, and Southerly to India; abundance of them even in Tartary, faith Paulus Vener. See Brierwood p. 139. And we find that they are by the Western Churches, if not the Greeks, called Heretics, and at the eafteft Schifmaricks. And yet as those very Friars that have lived among them fay, they are commonly free from any fuch Opinions as are charged on them, but only honour the name of Neftorius, and condemned the Councils that condemned him. This Mr. M. nor no Prelate will deny that retaineth humanity.

2. We find that this woful fraction hath continued about one Thousand two Hundred and thirty Years.

3. We are put to enquire, what was and is the cause; and we find that on both fides it is the Bifhops and their Clergy that now continue it, and it was Patriarchs and their Bishops that at first caused it.

4. We enquire how they did it: And Mr. Morrice confefleth that it began in a dispute between the two Patriarchs (whether the Virgin Mary was to be called The Mother of God, or rather The Mother of Jesus Chrift who is God and Man: and that on this occasion Cyril charged Neftarins, as making Chrift to be two Perfons, and he himfelf faid Chrift incarnate had but one Nature, but had no more skill in speaking, than by one Nature to mean
mean one Person; (though *Derodon* labour to prove that he meant worse,) that *Nestorius* professed two Natures in one Person. And Mr. M. faith, *Nestorius* when he spake well meant ill, and *Cyril* when he spake ill meant well. And upon this a General Council itself is first divided about them; even to blows: and after by the importunity of *Cyril's* party, *Nestorius* is banished, and the Bishops divided, fome for one, and fome for another to this day. Another Council is called at *Calcedon*, and confirmeth the Condemnation, and the *Nestorian* Bishops condemn that Council, and for many Ages the Bishops were divided also about that, one part condemning it, and the other subscribing to it, and honouring it. Judge now what these Bishops have done to Christian Religion and the Church of Christ, and continue to do: And if you dare join with our Canoneers in making the guilt your own, by justifying such dismal work; the further you go, the more of it you have to justify, till your Souls have guilt and load enough.

Honest Dr. *Moore* charged with Nestorianism, is fain to accuse *Nestorius* out of his Enemies words to clear himfelf: That he owned not a [*Physical Union of Natures*] is an ambiguous, unsafe word: A Physical Union seems to signifie one *quod* which is not to be faid. He never denied a personal or Hypoftatical Union. And if he had (as he did not) opposed the word *Hypoftasis*, fo did *Hierom* that was no Heretick, and many more for a long time.

I suppose Mr. M. is not more zealous against Nestorianism than the Hereticating Church of Rome is: And how great they really thought the *Nestorian* Heresie, the story which I mention of P. *Hormifda* tells you, which I will repeat. [There arose a controversy whether it might be faid that [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] Pope *Hormifda* faid [*No*] because they that were for it were suspected to be *Eutychians*: The *Nestorians* laid hold on this, and faid, [*Then we may not fay that Mary was the Parent of one of the Trinity.*]. This was a hard case: *Justinian* fent to Pope *John* about it. His infallibility and *Hormifda's* were contrary: he and his Council fay that we may fay, that [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] Hereupon *Baronius* and *Binnius* give us a useful note, [*Ita mutatis hostibus arma mutari nceffe fuerit.*] What should the World do if we had not had fuch a Judge of Controversies, I hope Mr. M. will not be fo heretical, or schifmatical,
as to say that either of these Popes erred against an Article of Faith: But will rather recant his Accusation of Nestorius, and number this with Things Indifferent, which the Church hath power to change at her pleasure.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Council of Ephesus 2d.

§ 1. That our Historian may justify the Dividers he makes himself a Party, and by downright mistake against both faith, 1. That Nestorius fell into Blasphemy, denying Christ to be true God. 2. And that Eutyches denied Christ to be true Man. This is our Reformer of History; when both of them professed Christ to be true God, and true man. I doubt not but the Man can write another Book to justify this; for what is it that some cannot talk for? Yea, he is at it again, p. 230. that Eutyches held Christ not to be true Man.

§ 2. He confesseth again that Cyril affirmeth but one Nature, and meant but one Person, and that Eutyches used the same words, but faith, sure they cannot be so mad as to fall out so violently when they say the same thing & words. Flavian could not be so foolish or so wicked, &c. Anf. I justify not the words of Eutyches or Cyril; but if I have great reason to believe, that as he confesseth Cyril so gross as to use quos for uesto, so Eutyches who had far less Learning than Cyril, did word amiss the conceptions, which were the same with Cyril's, I leave it to this mild Censuror to call them Fools, and mad, and wicked. It's taken for railing in me to blame them.

§ 3. He saith [Cyril never said there were two Natures in Christ before the Union. Anf. I have twice cited his words: Find a true difference between them and those of Eutyches if you can. I believe they both meant better than they spake.

§ 4. But the Spirit of detraction useth to fetch Accusations from Hearts, & Thoughts, and secret Actions, and so doth he against Eutyches; and he saith this hath been done of late times, To deliver that in select Meetings, which they will not in publick promiscuous Assemblies: as evil Spirits are under restraint in consecrated places. Anf.
Therefore it is that the Nonconformists have 20 or 19 years so earnestly beg'd for leave to preach in publick consecrated places to promiscuous Assemblies, that they might be out of suspicion, but could never obtain it of this sort of Masters. Ex ore tuo-- Thus they that cast the stone at others oft find it hit themselves. Mr. Edwards Gangrena is here commend-ed to those that are for Toleration. As if all differences were equally intolerable or tolerable: And he that faith [Tolerate not those that preach Blasphemy or intolerable error,] said no worse than he that faith [Silence Two Thousand Preachers, unless they will Profess, Promise, and Swear, and do all that is (oft described) imposed on them.

§ 5. In his Narrative he is no more tender of the honour of Bishops it seems than I am, nor so much of Emperours; for when he had said the Emperour [was too much addrest to this kind of Vermine (Eunuchs) and shews his bitterness against Flavian, he faith that the Letters which called this Council suggested sufficiently what it was to do, and that their business was to condemn a Bishop the Emperour did not care for, though without any just ground, nay, for his honesty.

I deny none of this: But were the Bishops of the Catholick Church in a good case then, that, when they knew before that they were called to such a work as this, would meet in a General Council and do it? No; he accuseth them himself, I need not do it.

The Emperour, he faith, knew how to choose Bishops, (and yet his Summons was general to all to come,) and the President, if half be true that is said of him, (and if that be a doubt, how credible are your Historians?) was one of the most wicked, profligate Wretches in the World,] yet he was one of the Patriarchs, and all the Council Bishops, and till they met, were not thus accustated. You see the man is a far greater railer than I even against Bishops: But it is but against those that are against his Interest and fide.

§ 6. He describes those Bishops as using violence, forgetting that it is it his Party trusteth to continually: just with the front as Baronius and Binnius, and many other Papists, justify Martin for being against putting Hereticks to death, and condemn Ithacius, while their Kingdom is upheld by that which they condemn, and worse, even the burning of true Christians as Hereticks, and it's Heretical with them to imitate Martin, just as those
those Matt. 23. Your Fathers killed the Prophets, and you build their Sepulchers, and say if we had lived in the days of our Fathers, we would not, &c.

§ 7. But in the passage I find our Historian in a more charitable mood to this Ephesine Council of Bishops than his Brethren, [How bad soever Dioscorus and this Council were, yet they are in my judgment to be looked on rather as favourers of Heresie than Hereticks, they followed the meaning I believe as well as the Words of Cyril.] Ans. And now I may hope I am Orthodox and Charitable when I have no less than his Judgment to justify mine. And Anatolius justifieth us both.

§ 8. But, Sir, now you are in a good Mood, will you consider,
1. Whether those Bishops and Councils that set the Christian World in that Flame that burneth dreadfully to this day, after above 1200 Years, were not guilty at least of a peccadillo or venial sin.
2. Whether they are imitable.
3. Whether this General Council had a supreme Legislative and Judicial power over all the Church on Earth, which all must obey and none must appeal from.

No: faith Bishop Gunning, It was a meeting of violent Robbers, Ans. But it was a General Council: which it seems then may be such.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the 4th General Council at Calcedon.

§ 1. He begins his Chapter comically, and notably derideth me for saying Pulcheria was the same that before at Ephesus had set the Bishops against Nestorius. Is this so ridiculous? It's well known that Historians make her very powerful with her Brother: she chose his Wife Eudocia, (They were long of two minds.) It's no wonder that she that got him condemned at Ephesus, got the the same further done at Calcedon, when she was Empress her self, having made Martian Emperor, and her nominal Husband, (for they were not conjugal to know each other.) Is there any thing in this that deserveth the stage? Though Theodosius be reproached by Popish Historians as
as an Eutychian, or a favourer of them, if credible honest Socrates may be believed, there have been few such Princes in the World, (for Piety, his House was a Church; for Patience, never seen angry; for Compassion, would never let a man die for Treason against himself.) But his Sister (a Woman eminent for Wit and Piety) was thought to govern him very much, & specially in the severities against Nestorius. Evagrius who bitterly reproacheth Nestorius, tells us of some writings of his that fell into his hand, in which he faith, that the Emperour was his friend, and would not sign his banishment, and laies the cruelties that he underwent on his Officer: and considering the case of a suffering man, I see nothing unseemly in the Letter to him, which Evagrius chargeth with contempt.

§ 2. My wish for the Churches Peace, that the unskilful words of Nestorius and Eutyches had been silenced by neglect, rather than the flame blown up by honouring them with two General Councils disputation, doth with this Gentleman deserve this Replication, [He cannot be more violent and outrageous, more bitter and malicious under all the provocations imaginable, than he is under that neglect which himself prescribeth for the cure.] Anf. If this be a true accuser, he can prove what he faith: It's easie to say this of any man: But if a man that hath a cholericke Stomack shall sware that there was Aloe in his Physick, his word is no proof. These are the men into whose hands we are by Gods permission fallen, while we are cast out, judged to silence, prifons, & beggary, if we do but repeat the words of the Laws and Canons, and in 17 Years time when most that they turned out are dead, if the rest at their own urgent demand do but tell them what they judge unlawful, and answer those that accuse them, they are outrageous, violent, bitter, and malicious. As if one that wounds me should sue me for saying, You hurt me. It's violence and an unpeaceableness to feel, but none at all in them to strike or to destroy. We will give you many thanks if you will hurt us no more than we do you.

§ 3. I said that one skilful healing man that could explicate ambiguous words, and persuade men to Love and Peace, till they understood each other, had more befriended Truth, Piety, and the Church, than the hereticating Councils did.] And why, faith he, may not that skilful man shew his skill in Councils, as well as else where?

Anf. Who denieth it? But the question is, how he shall be heard.
heard and prevail? I told you that here One man in one sentence did so, by differencing between mental distinguishing and dividing; even Basil of Seclencia, saying, [Cognoscimus duas naturas, non dividimus, neque divisas, neque confusas dicimus.] This was true and plain enough, to have ended all the quarrel: But who laid hold on it, or did improve it? What the better was Nazianzen for speaking well in the Council at Constantinople? Or Chrysostome for any thing he could say to the Bishops for himself? I hope few of all that great number of Councils that were Arian, Semiarian, Eutychian, Monoethelites, for Images, &c. were so bad as to have never a Bishop among them that could or would speak right: But did they prevail? In the very Council at Trent were more good Speeches than did prevail; and if Luther, Melanchthon, Zuinglius, and such others, had not done more good fingly by Writing and Preaching, than Dudithius could do at Trent, or any of them at Wormes, or Ratisbone, &c. there had been little done. What good did Philpor do in the Convocation? Some say one Paphnutius turned the Inclination of the first Nicene Council for good; But that hearing temper was too short or rare.

§ 4. Next he tells us, that [in many late Disputes of justification, &c. we find not that any of these healing men were able to reconcile Parties any more than the Councils of old.]

Answ. 1. If that were true, it's also true, that they have not made so great and many Parties as Councils did. We have not cast the world into so many Nations of Jacobites, Nestorians, and other Sects.

Answ. 2. Through God's mercy it is much better than such Historians would make men believe. Dr. Heylin tells us what work the Arminian Controversie made between Bishop Laud's Party, and the Parliaments and Abbots Party, as if it had set us all by the Ears. It is not so now: One of your Brethren lately tells us, how that Controversie is quieted: What Contention do you hear of among the Nonconformists about it? No man hath so much as writ a line, that I know of, against my Concilia-
notice of it. I (rarely) hear some preach against the Arminians: I take no notice of it, and there it dies: Whereas if one should write Challenges and Accusations to the Preachers, we might make work enough for all the Country. I never yet met with many such, but if you make not a War of it, and engage them by opposition, they grow weary themselves, and grow into un-observ’d neglect or contempt. Most of the spreading Errors and Contentions among us have come by the Bellows of too strong or imprudent Opposition or Disputes. I hear of no considerable Doctrinal Strivings among all the Nonconformists now in England. One Ignorant Uncalled Fellow is lately crept into London, and wrote proud Challenges for Antinomianism, and none answered him, and his is contemned and hath no Second that I hear of.

§ 5. Though he say [he is weary, yet he must not pass by, that when I mention Socrates his most high praise of Theodosiis (living under him) and the miracles which he faith God wrought for him; I say, if this be true, God owned his Moderation by Mirac-les, notwithstanding his favouring the Eutychians, more than he did any ways of violence.] And here the man hath found me in Contradiction, and faith, [These miracles could not countenance the Eutychian cause that was after. 2. That the Eutychians were the most violent men. Such Contradictions he and L’Estrange find in my Writings.

Ans. But, 1. Is it true that I said those miracles countenanced the Eutychian Cause? I said only that God owned the Moderati- on (not the Eutychian Opinion) of a man called an Eutychian by the Hereticators, notwithstanding his favouring the Eutychians. He was a man that studied the reconciliation of the contending Bish-ops, and was moderate towards all, but persuaded that the major Vote of the Bishops being against Nestorius, and for Cyril, and Dioscorus, it tended to peace to take that side. His Moderation was the same before the stir with Eutyches as after. I only said that God by miracles owned that mans moderation, who is charged with after favouring the Eutychians.

2. And what I spake of Moderation opposite to violence, in way of suppressing Hereticks, he feigneth me to speak it as opposite to violence in the Persons suppressed: I spake of Violence in the Prince as agent, and he feigneth me to speak of Violence in the parties that he dealt with. He may find matter at this rate
to write greater Volumes against any man. I read of none of the Heresies then contended about, Nestorian or Eutychian, but the accused Bishops were violent for them: But though they were all violent, yet if the question were, whether the Emperour should use violence or Moderation against them, I may say, that God owneth more the way of Moderation.

§ 6. P. 246. he faith [At Ephesus Eustathius was kied to death, and all those that durst defend him were threatened to be served in like manner.] Anf. Of this before: His memory failed him: It was not Eustathius but Flavianus. 2. Yet he after excuseth Diocres from Heresie; more Bishops than were Hereticks were violent.

§ 7. As to his Reflection, ["It may be he thinks the Emperour took a particular Delight in that kind of cruelty, and that he had rather one should be kied to death, than that he should be hanged or beheaded; which would not be much to the credit of his Moderation: And to say the truth, his Letter to Valentinian discovers a strange kind of Spirit; for there he justifies the proceedings of the Eutychians at Ephesus, and saies that all things were carried on with much freedom and perfect Truth, and Flavian found guilty of Innovating in Religion. This is but an ill sign, that Mr. B. is a hater of false History, when he lets this pass unreproued.

Anf. 1. Had I reproved such an Emperour, I might have expected that some of you would have published me an Enemy to Kings.

Anf. 2. Rather Sir, you and I should hence gather, that all men must have pardon and forbearance, and that for want of that, the names of Nestorians, Jacobites, Melchites, Greeks, Papists, Protestants, Lutheranes, Calvinists, Prelatists, and Presbyterians, &c. have almost swallowed up the Name, much more the Love of Christians.

Anf. 3. May it not conftit with modesty and the hatred of false History, to believe the high praiues of this Emperour, published by one that knew him in fo pious and credible words as Socrates speaks, as I before told you, giving him (to me) a more credible Canonization than the Pope could have done, as a man of eminent holinesse, wonderful Clemency, that would not let a Traitor go out of the Gates towards the place of Execution; and when he was moved to any Execution, answered, he had rather were
were he able, restore the Dead to Life: excelling all the Clergy in meekness, and never seen angry. May not I who am branded for a railer by meek Prelatists, be tolerated to think charitably of such an Emperour, and to wish that the world had many more such.

Ans. 4. Judges are taken for unjust if they will not hear both sides speak. And why should not I regard the words of such an Emperour, as well as of one half the Bishops against the other?

Ans. 5. Surely Modesty requireth me to think that the Emperour was much more capable of knowing the truth of the acts of his own Subjects, when his Servants present gave him an account of them, than I am 1200 Years after: And so good a man would not willingly lye.

Ans. 6. Therefore my own Conclusion is, God is true and all men are Liars, that is, untrusty: and that Eudocia and his Courtiers had much power with him for Dioseorus against Flavi-an, as Pulcheria had against Nestorius; but that it was the Peace and Concord of the Bishops which he most studied, and thought that it lay in going with the major part. And I believe things were bad on both sides, and worse than the Emperour thought with the Eutychian Bishops, and worse than others say with their Adver-saries; and that the Emperour, though fallible, was as Socrates faith, beyond all the Clergie.

But here I see that I am blamed for not railing against a meek and pious Emperour, and as a Railer for lamenting the sins of the Clergie.

§ 8. About the Council of Calcedon he accuseth me in general, as [disingeniously mincing the Acts, and using all the soul play possible.]

Easily said: And what's the proof? Why, 1. Leave out that they were violently beaten to it.

Ans. The Reader may see that this is false: I mention it oft, pag. 101. [The Bishops answered, that they did it against their Wills, being under fear: Condemnation and banishment was threat-ened, Soldiers were there with Clubs and Swords.] Shall I believe this man against such as Socrates, of things done 1200 Years ago, that will face me down with such untruths about my own yet visible Writings?

2. But is it falsehood to omit what is said in such and so many Volumns? May not the Reader there see it? Do I contradict it? Must
Must I write many Folio's or nothing? I refer all Readers to the Acts.

§ 9. But he faith, [*It would go near to excuse their Compliance with a merciful man.*]

Ans. I confess such are not so bad as the Clergy-men, that will sin for more Preferment, and will write against, and revile, and call for Execution on those that will not do as they. But if Nonconformists after 19 Years Ejection and Reproach, and Sufferings by more than Threats, should at last surrender to heinous sin, can he think it would excuse their Compliance, when Christ faith, *Luk. 14, 33. He that forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my Disciple?* If he think Martyrdom a work of Supererogation, he is dangerously mistaken. And he that to day thinks Threatning and Danger an Excuse for his sin, may to morrow think Poverty, and the next day the desire of Preferment an excuse.

§ 10. Dioscorus and the Eutychians, holding close to the Council of Nice, as sufficient, as a Test of the Orthodox, to which nothing was to be added, in reciting this he hath found my Ignorance in translating *[retractat] by [retract.] Is not the English word of the same fence with the Latin? If not, and I be ignorant in English too, what wrong is that to any Bishop?

§ 11. When he had charged Nonsense and Confusion on that which he understand not, and mentioned *Fusb. Doril. giving the Lye to Eutyches,* he confesseth that the thing was true.

§ 12. *P. 253. He faith, When the giddy rabble of Monks with Swords and Staves, like Bedlams broke loose, run upon them*---- I should rather pity them than insult.

Ans. If the History be an insulting, his own credited Historians insult by recording it. If noting it as a fault be insulting, then a motion to Repentance is insulting, and if he would have us pity them for their sin, and not only for their suffering, that is insulting too: But to own their sin, and draw men to imitate them, shall be none of my Compassion.

He minds me of *Peter's Denial,* and the Disciples forsaking Christ. Alas! he is not a man that is not sensible of Humane frailty? But is it not therefore to be blamed? Why doth Scripture mention it; but that we may avoid the like? Is it to tempt others to the like? Did Christ insult when he said to *Peter, Get thee behind me Satan,* &c.

§ 13. He next falls into his familiar strain, to carry that *ex Cathedra*
Cathedra, by sentence, which he cannot do by proof, and faith. [When I venture on Observations it's an even lay that I am out.] Ans. That is, I am out of the way of his Magistracy, Preconceit and Interest.

It is my Conciliatory words that the peaceable man is angry at, viz. [That his dolesful, Contentious, Anathematizing, and running of each other, was about the sense of ambiguous words, and they were both of one mind in the matter and knew it not.] He cannot but confess, that my judgment of them is softer than theirs that heretick each other. And Derodon hath fully proved that this Council when they condemned Neftorius, were of his Judgment in the whole matter, and said but the same as he.

§ 14. As to his telling me, that Eutyches denied Chrift to be truly and properly man, I will no more believe him, than if he had said Cyril did so.

§ 15. But he faith, the Monothelites were the genuine Disciples of Eutyches. They were of his mind in that Consequence: And such another Controversie it was. And how much greater error against our Belief of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have I proved e. g. to be, in your Dr. Sherocks Book; And yet I hope he meant better than he spake.

§ 16. P. 255. He confesseth of one Party what I said, viz. ["Of Dyofo corsus and Flavian, I am apt to believe they were much of the same Opinion as to the point in controversy, and knew it well enough; which was the only cause why Dyo scor us with his party of Bishops and Monks, would not endure to come to any Debate of the matter, for fear it would appear that they all agreed, and then there would have been no pretence to condemn Flavian, which was the Design, if not of the Emperour, yet at least of those that governed him."]

Ans. Fie Dr. will you thus abuse so many Orthodox Bishops? And almost condemn your vindicating Book? And harden me in my Error? But I am much of your mind, and if one of us err, so doth the other.

§ 17. And I like his Ingenuity, saying Anatolius confesseth in Council, that Dyo scor us was not condemned for Herefie but Tyranny, and no man contradicted him. Ans. Not in answer to those words, but the Accusations of many contradicted him before.

§ 18. That they mean one thing by their various expressions. I have.
I have fully proved, and he now whit confuteath: That the Eutychians acknowledged no distinct Properties, and Nestorius owned an Unity but in Dignity and Title only, are his flat flanders, to be no way proved but by their Adversaries accusations. The very words I named even now, [Divino, mirabili, sublimi nexn.] and many clearer, shew it of Nestorius. And I wish him to take heed himself how he defineth the Hypostatical Union, left the next General Council (if ever there be one) make him an Heretick.

Can he believe that the great number of Eutychian Bishops were so mad, as not to know that Christ's Mortality, possibility, material Quantity, Shape, &c. were the properties of Christ's Humanity and not his Deity? But some Men can believe any thing well or ill, reasonable or unreasonable, as Interest and affection lead them.

§ 19. He faith, that [If it were a faction that denied this, it was a strong one, and never was opposed by any Person before Mr. Baxter.

Anf. I heard you were a young man; but if you be not above one Hundred Years old, your reading cannot be great enough to excuse this confidence from such temerity as rendereth you the less credible. How many Thousand Books be they which you or I never read? How know you that none of them all oppose it? But would you persuade the Reader that I call it a Faction, to believe your fence of these Councils? Factious men are forwardest to judge others Hereticks without cause; and all that I say is, that Though such deny my Assertion it is true: Doth it follow that I take all for factions that deny it? If I had said, [Though Papists deny it,] that had not been all one as to say, [All are Papists that deny it.]

2. But did never any person oppose it? 1. I named you David Derodon before, who though he largely labour to prove Cyril an Eutychian in words and fence, and that by which he did mean Natura, and not Persona, yet as to Nestorius he copiously proveth, that the Council of Calcedon was just of his Mind, and condemned him for want of Understanding him. Though you have not seen that Book of Derodon, I have, and you should not judge of what you never saw.

2. Luther de Concilis first accueth Nestorius as a Heretick, denying Christ's Godhead, or holding two Persons; And present-
ly retracts it, and confesseth he was seduced by believing the Papists, but (though he had not read much of the Councils, but what he had gathered out of the Tripartite and such Historians) yet he gathered from the Passages of the History, that the difference lay only in words, which he openeth at large, and yet turns it sharply against Nestorius, for thinking that we may not speak of Christ's Godhead or Manhood by communicated names or Attributes, and greatly rejoiceth that this serveth his turn in his Opinion about Confubstantiation and Sacramental words.

Because I will leave nothing in doubt with you, but whether Luther was before my days, and left you say again that I cite Books which I see not, I will give you some of his words, beginning earlier, (not translating left I have not skill enough) but they are so like mine, that I doubt you will be no Lutheran.

De Concil, pag. 175: Ecclesia Romana & C. P. ambitiose vixata sunt de re nihil, vanissimis & nugacissimis naniis donec tandem utraque horribiliter va{stata & delete est.— Illa omnia libentius recito, ut videat prudens Lettor quomodo ex tam celebris Synodo Constantinopolitana, seu ex fonde manaverint seminum maximarum Confusionum, propterea quod ibi Episcopus Ecclesia ut Patriarcha fuerat Praefidens.— p. 178. Quam horribilia certamina & contentiones moverunt hi duo Episcopi de primatu: ut facile judicari posset Spiritum sanctum non esse authorem hujus Instituti: Alia habet Episcopus longe potiora quae agat, quam sunt hi pueriles & inepti ludi.— Præmonemur quod Concilia, prorsus nihil novi debent comminisci vel tradere.

Mentioning the false accumulations of Nestorius, making two Persons, &c. [Atque adeo intricata & confusa sunt que scribunt, ut existimem ne quidem ipsos seire in bunc usque diem, quid & propter quas causas damnnaverint Nestorium. Hoc inde conjicto, Facientur credidisse Nestorium quod Christus sit Deus & Homo--- exhis certum est quod Nestorius non crediderit Christum esse purum hominem.--- Constat Nestorium non duos sed unum Christum credidisse, id quarum verba testantur---ideoque non potuit credere esse duas personas. Nec ullibi reperitur in historiis quod Nestorius unum Christum crediderit habere duas personas, nisi quod Pontifices & eorum historia ita arguantur. Apparet Papam & scriptores Pontificios hæc verba contra Nestorium calumniæ & veteratorie finxisse, quod Christum pro puro homine & non pro Deo, & quod unum Christum pro duabus personis vel gemino Christo habuerit.--- Nestorius fuit homo inflatus tumens Pharisaico fastu, & indoctus; et cum subito esset evexitus ad supremum.fastigium Ecclesiae, adeo ut haberetur pro summo Pontifice. Patriarcha, somniabat se umnum anteccellere doctrina & eruditione omnes homines in toto genere humano, nec ebi opus esse lectione librorum qui erant scripti à Majoribus aut aliis, nec in explicatione magnaram verum retinendos esse modos loquendi antiquitus receptos in Ecclesia puriore; sed quia & voce valebat, & ex temporali facundia volebat esse adversatoris, Doctore vel Magister, & formas loquendi quibus ipse eterum tantum recipiendas esse in Ecclesia, non alias. Et tali faetu armatus adorabatur illum articulum. Maria est mater Dei, aut generatrix Dei; Ibi vicissim Episcopos in adversa parte invent perinde inflatos, quibus vehementer diplicebat Nestorii faetus, in primis Cyrillum Alexandrinum: quia tunc nullus erat Augustinum aut Ambrosium---p. 189. Hinc manifestum est, quod Nestorius ut homo imprudens & vanissima persuasione adactus, loquantur quidem bono zelo de Christo: sed ex.
ex mira inscitia non intelligat quid & quomodo loquatur. — p. 192. Non est Nestorii error quod Christum credit tantum esse purum hominem, nec in duas personas eum diviri; sed duas naturas Deum & hominem in una persona uniri sектetur: sed communicationem idiomatum non vult concedere. Objiciat autem hic aliquis, Nestorium insidioso confessum esse, quod Christus Deus sit & una persona. Resp. Quod non: Tam ingeniösus enim & industrius non sit, sed serio ita judicavit.— Ad hoc accessit aliorum Episcoporum insolentia, qui non cogitaverunt quomodo sananda essent talia vulgära, sed multa magis irritandis & refricandis causam dederunt. Vide cat.era.

nitione, nec superbissimi errantes abjiciendi essent. Utinam meo judicio non respondet eventus: sed vereor profecto aliquos hereticos in novissimo die fieri judices; & illos ipsos Episcopos penes quos sit judicandi potestas, in aeternum damnatos, in Deos est mirabilis & incomprehensibilis in suis judiciis; nisi quod scimus cum esse propitium humilibus & infensissimum superbis. Et praesertim in Concilii & Ecclesiae nihil erat agendum Zelo vel invidia, vel superbia, quia Deus non potest ferre.

§ 20. Readers, you see what tedious work some men can make us: Many are scandalized, as if we gave them false History, if we do not thus confute them; and if we do, we tire our selves and you. If I should cite you many more thus to confute his falsity, that never person before me opposed that Faction, you would be weary of it.

§ 21. Yet now my hand is in, you shall see further how much Luther was for the same that I have written. [Qui voles poterit alterius legere at a Concilii, privata opera. Ego ad tudem & nau- seam usq; legi ista; ejusmodi Chaos ceremoniarum & confusionum est ibi, ut videatur recte judicasse Greg. Naz. qui Synodis eruditionis & sedationibus interfuit. & scribit [Sic affectus sum si dicendarum est veritas, ut malum omnes Episcoporum conventus vitare, quia nullus Synodi-sine vidit bonum, aut qui magis tolleret mala quam augeret. Nam cupiditas contentionis & principatus, & amalatio vincunt rationem. Ut profecto miror quod propter haec verba non dandum cum excommunicaverunt ut atrociissimum hereticum. Sed quid sit quod dicit in Synodis Episcopos certasse ambitione, superbia, quomodo, habes in hac Synodo clarissimum exemplum. Quod autem certum sit quod hic dicit se nullius Synodi vidisse finem bonum, docent nos historiae: Nam Ariana hesis jocos fuit ante Nicenum Concilium pra illa confusione quam ipsi post Concilium excitarunt, (that was not long of the Synod.) Talis etiam fuit Macedonici & Nestoriani Concilii. Nam illa pars qua est condemnata eo fuit conjunctione, ut tali specie concordiae & unitatis suas prestigias pingere quasi nulli justa ratione damnari possent. Sabinde excitarunt majora certamina contra Concilia quae ipsi non recte intelligebant.---

F. 247. Illud possim facillime probare quod miser ille Pastor in Hippone S. Augustinus plus docuit quam omnia Concilia---Dicam & quiddam amplius: Majus Lumen accedit Doctrina Christiana ex Catechismo puerili quam ex omnibus Conciliis. & oratio Dominica & decem pracepta plus continent doctrina & eruditionis quam omnia Concilia.
§ 2. Because I recite the words of the Bishops crying Pecca-

vīmus, he exclaimeth against me, as making Repentance and Re-
santation a derision, and this by the Spirit of Schism which is

nice in point of honour, no Conviction shall be able to reclaim it,

though in the most indefensible thing in the World.

Ans. Add but with the Inquiritors, [Therefore burn them as

hopeless,] and you are come to the end of your Lesson. The pe-
netrating Wits of some men are admirable. This man whose face

I never saw, knoweth my heart so much better than my self and

my acquaintance, that he can tell that it is to avoid dishonour

that I avoid Repentance, when I offer him my Oath, that if I

have any knowledge of my own desire, I would thank him as

my dearest Friend, who will by Evidence shew me any necessa-

ry truth that I deny, or Falshood that I hold, and will joyfully

publish my recantation.

2. And he can see Schism in my forbearing known and hei-

nous sin in the satisfaction of my Conscience, while I write, and

preach, and practise Communion with their Church, and can see

none in silencing Thousands, and ipso facto excommunicating ma-

ny more Thousands of godly Christians, and denying Baptism and

the Lords Supper to such as think it is sinful to do---- he knows

what.

3. And he can see those things to be most indefensible, which

after our best study we take to be clear, and can get no rational

Reply to our defence.

4. And (for want of memory or tenderness of his partners ve-

racity) when their Advocates have so oft and scornfully charged

me with Retractions, and also told the World how much my

own party (as they call them) speak against me, and my many

large and free oppositions to the faults of Nonconformists that

run into any extremity, do all proclaim how little I have set by

such honour; yea, when himself faith that I have fiercely con-
tended against all Sects and Parties, and they call me Ishmael,

whose hand is against every man: After all this to proclaim as

aforesaid, such obstinate Impenitence for the love of Honour, I

confess doth no more further my conviction than the Oath of

an Irish Witness would have done: For if he had sworn it, I

would have shewed my Books and their contrary testimony, and

have asked him, whose honouring of me is it that I buy so
dearly? It is not the Rulers, nor the Prelates, nor their Clergy,
nor their adherents, noble or ignoble: And if I have willingly and laboriously displeased and lost the Sectaries too, whose honour is it that I feel my Soul for?

§ 23. But did the man think that Unconstancy and compliance with powerful Heresie, is the same thing with Repentance for it? Or is it well done to persuade the Reader that it is Repentance or Retraction of Heresie I write against, when I recite the words of the Council and their own? Do I say that peccavi- mus was their sin?

§ 24. And I would humbly desire him in time to consider, 1. Whether it was a venial sin not to be named by me, when the most zealous Papists and Historians name it, for so great a number of Bishops to turn and turn again so often, and that with Anathematising one year of what they voted for before with Anathema to the contrary. I crave your impartial consideration but of two Instances: How oft did they with Anathema's vote for and against the Council of Calcedon as the Emperours changed? Yea in the same Usurpers time, Basiliscus, when he changed himself. 2. In the case of Images: How oft did they change in Councils, for them and against them, as the Princes changed? Sir, we mind this with lamentation and not insultingly: But if you take these for venial little sins, and our not swearing and covenanting all that you bid us for a mortal sin, are you not partial?

2. And I would wish you to think on it again, before you make this guilt your own, by mincing and excusing it; and lest you make all other mens sin your own, whom hereby you encourage in the imitation of them. These are not things indifferent.

3. And do not so dishonour Prelacy, and your Church and Discipline, as to tell the World that these in Bishops are little things; what then is left for you to stick at? No man should make light of such Beams in the Eyes of those that should be the most pure, while they are pulling the mote of scrupling a Ceremony, yea an Oath. &c. from their Brothers Eye, and that by such Iron Instruments as they use.

§ 25. Next comes his Logical terms, [throwing dirt, outrageous, bitter, malicious, &c.] And what's the matter? [I give not one loose at Emperours and Courts: scorning to change the game, charging the Bishops with the faults of the Magistrate, and laying
all the blame on them.] In what words? I say, [so far could fierce, and seditious Prelates prevail with a pious and peaceable Prince, by the pretences of opposing Herefie and Schism.

Anf. 1. Was he not a most pious and peaceable Prince? Then Socrates that knew him, and protesteth against flattery, and many others, are not to be believed? yea, if he excelled not the Bishops?

2. Do I say that none but the Bishops persuaded him? Where do I lay all the fault on them? Do I not after name the Emperess Eudocia, as the Agent to persuade him for the Eutychians, and Pulcheria to persuade him against Nestorius: My words are visible.

3. What Bishops were they that persuaded him to make a Law to confirm the Ephesine, Eutychian Council? Was it not Dioscorus and the Eutychians? Were they not Bishops? Did they not do it? Yea, doth not this man oft revile them far more bitterly than ever I did, and revile me for speaking so charitably of them? Would you ever have expected that the same man should have so reviled me, for saying that these Eutychian Bishops prevailed with a good Emperour to confirm that Council of Eutychians?

4. Is it a sin not to speak hardlier of so good a Prince, who after repented and punished his Wife and Eunuch for persuading him? It was a blaming him to tell to what he was persuaded.

Truly the mans anger here for my blaming the Eutychian Bishops, in condemnation of whom he hath poured out so much more than I, doth make me think that there is somewhat in the sound of some words, that turns his wrath this way or that: When he hears the name of an Eutychian, away with them, speak not easily of them. When the same men are called Bishops, it's malice, outrageous bitterness to blame them for getting a Law to confirm that called an Heretical, Murdering, Latrocinian Council. His words are, p. 146. [Were there ever greater vio-
lences committed than in that infamous Conventicle at Ephesus?]

§ 26. P. 263. He confesseth that the Debate between the Council and the Egyptian Bishops was something too warm: but faith that heat was not altogether without reason. Anf. This is his way to confess their faults, and then rail at me for bare reciting the words of the Debate or History. But it was not without reason: He confesseth.
confesseth not so much as this of the silencing and ruining Ministers now. It shall not be the use of my reason to make Fig-leaves to cloath and cover the sins which God abhorreth.

Men will be men he faith, wherever they are placed, whether in a Council or in the Church, or even at the Altar.

Anf. By Men I suppose he meaneth Sinners: and it's true. But of all Sinners Oh that God would save his Church from those who hate reproof, and cherish the worst that will be for them, and excommunicate and prosecute the most conscientable that will not obey them in things which they call indifferent, for fear of sinning against God.

§ 27. His trifling words about Leo and Rome are not worthy of an Answer.

§ 28. He hath, P. 268. hit again on the oversight which I before confessed, even the effect of my necessitated haste, that in translating Theodoret's words I put (truly) in the wrong place: I ask him forgiveness, and the Bishops, if that be any slander against them, which is nothing to them.

§ 29. He faith, P. 269. [There is no truth in what our Author saith, that Ibas Epistle was acquit.] Anf. There is no truth in saying that I said it was, when my words were disjunctive, [The Epistle was acquit, or at least the Bishop upon the reading of it.] He faith, Ibas was not acquit on the reading the Epistle, but on the defence he made, that he communicated with Cyril. Anf. His Accusations of Falsahood are commonly Boyish Quibbles. His Defence and the Reading of his Letter go together, and in Bii- nius the Letter, and the Letters of the Clergy of Edessa are the last things done before he is discharged.

§ 30. P. 270. He faith, [The truth is, the Eastern Bishops were not so ingenuous and fair after their reconciliation with Cyril, &c.] Thus he becomes himself still an accuser of the Bishops.

§ 31. Because I say that the Judges past sentence to cast out both Stephen and Bassign from Ephesus, and all consented, he faith, [One would think here the Judges past sentence against the consent or Inclination of the Bishops.] Anf. There is no end of answering your thinkings. I did not say that the Judges past the Councils Sentence but their own: And whether it were against the Fore-inclination of the Council let any Reader judge, when the Judges asking the Council their fentence, [Ref. Episcopi clamaverunt, justitia Bassignum vocat: Regula valeant. The Judges
Judges answered them that their judgment was that both were to be cast out, and a third chosen, and the Council suddenly consented. If he would be believed contradicting this he must deny the Acts.

§ 32. He hath found matter for a quibble against tating Pothierius Flesh with their Teeth. Teeth taste not: Dangerous false History, or want of Learning is learnedly here discovered. When he cannot deny the most woeful, calamitous dissentions which followed the Calcedon Council, he faith, [Was it the misfortune or the fault of these only not to be able to heal the differences of the Church? Or was the defect in the Councils, or the blame to be imputed to those obstinate men that opposed the Rule established by them?]

Ans. No: They were neither the first nor the last that have miscarried. Nor are we the first that suffer under such miscarriage. It was the misfortune of the Churches to have such Physicians: But as it is the honour of some Physicians to shew how many Patients they have cured, so is it of some others, when most die under their hands, to be able to say, that it was long of the Patients that would not be ruled, or that they killed them seconfum artcm. It was a Proverb in Sutton-Coldfield, [Who begun? ] A poor man had but one Afs and he loaded him too hard, and the Afs being in pain bit his Master a little on the Buttock; and his Master knockt him down, and killed him; and when he saw him dying, , [Well, (saith he) But who begun? ] But who had the los? There be Clergy-Men that can impen- tently see the Strages, the divisions, the swarms of sin that are the consequents of their needless masterly Impositions, and wipe their mouths and say, It was the obstinacy of those that would not be ruled by us! They kill a Flea on a mans Forehead with a Beetle, and say they meant not to kill the man.

But if that Councils Acts were a fit means to cure the Churches Divisions, how came they to be presently and through many Ages, yea, ever since to this day, thereby increased so many fold? Though the Assembly at Jerusalem cured not all the Jewish Teachers of their blind Zeal for Moses Law, it was so far from increasing the Dissentions and number of Dif- ferers, that it satisfied the Gentile Christians for the most part, and many of the Jewish, and greatly diminished the Discord. It's one thing not wholly to cure, and another to make far worse.

§ 33.
§ 33. He instanceth also in the Dort Synod that made things worse.

Ans. 1. The Synod of Dort made things the worse in their own Country, not by their Doctrinal Decisions, but by too much of the Masterly Spirit, engaging the Magistrates against the Arminians in the use of the Sword. Whether it be true that they say, that they were necessitated to do what they did against Barnevelt and Grotius for the safety of their State, I am no Judge: But I am sure it is of an ill sound to those that read it: And so is it to read in Episcopius and others, what violence the People have used against the Arminians, and they were fain to tolerate them when all was done.

And it's no wonder that the Controversy increased in England, when the Clergy would not long stand to the decrees that by our own six Delegates were moderated: Dr. Heylin tells you how Bishop Laun's Zeal was the cause of our following Contentions: And how? By bearing down all that were against him.

2. But the meer Doctrinal Decrees of the Synod of Dort are so moderate and healing, that where Violence hath been forborn, and Reason used, many have been pacified by them. And

3. What that Synod did not, a few private Peace-makers have much done: The Writings of Camero Amyraldus, Capellus, Placens, Testardus, Iud. Crocius, Mat. Martinius, Conr. Bergius, Job. Bergius, Blondel, Daile, and above all, Le Blank's have for ought I hear, half ended the controversy. And having my self written one Book (Cathol. Theologie) for Reconciliation, I have not to this day had a word of Contradiction, but the Consent of very many. And as I before noted, Is not even in London where other differences might exasperate, yet this Controversie almost laid to sleep? But if our Arminians will but get as severe Laws and Canons made against them that are not of their Opinions, as be against them that dare not conform to the Diocesan Model and the rest, they shall quickly see this quarrel revived. The Articles of the Church of England determine not these Controversies, and that is our Peace. But in but one determining Article against either side, and it will break us more in pieces. Doth not our own Case and Experience then confute those over-doing Councils?

§ 34. His next Instance is that of the Westminster Assembly,—So far from reconciling the People, that after this they were disfrafted
Straited into innumerable Schisms: Never was there so lamentable a face of things, never such variety of Heresies, and such Wantonness; and Extravagancy, in blaspheming God under pretence of Religion and Conscience: And this is the State whither the same manner of men are driving again.

Anf. I say again I knew so many of that Assembly, as that I do not think that the Christian World had ever an Assembly of more able and truly pious Clergy-Men, these 1300 Years at least. But these Upstarts that knew them not can tell us any thing that Faction hath taught them to believe concerning them and others. The Parliament was by seeming necessity drawn to gratifie the Scots: The Assembly, though Conformists, all, save Eight or Nine, were as sensibls as the Nonconformists of the mischiefs of silencing worthy Ministers, and forbidding Afternoon Sermons, and such like; and they were as much against Arminianism and Popery as the Church of England was in A.Bp. Abbat's days, and as much as he against the Doctrine of Mainwaring and Sibthorp: And the Parliament absolutely restrained them from debating any thing but what they proposed to them; so that they that were for the Primitive Episcopacy had no liberty to debate it, or speak for it, but on the by. But when the Covenant was offered them against Prelacy, they were about to enter a Protestantation against it, and were stopp'd only by limiting the renunciation to the English frame described in an explicatory Parenthesis. But for my part I think them much to be blamed, that they did not, though against that prohibition, resolve to propose such moderate healing terms to the Parliament as were agreeable to their judgments, or at least have testified against the limiting of Church Concord to such narrow terms, as must exclude such men as were for the English Episcopacy: They might easily have known, that the number of such in England was so great, as that an excluding Law must needs be an Engine of great Division; and that Conquest will not change mens Judgments.

And as I doubt not but the five Dissenting Independents were greatly to blame, for making such a stir for leave to gather their Churches, when nothing was imposed on them which they could accuse; So I doubt not but the Assembly were to be blamed for making a greater noise against errors than they had cause for. Their desire of Concord, which was good itself, did raise
them to too great Expectations of it, and too great impatience of little differences. They published their Testimony against the errors of the times, in which they took in Dr. Hammond, and made many differences worse than they were, too like the old Hereticators. And they wanted that skill to compose their differences with the Independents, as was needful to that end, and might have been attained. And will the faults of that Assembly justify the far greater faults of others? But

2. This sort of Historians do much more differ from us about the matters of Fact, which our Eyes have dayly seen, yea, about our own Thoughts and Minds, than about the History of the ancient Church. The case was very far different from that which he describeth. Mr. Lawson, a Conformist, faith, [There was never better Preaching, Piety encouraged and encreased, &c. than at that time. In all the Counties where I was acquainted, there were many young Orthodox faithful Preachers, that gave themselves wholly to do good, for one that was ten Years before, and not any considerable number noted for any immorality: We were in the County where I lived almost all of one mind; for Episcopal, Presbyterians and Independents uniting in that which they agreed in, and leaving all to Liberty in the rest, we lived in constant Brotherly Love and Peace without Dissent. I never knew of any of divers Religion in all the County, save at the end, in one or two corners about Twenty Quakers: And near me were about Twenty otherwise Orthodox, that denied Infant-Baptism, (and perhaps as many more in the whole County,) and Two or Three ignorant Socinians. In the next County I heard not of so many Heterodox: Never did I see, before or since, so much Love and Concord among Ministers, and all religious People, nor read of any Age that had so much for 1300 Years. And whereas the common cry is, Oh, but they were all Rebels against the King! I have named abundance of the Ministers in mine Apology to Dr. Good, (who being Episcopal was a Guide in our Meetings, and after so accused the Nonconformists) and challenged him to name one of them that ever meddled with Wars. I knew none in all the County that was in any Army save the King’s, save Mr. Hopkins of Evesham (dead) and myself and one that is a Conformist, and one Independent (dead.)

But it’s true, that they were then so set upon Parish Reformation and Concord, that they were more troubled at any one that
that did turn Quaker, or against Infant Baptism, than some indifferent Persons are at Multitudes. And I was one that disputed most against them, and wrote against some distant Antinomians, mostly Soldiers; But our Disputes satisfied and confirmed all our Neighbours more than Prisons would have done. We punished none of them, and none of our People there turned to them. But I confess we were commonly too little sensible, how much hurtful Violence hindereth Concord, more than loving forbearance of tolerable differences. As too many were how much for Peace they should have abated of the Zeal for their private Opinions, which they thought to be better than they were. We were much like the days that followed the Apostles, which had some troublesome Sectaries, but the main Body of Christians did cleave together in Love, till success had puff up a rebellious Army to make themselves Rulers, to the Confusion of themselves and others.

§ 35. At last mentioning the common Discontent of the Churches, he seems to resolve the Question, What then must be done? But he puts us off only with the Negative Answer, that [the Rule, i.e. of our Uniformity is not to be altered. And why? [We have no assurance that we shall find any Conformity to it more than we have now.]

Anf. I must not call this Answer as it deserveth.

1. You were about dealing otherwise with the Papists: Dr. Heylin tells us how much they were to have altered for Concord: Mr. Thorndike threatens the Land, if you alter not the Oath of Supremacy for them: The name of the Pope and Anti-Chrift hath been expunged for them; yet you said not, We know not that they will come any nearer us.

2. By these measures a Rag or a Ceremony should never be abated for the Peace and Concord of any Church or Kingdom: You may still say we are not sure that this will serve them. The Pope may say, where he refuseth to abate the shaving of the Priests Beards, or the least of his Impostions; yea he knows that would not serve. They said so to the Bohemians four Demands: They concluded so at first against Luther. This very Argument hath kept them from all Reformation.

3. Can you find nothing in your Impostions that in the nature of the thing is worthy to be altered? If not, you have more or less Wisdom than Bishop Morton, and the rest of the Church
Doctors who at Westminster motioned so many Alterations. If one should but then move you to correct your known false Rule for finding Easterday, or to give Parents leave to be the first Promisers for their own Children, and Godfathers but their seconds, or not to deny Chrifteidom and Communion for that or a Ceremony: No, come on it what will, nothing must be altered, left men ask more. And yet you preach against Clergy Infallibility, (or subscribe at leaft.)

4. But if you are so much againft altering, why did you alter to our greater fuffering, and add as much more (yea five times more) to the former Task and Burden? You can no doubt fay somewhat for all this.

5. And when it is the fame things that the old Nonconformifts still asked, and we since 1660 askt yet less, what reafon had you to raife that fuspicion that we will not be fatisfied with what we ask? Have we given you any caufe? If you mean, that perhaps there be fome still that may be unsatisfied, will you deny Peace to fo many that beg it of you, becaufe others will not accept it on their Terms? Or will you never agree with any left some disagreement fhould arise hereafter.

Some Travellers were affaulted by the high way by a Captain of Soultdiers, who took all their Money, Swords and Horfes, and swore he would kill them if they would not take an Oath to conceal him: One took the Oath to fave his Life, another fcrupled it: They begg'd his Mercy to restore fo much as would bring them home: He askt them what would fatisfie them: One would have his Horf, another his Sword, another part of his Money. He told them, You are a Company of Rogues, that can neither agree what to ask; nor give me assurance if I give you this you will ask no more. I compare not the Authority but the Reafons of the Denial.

§ 36. But feeing no abatement of their Canons, &c. must be granted, what is it that muft caufe our Concord? He would not tell you; but it's discernible what's left: It muft be no Concord but what Punishment can procure: And what punishment? Sharper than is yet tried; for that hath not done it: Such Concord as Tertullian nameth, Solitudinem faciunt & pacem vocant: The Concord in Spain is worse than the Amsterdam toleration.

Again I remember the great Fift-Pond mentioned by Judge Hale, that had multitudes of Fift and frie; and at last two small
small Pikes put in; when the Pond was drawn there was never a Fish but the two Tyrants (as he calls them) grown to a huge bigness. The fear least Popery and Prelacy should be the two Pikes, tempted men irregularly to covenant against them. To have such variety as Roch, Dace, Pierch, Tench, Carp, made it a Schismatical Pond; The two Pikes were against Schism and Toleration, and for ending the Division by reducing all to unity of Species.

§ 37. As to his Question of Qu. Elizabeths days, the Intimation may seduce the ignorant, but none else. 1. If he know not that it was the Subscription required in the Canons, (that nothing in the Books is contrary to the Word of God, scrupled, which broke the Peace and Concord of England, he is unfit by his Ignorance to be an Informer of others. I have known many that would have yielded to come into the Conforming Church, if that one word had been but forborne: For when any practice against their Consciences about baptizing, Communion, or Burials had fallen in their way, they would have silently shifted it off, or been from home, and have ventured to answer it, so they could but conscienceably have got in. But our Canoneers are for all or nothing.

2. He is sure no English Clergy-man, if he know not how much is laid on us, that was not known in the days of Qu. Elizabeth. Is it to inform men, or deceive them, that he makes the difference to be between 36 and 39 Articles, and faith nothing of all the new Covenants, Declarations, Oaths, Subscriptions, Doctrine and Practices?

§ 38. Many make use of Mr. Edwards Gangrena, and the London Ministers Testimony against errors, to prove the Heresies and Confusions of the late times. No doubt all sin is odious; But few men living are more competent Witnesses of those things than I. The Errors that sprung up were much more tenderly resented then than now. You now have many called Wits and Persons of Quality, who at a Club dispute against the Providence of God, the immortality of the Soul, and a future Life; and there is neither Church-Admonition, Excommunication, nor any great matter made of it, but they are Members of the Church of England, the purest Church in all the World: Whereas in those licentious times, if one Souldier had spoken such a Word, it would have rung out through the Land, and perhaps his Tongue would have
have been bored with an hot Iron. It was the errours of the proud rebellious Soldiers that made most of the noise, that had no considerable number of Ministers left with them. I had a hand in Mr. Edwards Book thus: An Assembly of Ministers after Naseby Fight sent me into the Army to try if I could reduce them. Dayly disputing with them, a few proud selfconceited Fellows vented some gross words. At Amerfoam a few Country Sectaries had set up a Meeting in Dr. Crooks Church, to dispute and deceive the People: A few of Major Bethel's Troop (that afterwards turned Levellers and were ruined) joined with them: I met them, and almost all day disputed against them, and shamed them, and they met there no more. I gathered up all the gross words which they uttered and wrote them in a Letter to Francis Tyton, and after I found them cited in Mr. Edwards Gangrena. And what's the absurd Speeches of a few ignorant Souldiers, that are dead with them, to the Heresies and Schisms that these 1000 or 1200 Years continue in all the Roman Communion, and they say in all the rest of the Christian World. One cheating Papist as a converted Jew got into an Anabaptists Meeting, one Maxwell a Scot, and all England rung of it. But when Bishops have made and keep France, Spain, Italy, &c. in the same Errours, Dr. Heylin, and Bp. Bromhall, and such others, took them for such, with whom a Coalition on the terms by them described was very desirable.

CHAP. XXIV.

His 7th Chapter considered.

§ 1. THE Man had not the courage to defend the surgent Prelacy in its Manhood and Maturity, but only in its Infant and Juvenile State; nor to defend the many hundred Councils which I mentioned after the Council of Calcedon, in which either his Modesty or Cautelousness comes short of his Rd. Fathers, who some of them own the six first General Councils, and some of them eight, and some would unite with the Church of Rome, if they will abate but the last 400 Years additions.

§ 2. In
§ 2. In his Gleanings in this 7th Chap. he over, and over, and over persuadeth his Reader, that I make or affirm that the Bps. were the cause of all the Heresies in the world, and of all the Heresies, Schisms, and Evils that have afflicted the Church. And hath this Historian any proof of this? Or is it the melancholy fiction of his Brain? Yes, this is his proof contrary to my manifold Instances, because I say in one age, [We have a strange thing, a Heresie raised by one that was no Bishop: which I have answered before. To be then strange, and never to be at all; are not words of the same sense? But his Answers throughout do mind me of Seneca's Words, that a man that is fore complains (or cries Oh) when he doth but think you touch him.

§ 3. He thus himself accuseth the Bishops, p. 276. [There have been wicked men and wicked Bishops in all times.] And p. 277: [That some Bishops have abused their Authority and Office, and been the cause of Heresie and Schism cannot be denied.] But yet [He hath showed sufficiently, that most of my particular Accusations are void of all truth and Ingenuity.] Ans. Or else those words are so.

§ 4. He faith. All Ecclesiastical Writers agree, that Simon Magus was Author of the first Heresie in Christian Religion.] Ans. All confess that Judas was before him: And if it be a Heresie to buy the Spirit for Money, it is a Heresie to sell Christ for Money. But I confess some tell us of his after pranks at Rome, and imitating Icarus, at Peters Prayers: If you would see why Dr. More takes this for a toyish Legend, see his Mystery of Iniquity, Lib. 2. C. 19. § 6. 7. p. 447, 448.

§ 5. P. 286, 287. Baronius first, and Philastrius after, are made guilty of Forgery and disregardable History, so that I may well bear some of his Censures.

§ 6. P. 290. To confute me effectually he faith much what the same which is much of the sum of all my Book: And yet it's false and malicious in me, and true and charitable in him: viz. [Praising the first 300 years, (when the Bishops were such as we offer to submit to:) he adds [The following Ages were not so happy; but as Christians generally degenerated so did the Bishops too.]

Ans. What! Before the Council of Nice! That's a sad Confession. I was ready to say as a Roman Emperour said to a flatterer, that still said all that he said, [Dic abint aliquid ut duo si-
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... But his next words allay it, [But yet not so much as our Author would make it appear.] As the Dominicans and Oratorians must say some fallhood of Calvin, lest they be thought Calvinists.

And yet he addeth, [The beginning of the 4th Century was very unhappy to the Church, for Persecution without, and Heresie and Schism within. Meletius an Egyptian began a Schism, forsook the Communion of the Church, &c. Next the Donatists, Arians, &c.]

Ans. It seems that the Emperours Constantius and Valens were without the Church, and yet the Arian Priests and Bishops were within it. When he defineth the Church we may understand this. But is it not this 4th Century that is made the Churches more flourishing state by others?

§ 7. Even the great Historian of Heresyes, Epiphanius, is said p. 292. to be [unaccountably mistaken in several things relating to that History.] And 293. hath [a strange unaccountable mistake in diverse other things relating to that matter.] If I had at any time erred with such a Bishop and Father, I might have been excusable for reciting his History.

§ 8. Pag. 295. He opens the very Heart of his Parties Principles, and faith, [The Church is never distracted more by any thing than Projects of Moderation.]

Ans. Experience proveth that you speak your Heart. The words are no wilful Lye which agree with a mans Mind, be they never so false as disagreeable to the matter. No man was more of that Opinion than Hildebrand, that would not yield the Emperours the Invesiture, nor as I before said, abate the Prince of Carolus the shaving of his Bishops Beard to save his Kingdom. Victor began with that Opinion too soon, but his Successors have these Thousand Years been as much for it as you can wish.

2. But to whom is it that you intend this? Sure not to all: Was Bishop Land of that mind toward the Papists if Dr. Heylin say true? Was Grotius of that mind toward them? Was Archbishop Bromhall, Forbes, Beziar, Thorndike (and many more such) of that mind? No: I'll excuse you, that you meant not them and their Projects of Moderation: Nor I believe neither Cassander's, Erasmus's, Wicelius's, Sancta Clara's, Leander's, &c.

But towards such as I am, you have been as firm to that Principle as any one of our Enemies could wish. In 1660, 1661. it was
was most effectually improved; and you have attained much of
the fruits then foretold: and ever since have been unmoveably
and prevalingly true to it.

3. But this maketh some men the Disrafflers of the Church, if
not the greatest, which truly I have better thoughts of: Such
as Junius, Parraus, Amyraldus, Le Blanke, Davenant, Ward,
Usher, Holdsworth, Morton, Hall, &c. And lately when we
were preparing for the Kings Return, Bp. Brownrig, and after
his death Dr. Gawden, Dr. Gulston, Dr. Allen, Dr. Bernard, and
diverse such did offer themselves to a Treaty for Moderation:
And since then Dr. Wilkins, Dr. Burton, Dr. Tillotson, and in di-
chus illis Dr. Stillingfleet have been guilty of this crime, of di-
stratting the Church by projects of Moderation: But I can name
the Bps. that were not guilty of it.

To abate or forsake the necessary points of Faith and Practice
on pretence of Moderation, is to destroy Christianity on pre-
tence of Humanity or Peace. But to make Laws that men shall
preach with Horns on their Heads, to signify the Victory of
Truth, and to ruine all that will not keep these Laws (much
more if men shoud command worse) and to say a Project
for Moderation would distract the Church, would be as far from
Wisdom as it is from Moderation: And some Prelates have
done as bad as this.

§ 9. He confesseth p. 296., that by force and Fraud [the whole
World in a manner was turned Arian.] And did I ever say worse
of the Bishops than this?

§ 10. He maketh Aerus to speak against Bishops because he
could not be a Bishop, so that he was of a Prelatical Judgment
and Spirit, and calleth him [The Cartwright of the times,] by
which if he mean that Cartwright would have been a Bishop,
it doth but tell us that he deserveth little belief in his Histo-
ry.

§ 11. He is a most singular Historian, p. 303. in telling us,
that after the Monothelites in following Ages of the Church the
Devil started up but few Heresies till these Ages,—Swenkfeldians,
Anabaptists, &c.

By this I perceive he believeth neither Papists nor Protestants:
For the Papists name many Heresies since, and the Protestants
say that Popery is but a Composition of many Heresies, and
name us many that concur'd thereto.
§ 12. He there giveth me this serious Admonition, [It is a much greater wonder that any man that makes Conscience of what he faith, should against all truth of History, and against his own knowledge, charge the Bishops with all the Heresies in the World: that a person that seems so sensible of approaching Judgment, as frequently to put himself in mind of it—should yet advance so malicious and groundless an Accusation. There is no dallying with the all-seeing God—What Plea shall be made for whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction, &c.]

Ans. This is not the least acceptable passage to me in his Book; I love the man the better for seeming serious in the belief of Judgment; and I hope his Warning shall make me search my Heart with some more Jealousie and care. He seems here to believe himself; but being my self far more concerned than he is to know how far I am guilty of what I am accused, as far as I can know my Heart and Writings, I'll tell the Reader what to judge of his words and me.

1. That I charge the Bishops with all the Heresies in the World, never was in my mind, nor can I find it in any of my Writings; yet this he very oft repeateth: And shoul'd a man so often write a falsehood about a thing visible, and never cite the place where I say it, and this while he is thus seriously mentioning Calumny and Judgment.

2. Can he make men believe at once that I do persuade men that Bishops or Diocesanes came not up till about 150 years after Christ, and yet that I make them the Authors of the Heresies that were in those times? Non est non est actio: Could Bishops be Heretics when there were no Bishops?

3. If I had charged the Bishops with all the Heresies, it followeth not that I had charged no one else with them, and made the Bishops the sole Authors, and acquit People, Priests, and Princes, why then doth he name many Monks and Priests that were Heretics? Or Emperours that promoted them, as if this crossed what I say? Did he think that I excluded the Army if I blame the General; or the Prelatical Priests when I blame the Prelates? If I took the Bishops of England to be the chief cause of our Church-Schisms, and Calamities, doth it follow that I acquit such as you, and all the Clergy like you?

4. That I have done this [against all Truth of History] which I transcribed out of the Councils and Historians most partial for
the highest Prelacie, is either a great untruth, and unproved by him, or I know not what I read or write.

5. That I do this against my own Knowledge I am certain is an untruth.

6. That my Accusations are malicious I am certain is untruth, as being able to say that I speak in pitty to the Church, and to save Souls from deceit, and malice no man; but pray with the Liturgy, that God will forgive our Enemies, Persecutors, and Slanderers, and turn their Hearts.

7. That I have brought any Groundless Accusation I must take for an untruth, till my Grounds produced are better confuted.

8. Much more that I write whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction.

All these and more untruths being heapt up with the mention of Death and Judgment, tells us whither Faction and Prepossession may carry men.

2. But what is the truth I shall again briefly tell the Reader:

1. About 2000 of such Ministers as I confidently take for the most spiritual, and conscionable and devoted to God and the good of Souls are silenced, and in Law imprisoned and ruined; and all the People of their mind are ipso facto (if they confess it) excommunicated, besides their other penalties. I accuse not the Law but mention only the matter of Fact, which the K. once commissioned Bps. to have prevented.

2. The Kingdom is dolefully divided, and alas, the sad consequents are not to be named.

3. Besides all our Penalties the Bishops accuse us as the causes of all, and as wilful Schismaticks, and call for the Execution of the Laws against us.

4. We say, we dare not do that, which when ever they will give us leave, we are ready to give our reasons why we take it for heinous sin against God, and tending to the ruine of the Church: nor dare we forsake our Ministry while the Churches necessities are to us past doubt.

5. We beg of them but to abate us some needless Oaths, and Covenants, and Professions, and a few things called indifferent by the Imposers, that we may all live in Christian Love and Peace, and we offer them as unquestionable security for our Peaceableness, Loyalty, and Orthodoxy, as the said Oaths, Promises, or Professions can be.
6. They tell us, Nothing is to be abated in; and we must cease preaching, the Rule must not be altered; we will do more harm in the Church than out. Projects for Moderation most distract the Church; There is no Concord or Liberty to be expected, but by our total obedience to the Bishops; It is obeying the Church, ye a the Universal Church of Bishops, that is the only way to Concord.

7. To confute this Supposition, which is the root of our Calamities, I transcribe out of History and the Acts of Councils, how great a hand in the Schisms, and Heresies, and Confusions of Christians, those Bishops have had, who have swelled up above the primitive species, by vast Diocesses, Wealth, and claim of Government over other Churches and Bishops; and that it is notorious that this Grandeur and exorbitant power of Bishops, singly or in Councils, hath been so far from keeping the Church from Schisms, that it hath been one of the greatest causes of the Schisms of most Ages, since such a sort of Prelacy sprung up, and that Popery came not up in a day, but rose from that Juniority, to its present Maturity. This was my work.

§ 13. He truly tells you, that the Original of all mischief is the Lusts that war in our Members, and not this or that Order of Men.

When the World had a good Pope, if God would bless that Order of men, some think he might do more good than any other man. But he hath toucht the Core of the Churches Mala- dy. Verily, the grand Strife is between the Flesh and Spirit, the feed of the Serpent and of the Woman: And if Patriarchs and Dioceses were but as much set on the promoting of a holy and heavenly Life, as those Ministers are whom they silence and imprison, they might do much good, though the largeness of their Dioceses render them incapable of performing the 40th part of a true Bishops Work. No doubt but Bishop Hall, and Potter, and Usher, &c. did much good, by such preaching, writing, and good living, as others use that are no Bishops.

But will fire burn without fuel? And will it not burn if combustible fuel be contiguous? Do not the Lusts that war in our Members live upon that food which we are forbidden to provide? Do you think that the Lust of the Flesh doth not more desire Riches than Poverty, Honour than a low Estate, Domination over others, to have our Will on all, than humble Subjection? Where the Carcass is there will the Eagles be gathered.
ed. Do not you your self say, that the Bishops and Church grew more corrupt after the third Century? Do you be-
lieve that when a Bishops Power was made equal to a great Lords, or more, and all his Pomp and Riches answerable, that the Lust of the Flesh would not more greedily desire it, than it would desire a meer mediocrity? Or that a worldly proud man would not seek more for Lordship and Greatness, than a Synesius, and such others as you say fled from it? If the poor retired Monks were as bad as you make them, what wonder if great Lordly Bishops were much worse? Will not the fire of Lust grow greater as the jewel is greater?

I am satisfied that Riches and Power well used, may greatly serve the interest of Religion: But two things must be con-
dered.

1. That the greatest Power and Wealth being far more desired by carnal Worldlings, (that is, by bad men) than by mortified heavenly minded men, the more men desire them, the more eagerly they will seek them by Friends, Flattery, or any means: and therefore the liker they are to attain them, except when the choosers are some resolved godly men. And so which way can a Succession of the worst men be avoided? But a mediocri-
ty that doth not to the Flesh overweigh the labours and diffi-
culties of the sacred Office, will encourage the good, and not much tempt the bad: Or if good men will be never so bounti-
ful to pious uses, their bounty and Church-Lands may better maintain Labourers enough for the work, than be made a snare to one.

2. And that Power which depopulateth and destroys its end, is unlawful in its very state, as well as in its use. The Power of one man to be sole Physician to the City, and to have none but Apothecaries under him; or of one man to be the only School-
Master in the County, and have none but Ufthers under him, is rather to be called Destruction than Power. It is Bishops casting out Power that I am against, that is, the necessary Power of the Keys in the Parifh Minifters, or putting down necessary Bishops; and also a Power to silence Christ's faithful Minifters, and deprive Souls of the necessary means, by imposing things needless in themselves, and sinful in the receiver, that after his best search believes them such.

Seeing then that we are agreed, that it is the Lust that war-
...and for It or And it. Hereticks when they have gained Wealth and Honour, are commonly willing to secure the enjoyment of those Possessions, by letting things run in their ordinary course.

§ 14. And he truly faith, [p. 306. that the generality of men when they have gained Wealth and Honour, are commonly willing to secure the enjoyment of those Possessions, by letting things run in their ordinary course.

( The Spanish Proverb is, The World is a Carryon, and they are Dogs that love it, and they will sharle at any that would take it from them, and if it lie in the Ditch, Dogs rather than Men will gather about it: and its pitty such men should by such a Bait be tempted into the sacred Chair.) And he truly adds, that Repulse and Disappointment will end such mens Patience. For really as the man is, such are his desires: It is not only turgent Prelacy but a Prelatical Spirit that troubleth the Church: And If Novatianus or Arius would fain be a Prelate, it is in his heart; and no wonder if he be a Schismatick; Trabit sua quemque voluptas. Appetite is the Spring of Action. All the Popes Clergy are much of his mind; for they participate of his worldly Interest, and depend on him, and therefore participate of the Papal Spirit. The Interest of the General and Army are conjunct.

§ 15. And its true that he faith, that the Bishops Interest obligeth him to maintain Peace and Unity. And so no doubt from that sense of Interest it is endeavoured, in Italy, Spain, France, Germany, &c. when a strong man armed keeps his house, the things which he possesses are in Peace. But whether therefore the People did ill that forsook the Bishops and followed Luther, or are all bound to cleave to the Bishops Unity, is the doubt.

§ 16. Whether it be true, p. 310 that very few if any one were Bishops when they turned Hereticks, I have enquired in the Preface; though if they ascended from Herefsie to Prelacy it's all one to me. But by this I conjecture that he taketh fewer for Hereticks than others do, and that he pretends acquaintance with their minds, in that antecedent part of their Lives which no History mentioneth. I confess I think that for the most part men are Papists before they are Popes or Papist Bishops: And yet I think that it is first the desire of Papal and Prelatical Gran...
and next the Exercise of it, which is the cause of Schism and Persecution.

§ 17. I verily believe as he doth, that Platonick Philosophy, and a willingness to win the Heathens by compliance, had a great hand in corrupting many Doctrines; and not only Monks but others of the most religious Christians, had a great hand in many of the ancient Superstitions, especially those that tended to the over-honouring of their Martyrs, and too much advancement of their Bishops, when they came newly from under the Persecution of the Heathens. But it came not to be universal, nor the Engine of great Corruption and cruelty, till the Bishops turned all into a Law. Who could make any of all this necessary, but Pope, Prelates, or Princes, who pretended a Legislative Power hereto? Even Luther and Melanthon were indifferent to diverse Ceremonies, so they were made to be differently used. But when they are made necessary by a Law (especially more necessary to a Minister than his Ministry, and to a private Christian, than his Church Communion, who doth more vehemently condemn them than they?

§ 18. That Paskhasius Radbertus was the first that broached the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, is a doubtful expression. Either he meaneth the Name or only the Thing under another Name. If the latter, he will do more than Edm. Albertinus, or Bp. Confus have done, if he prove it: If it be the name that he meaneth, I think (by my Memory, for I will not for that go read him all over) that he will not find the name in Radbertus, nor any where before Stephanus Eduensis, about 130 years after him: and that all that he can truly say, is but as Bellarmine doth, [Hic Amplior primus sit qui, seriò & copiosè scriptæ de veritate Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia contra Bertramum Presbyterum.

§ 19. That the Bishops charged by me with these Corruptions, were the only Opposers of them that we find in antiquity, as we may see in the Canons of Africk and Spain, ] is a saying very near kin to much of his History: I confess that so few Presbyters in comparison of Bishops were publick Actors, whose Judgments were notified to the World, that it's no wonder (after Constantine's time) if there be more proofs of their words and deeds than of other mens: But there are a great number of excellent men here flandered against the credit of all Church-History, and
their own Writings yet in our hands. Would it be worth the Readers Price and Labour, I could swell my Book with the proof that what he speaketh is untrue. Did he think that I could not prove that Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origene, Arnobius, Latianius, Macarius, Maternus Firmicus, Ephraem Syrus, Faustinus, Hierome, Ruffinus, Prudentius, Sulpius Severus, Sedulius, Mammertus, Cassianus, Vincent, Livinensis, Socrates, Sozomen, Isodore Pelusiora, &c. did something in opposition to some Church-Corruptions? Though some of them promoted some others: Yea, Antonye and abundance of Monks that furthered some, opposed others no less dangerous: Though many of them may be accused as Bellarmine doth Sulpi. Severus, for saying, Ecclesiæ aurum non fruifed deftrui.

Judge of time past by what we see; Is it only the Bishops that are against the Popes Church-Corrupting Usurpation in Italy, Spain, France, &c. Is it only the Bishops that are against the Mass Corruptions, and against all their corrupt Doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, Images, &c. and against all their Ceremonies, and profane abuse of holy things? Was it only the Bishops at Constance and Baslé, that were against suppressing the Bohemian and Moravian Reformation? In the end of Lydium upon Prateolus you may read a Letter subscribed by so great a number of Lords and great men, for John Hus, and Hierome, and the Reformation, which yet prevailed not with the Bishops, as will tell you who was then the greatest Opposers of Church-Corruption. And I think Princes and Drs. opposed it more than Bps, in Luther's time. Is it only the Bishops that have opposed warping towards Rome for Church-Unity? Have none but Bishops been against corrupting the Churches, by silencing good Ministers and ordaining bad ones? The things that are, have been. I confess our difference is great on the case, what is to be accounted Church-Corruption. For that which in one Country goeth for Corruption, in another (yea the same) goeth for Church-Glory, Strength, and Beauty; Our main difference is about what's good, and what's bad; what's Virtue, and what's Vice.

§ 20. He next comes to Sedition, and asketh [What Reign have they disturbed here with their Sedition?] And because he knoweth that I can refer him to the large Volume of their Treason written by Prin, and abroad to the many Volumes in Gold...
And the many Histories of the Wars of Popes and Councils against Emperours,] he prevents all my Proof with a downright Untruth, that ["If a man be not blind he may see that my History is only designed against Protestant Bishops under a general name.

Ans. Was it not enough so grossly to write this Untruth of me, but he must also reproach all the Readers as blind that will not judge fallly of what they read? Doth he know my meaning better than my self? He knoweth that I plead for the Primitive Episcopacy, and that I profess to intend this History most to discover the Rise, Growth, and Maturity of the Popish destructive sort of Prelacy. Readers, can you believe this man, that I wrote the case of the Bishops before and under Popery, and of the Popes, and of above Five hundred Councils, and all these before the name of a Protestant Bishop was known in the World, and as he faith, gathered their faults, and all this only against the Protestant Bishops, and not against Popes or Prelates, or any of the Councils that I named?

Perhaps he would tempt me to refer him to the History of Bishop *Lana's Trial*, or to what Bishop *Abbot*, George and Robert, Bishop *Hall* and others said against him: Or to tell him of A. Bp. *Williams* Arms for the Parliament. But these are not Subjects fit for our Debates.

§ 21. P. 318. When I say, that where Prelacy with the Papists is at the highest, Princes are at the lowest. He asketh, Is it the Bishop or the Papist that is here to blame? Is this the effect of their Order?

Ans. 1. I thought the Pope of Rome and the Bishop of Rome had been the same. 2. But this Corrector of History taking Untruths not only into the Completion, but the Stamina and Scope of his Book, among all the rest supposeth me to speak against a Bishop as a Bishop, when I have troubled him with my repeating so often that I am for Bishops, and that it is not the Office but the tumor, and that tumor that maketh another species which I oppose. Doth he not think that the Popes Bishoprick is faulty (yea, as a corrupt species?) And as it is more tumid than the Patriarchs, is not the Patriarchs more tumid than the Metropolitanas, and that than the Diocesanes? And if Dr. Hammond were not deceived, who thought that there were no stated worshipping Assemblies in Scripture times without a present Bishop,
Bishop, is not the sole Bishop of a Thousand or a Hundred such Assemblies different from a Bishop of One only? And if many Ca-
nons speak truly, that say a Bishop should be in every City that hath a Church; and every great Town like our Corporations and Market Towns was called a City, doth not a Bishop of one City, and a Bishop of 50, or 40, or 10, differ so far, that a man may be against one without being against the other? Doth he speak against Patriarchs that speaks against the Pope? Or against Diocesanates that speaks against Patriarchs? Or against the Primitive Bishops that speaks only against such Diocesanates as put them all down, and all their Churches, and almost all true Discipline of such Churches, like Erafians.

§ 22. P. 319, 322. His Charge on Socrates and Sozomen (shak-
ing the credit of Church-History) as writing that [which no rea-
sonable man can believe as it is related by them, without loving a ma-
licious Lye.] I spake to before: If such Historians believed not what they write or loved a malicious Lye; alas, whom shall we believe? Is he better than they?

And his note that Valesius judged Eusebius Nicomed no Here-
tick, I before noted.

But I will follow that case no further, left he should draw me to seem to charge the ancient Bishops with sedition, whom I ne-
ever intended so to charge; but only to desire those that can ex-
cuse the Language e. g. of Gregory the great to Phocas, of Am-
brase to Eugenius, of the Bishops to Maximus, and many such like, not implacably to reproach and hunt those that did no more or not so much.

§ 23. His full Stomach dischargeth itself against me three times over with one charge, P. 314, 320, 352. [Oliver Crom-
well and his Son, the David and Absalom of Mr. B.] And [He com-
parres the most barbarous villain in the World to King David,
in his Epistle to his Son.

Anf. Reader if there be no such word in any of my Writings, after all these Accusations of this man and many such other, I must leave it to thy self how thou wilt name these men, their History, and their dealings; for if I name them they will say I rail.

Yea, what if this very man (it's easie to know why and whence) doth even here, p. 352. &c. reprint the very Epistle which he thus accuseth, and cite no such word, to tell us that he
he knew there was no such word there, and yet thus affirmeth it, what will you call this?

The words cited by himself are these, ["Many observe that you have been strangely kept from participating in any of our late bloody Contentions, that God might make you a Healer of our Breaches, and employ you in that Temple Work, which David himself might not be honoured with, though it was in his mind, be- cause he had shed blood abundantly, and made great Wars. 1 Chr. 22. 7, 8."

Is there ever a word of Oliver? Is he here called David? Did I not purposely say, [David himself] and cite the Text, lest any should feign the same that he doth? Any man may see that he hath nothing to say, but to accuse my Thoughts, and suspect that I had such a meaning. And who made him acquainted with Thoughts that were never uttered? Or made him a Judge of them? If his and other mens thoughts may be thus by conjecture accused, no Enemy need to want matter of Accusation.

It's like he will appeal to my Conscience whether it were not my thought? And 1. By what authority will he so do? 2. But I will strive my self to him this once. It is so long since, that truly I remember not what was in my Thoughts, any further than my words express: But I well remember my former Actions, and what was then my judgment of Oliver and his Actions, and I use not to speak against my judgment. Many knew that he being acquainted the first day that I went into the Army, (which was after Naseby Fight) that I was sent by an Assembly of Divines, to try whether I could turn the Soldiers against his subverting Designs, (then first discovered to me,) he would never once speak to me while I was in the Army; and that ever after I was driven away, I openly in Pulpit, Preb's and Conference disowned; and warned men to disown his Actions against King and Parliament, and his Usurpation; and that I wrote against the Engagement: And therefore I do not think that ever I meant to call him David, and I am sure I never did it. But they say old Men can see better afar off than near at hand; and so all these notorious Untruths about visible present things, may yet consist with such mens credibility about things said and done 1300 Years ago.

§ 24. And now I am here, I must not pass by his friendly Admonition, p. 357. after his reciting my Epistles, ["If I were as worthy

Had I said what is this Week published, as one of their chief Dr's Elegy upon Oliver Cromwell, (with two others) what should I have heard? What abundance of Conformists flattered Oliver, while I openly disowned him as a Usurper, but now their malice hath got the ban- dle.
worthy to advise Mr. B. as he was to advise Cromwell, I would say, It were much more advisable for a Christian, specially for one that thinks he is so near his eternal State, to repent and cry, peccavimus, than to stand on justification of the fact, &c."

Ans. 1. It was usual for men to choose their own Confessours: But it being the Custom of the times for Pastors and Confessors to be forced on Dissenters, I will submit now to your way, though my former Confessions and my Communion with you have been turned to Reproach and Scorn.

1. I do daily beg earnestly of God, to let none of my sins be unknown to me, and taken for no sin, and be unrepented of; and that he would forgive that which I would fain know, and do not.

2. I do not repent of owning Oliver's Actions against King and Parliament, or his Usurpation; for I never owned them, nor the Actions of them that set up his Son.

3. I do not repent that I loved the Peace of the Church, and that I desired the Governour, though a Usurper, should do good and not evil.

4. I do not repent that seeing the Armies Rebellions and Confusions, I stirred up Rulers and People to take heed of favouring so great Sin.

5. But I do now by experience of other ways perceive that I was sometimes too eager in aggravating mens Errors, and repent that I used not more forbearance of some of my Accusations of some of them.

6. I did think that Richard Cromwell was an Usurper: But when we had been twelve Years at least without a rightfull Governour, I then thought as Thomas White, alias Blacklow, the moderate Papist, wrote, that the Land could not subsist in Society without some Government; and that No-Government is worse to the People than a Usurped one: And that it is sometime lawful to submit and use an Usurper, when it is not lawful to approve his Entrance. And wherein I was deceived I am willing to be better informed.

7. But I do unfeignedly repent that I wrote those two Epistles, though it was to put a man on to do good, whom I never saw, nor ever had the least to do with.

8. And I do more repent of the cause of all, viz. that I appointed God a time, and limited his Providence; and thought that
that because so many Armies and Endeavours had failed Twelve or Fourteen Years, that had attempted the restoring of the King, therefore there was no probability of accomplishing it: I do not repent that I was not a Prophet, to know before what God would do; for it was not in my power; nor do I repent that I preached Christ's Gospel under Usurpers; but I repent that I waited not God's time, and did not better consider that want of humane Power is no hinderance to Omnipotency, and nothing is difficult to him.

9. I was drawn too far by Mr. Harrington's Scorn, and the dislike of Sir Henry Vane's Attempts for a Common-Wealth, to meddle with matters of Government, and to write my Political Aphorisms, called, \textit{A Holy Common-Wealth}: And I do unfeignedly repent that ever I wrote and published it, and had not more confined myself to the matters proper to my Calling, and let those meddle with forms of Government who were fitter for it.

All these, besides what's formerly said to Mr. Bagshaw, I declare my unfeigned Repentance of. And though it please thee to feign me a Schismatick, and hater of Repentance; (for speaking against the fault, that needed it) I shall thank you to be a real helper of me in so necessary a work as Repentance is.

And that I may do the like by you, I shall now only require you with this Advice, that before you write next, you will set before your Eyes the Ninth Commandment, \textit{Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour}: And that when you say your Prayers, you would be serious when you say, \textit{Lord have Mercy upon us, and encline our hearts to keep this Law}.

§ 25. A Roman Zeal tells us, that Faction and Schism, when animated by worldly Interest, and grown up to a malignant hatred of the things and persons that are averse to it, is hardly bounded, but is thriving up towards destructive Persecution, as swelling Prelacy did towards the Papacy and the Inquisition. It is not one or two Fifths that will satisfy the stomach of a Pike: Nor is it the flandering or ruining of one or two men, or silencing of one or two of the Ministers of Christ, that will satisfy a malignant Spirit. One Meal will not make a lean Man fat. Whether there be a Legion in those that would destroy a Legion of Christ's Servants, or one have so much Power I know not; but the effects tell us what manner of Spirit they are of. But let the Papiists pass.
§ 26. When I read p. 337, and 358, 359, and such passages, it makes me think of them that cried, [His Blood be on us, and our Children,] together with our Judge's words, [In as much as you did it or did it not to one of the least of these my Brethren, you did it or did it not to me.] P. 337. he faith, [There is great reason to value the peaceable Resignation of the Nonconformists, when we consider by what Usurpation and Violence they were brought in, and what a number of worthy learned Ministers were turned out to make vacancies for these men, who were to instruct the People in new Mysteries of Religion, which their old Pastors had not the Conscience or Ability to teach them, that is, of the lawfulness of Rebellion.--- And p. 358, &c. There were many of those Ministers Usurpers, and had intruded into the Churches of other men, who had been silenced and cast out.--- There were many others that were intruders into the Ministry, and such not a few of them as Mr. B. himself would not have thought fit to have continued. All the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule that was then established in the Church, but chose rather to leave their Livings, and the Bishops could not help it, any otherwise than as they were Members of Parliament; for it was the Law that tied them to their choice, and not the Bishops. If Mr. B. means what happened before the last Civil Wars, as it's likely he may, then these ancient Teachers were the Instruments of an Antimonarchical, Antiepiscopal Faction: They would preach but they would not conform to the Established Religion: Nay many of them would preach against it, and against their Governors too. These were such Incendiaries as no Government would endure, &c.]

And. When you have noted this part of his History, it will not be hard to judge of his credibility.

I. The things that he defendeth is the silencing and prosecuting of three sorts of Ministers. 1. Many Hundreds of Nonconformists in the days of Qu. Eliz. K. James, and some few in the time of K. Charles 1. 2. Many Conformists in the time of K. Charles 1. under Bishop Laud. 3. About 2000 that conform not to the New Laws of Uniformity in the time of K. Ch. 2. What these Ministers were or are, and what the fruits of their silencing have been, and what it hath done to the Church of England, and to many Thousands of Godly Christians, I will not be judge: Nor will I dispute that which all England sees or feels. But it seems so well done to our Historian, as that he is willing
willing deliberately to justify or defend it, which as I understand is to make it his own, and to undertake to be one of those that shall answer for it. What if another had done as much against him, as he hath done against himself? And for how small a prize?

I I. As he before would insinuate, that what is said of the great number of Drunkards, and ignorant men turned out, was false, though so judged upon the Oaths of men accounted the greatest lovers of Religion in their Parishes; so he seemeth here to intimate that it was only or chiefly into the places of learned worthy men, that the silenced Ministers succeeded; whereas it was not one of many that came into any such mens places of them that were silenced at the fatal Bartholomew day.

I I I. He seemeth to intimate, that when the Parliament (suppose by wrong) put out either such as he or I describe, the Land must be under an Interdict till the Bishops and King were restored, and that Christ's Gospel was no more to be preached in England, till Diocefanes returned, but all Souls be given up to Damnation, unless Christ would save them without the preaching of his Gospel, and the Land was to be left to the Devil and Paganism. And who can deny now but the Diocefan Species is essential to the Church?

I V. When I spake only of the silencing and ejecting Act, of Aug. 24. 1662. he would make the Reader believe, that this Change was to restore the Churches to their ejected Pastors, or cast out Usurpers; whereas unless Ignorance or worse hinder him, he knoweth that all that were cast out and were alive, laid claim to their Benefices, and were restored before that, and their Livings resigned quietly to them, to say nothing of the rest that were supposed to be at the Lord Chancellors disposal. Those that were put out that the sequestred might re-enter, were none of them silenced, nor made incapable of other Livings till August 24. 1662.

V. He would insinuate that it was only the Nonconformists that were cast out of such sequestrations: Whereas in the Countries that I either lived in or heard of, it was as many or more of the Conformists, that had sequestred Livings and were cast out, and took new presentations.

V I. And this is evident by his Intimation, as if it were a very great number of the Church Livings that were so posleffed:

Whereas
Whereas of Nine Thousand or Ten Thousand Ministers then in Possession, Seven or Eight Thousand Conformed: Therefore 'tis likely that the Conformists had most of the Sequestrations.

VII. He tells you that the Ejected Ministers were brought in to instruct the People in the Lawfulness of Rebellion: Doth not this intimate that this was the case only or chiefly of the silenced Nonconformists? But I have oft cited Jewell defending the French Protestants; Was not he a Bishop? I have oft cited Bilson, affirming it no Rebellion if the Nobles and People defend their Legal Constitution against one that will-- (I will not recite the rest.) ---- I have oft cited Ri. Hooker whose popular Principles I have confuted, and goeth higher against absolute Monarchy, than I or any of my Correspondency did in all the Wars. Heylin is for Conciliation with the Papists: He knoweth not their Writings who knoweth not that the Papists are more for popular Election, and Power towards Princes, far than ever such as I were. And had he not put his Head and Eyes into a Bag, he could hardly have denied but that they were Episcopal Conformists on both sides that began the War: But being got into the dark he loudly denieth it.

VIII. He saith, There were many others that himself would not have thought fit to have continued. Ans. I thought I was more likely to know them than he. I remember not one such of an hundred that did not conform. I confess that when the Prelatical party intreated me no longer to refuse the Westminster Commissioners Letters, deputing me with others to try and judge of some Episcopal Conformists that stood then for Livings, to avoid all seeming opposition to that way I did stretch as far as I durst, to approve and keep in some Conformists, of very low parts who knew not a quarter so much as some Lay People did: But none of these were Nonconformists.

IX. He saith, All the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule then established in the Church. This is true: And what was that Rule? Did Peter or Paul make it, or submit to it? Did they refuse any thing that God commanded in Nature or Scripture? Or any Circumstantialls necessary in general left in specie to the Magistrates determination? They were guilty of believing that God is above man, and that there is no Power but of God, and none against him; and that we must please him whoever
whoever be displeased. They were guilty of so much Self-love as to be unwilling to be damned for a Benefice, or for a Bishops Will. They did not consent to profess Assent and Consent to all things contained in and prescribed by three Books, written by such as declare themselves to be fallible; and such as not one of Fourty ever saw before they declared the said Assent and Consent to them. They did not consent to cast out all Infants from Christendom, whose Parents durst not offer them to Baptism, under the Sacramental Symbol of the Cross; nor unless they might have themselves been Covenanters, Undertakers, or Promisers for them, as well as the Godfathers: Or that scrupled getting Strangers to undertake that perfidiously for their Children which they never intended to perform. They durst not read Excommunications against Christ's true Servants, nor repel those from Christian Communion, who scruple kneeling in the reception of the Sacrament: They durst not swear that many Thousands whom they never knew are not obliged by the Covenant, when they know not in what sense they took it: For they are not willing to believe that the compounding Lords and Knights did not put a good fence on it before they took it. They durst not say that all is so well in our Church Government by Diocesanes, Lay-Chancellours Power of the Keys, Archdeacons, Officials, Commissaries, &c. that we may swear against all endeavours to amend it by any alteration; They do believe that the Law of Nature is Gods Law, and that as it alloweth a single Person only private defence, so it alloweth every Nation publick defence against Enemies notorious destroying assaults: And they dare not swear or covenant, that if any should from the Lord Chancellour, &c. get a Commission to seize on the Kings Navy, Treasures, Forts, Guards, Person, and to seize on the Lives and Estates of all his Innocent Subjects, that it is unlawful to refift any that execute such a Commission. They find it so hard a Controversie, what God doth with the dying Infants of Atheists, Infidels, Mahometanes, and Persecutors, that they dare not declare, that if any of their Children be baptized and die, it is certain by the word of God that they are undoubtedly saved. We say not that the Law binds us to any of the evil which we fear: But we dare not take Oaths and Promises which we understand not.

Abundance I pretermitt.
He is extremly censorious if he think that Mr. R. Hooker, Bp. Bilson, Bp. Grindal, A. Bp. Abbod, Bp. Rob. Abbod, Bp. Jewel, &c. would have been Conformists had they been now alive.

X. He faith, [They chose rather to leave their Livings.] Ans. They chose not to conform, but submitted only to leave their Livings; Eligere est agere. They were passive in this, they refused to conform as supposed by them a heinous Sin, but they chose not to be silenced or cast out; but they chose to endure it when the Bishops chose it for them.

XI. He faith, that [the Bishops could not help it any otherwise than as they were Members of Parliament.

Ans. 1. I confess Scripture useth the like Phrafe, Can the Leopard change his Spots, &c. or they that are accustomed to do evil learn to do well? And Rom. 8, 6, 7. The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to his Law, nor can be.] I will not here too much contradict him, 2. But is it nothing that they could have done in Parliament, had they been willing? 3. Is it unlawful for us to know if he know it not, or deny it, how much the Bishops and Clergy did with the Parliament-Men? 4. He should at least have stayed till Dr. Bates, Dr. Jacob, and I are dead, who wrote and disputed with the Bishops by the Kings Commission, before he had talked at this rate to the World. Did not the King make his Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs? And did he not under the broad Seal commission those Bishops and Doctors to treat with us for the making such alterations as were necessary to tender Conscience? Did they not maintain that no alterations were thereto necessary, and so end the treaty. 5. Did they not in their next Convocation lay aside the Kings Indulgent Declaration, and make the Additions to the Liturgy? And yet could they not help it? Nor was it none of their doings? 6. Doth not England know that Parliaments since have by experience perceived their Mistake, and would have suspend ed our Prosecution, and restored us to Unity, and the Bishops and Clergy will not consent but rage against it, and preach and write to have us executed according to the Laws; and no abatement to be made, and as this man, think that the Churches Distraction is from Projects of Moderation. What name should one give to such Histories as these? The guilty cannot bear their names.

XII. He
XIII. He faith, [It was the Law that tied them to their choice and not the Bishops.]

Anf. 1. Suppose the word *choice* were proper here, [Is it any justification of the Executioners?] It was the Emperour Charles the 5th’s Edict that tied all the Protestant Ministers to conform to the Interim, or be gone: It was the Law that tied the Martyrs in Qu. Maries days to profess what they believed not, or to be burnt. Alas! How could Bonner and Gardiner help it? 2. But how many Bishops were against the passing of that Bill? And who persuaded the Lay-Men to it? Must we not know when it’s night if you deny it?

XIII. He tells you, that [the ancient silenced Teachers before the Civil Wars, were the Instruments of Antimonarchical and Antiepiscopal Faction.]

Anf. 1. Which of them all said so much as Mr. Hooker, Bp. Bilson, Bp. Jewel, &c. have done? 2. If you make any Conscience of the 9th Commandment, prove the Truth of what you say of those that were suspended and driven out of the Kingdom in the times of A. Bp. Laud, Bp. Wren, Bp. Piercy, &c. for not reading the Book for Lords-days Dancing and Sports, and that were prosecuted for Preaching twice on the Lords-day, and for not turning the Table Altar-wife, and railing in, which even Bp. Montague as well as Williams was against. Was Bishop Miles Smyth of Gloucester, were A. Bp. Abbot or Grindall Antimonarchical or Antiepiscopal? 3. Prove if you are able any Antimonarchical Principles, Words, or Deeds by Mr. Hilderlam, Mr. Brinsley, Mr. Paul Baine, Mr. Dod, Mr. Knewstubs, and hundreds of such I might name. The most malicious are fain to talk of one Knox, or one Goodman, or one Junius Brutus, (that is, Hubertus Langenus Melanthon friend) or somewhat in Buchanan, not the tenth part so much as is commonly said by the Papists, with whom our A. Bp. Bromhall and his Companions so much plead for Concord. 4. Doth not Al. Cope, and Sanders, and Pateson in the Image of both Churches, and lately the nominal Bellamy in his Philanaxis Anglicus, and many more such, say all the fame of the Bishops and Church of England, and all that they deride as [Protestants of Sincerity] as guilty of far more rebellious Principles and Practices, than ever you can prove by the meer Nonconformists old or new? And is it enough to accuse?
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XIV. He
XIV. He faith, They would preach but they would not conform to the established Religion.

Anf. 1. But why should they be forbidden to preach (which was good and they were devoted to?) If a man will not do all that you would have him to do, shall he do nothing?

2. What was that which he calleth the Established Religion? It was the Ceremonies and Subscription, that there is nothing in the Liturgy contrary to the Word of God.] And was this a Crime worthy the forbidding men to preach the Gospel? Or why should the Souls of Thousands of the Innocent People be so heavily punished for another mans omission, even because the Teachers fear Conformity.

3. But still we see what these mens Religion is: Had their Religion been the Scripture, or any Doctrine or Worship common to the Christian or Protestant Churches, the old Nonconformists willingly consented to it. But here they shew that their Ceremonies and proper Liturgy forms are their Religion. But then 1. Why do Dr. Burges and all that plead for your Ceremonies and Invention, build all on this, that you make them not any parts of Worship or Religion, (which they confess man may not invent) but meer accidents? 2. How old then is your Religion? Your Liturgy was made since Luther began his Reformation. 3. It seems then that you are not of the same Religion with the Protestants that have none of your Ceremonies, Liturgy or Subscriptions. 4. Is not then your Church of a singular Religion from all the World, and consequently a singular Church? And is it the whole Catholick Church then, or a Schismatitical Church?

I confess that you shew more evidently than by such words, that your self-made Rules and Circumstances are your Religion: For 1. You make Conformity to them to be de facto more necessary than our Preaching the Gospel, or our Church Communion, or any publick Church Worship of God. 2. And you excommunicate by your Rule or Canon every Member of Christ in England, that doth but think and say, that any thing of your Imposition, Liturgy, Ceremonies, or Government are sinful. 3. And yet when you have done you call all your Impositions things indifferent. 4. And thereby you declare that your Religion in part is a thing indifferent. 5. And no Man or Woman shall be of your Church that cannot know all the indifferent.
different things in the world which may be imposed on them, to be Indifferent and not Unlawful; when you know (or you know not whom you dwell among) that we have much ado to get one half your Church to know things necessary. 6. The Papists that put a greater necessity on their Inventions will deride you for an Indifferent Religion.

There was a poor Puritane Nonconformist that feared Lying, that went about the Streets with Ink to sell, and was wont truly to cry, [Very good Ink, very good Ink;] but once his Ink a little miscarried, and he durst not call it [Very good,] but cried, Pretty good Ink, Pretty good Ink,] and no body would buy of him, and he lost his Ink. And if you cry up [An indifferent Religion,] whatever you have for numbers, you will have for quality but an Indifferent Church, (save our Rulers.)

XV. But he adds, [Many of them would preach against it and their Government too.]

Ans. 1. You tempt them towards it. If I ask the Butcher [Is your Meat sweet?] and he say it is indifferent, I am excusable if I think it flinks. 2. They judge by the effects: They thought that when an indifferent thing casteth out a necessary thing, it becomes naught. 3. But yet your Accusation is unfaithful: Why did you not say then, that it was not for Nonconformity that men were cast out, but for preaching against your Religion? Who were those? Was it proved? If so, what was that to the rest? Do you punish many learned moderate men for the fault of a few others that they were not concerned with? You now alledge Mr. Hildersham, Ball, Bradshaw, Baine, Knows, and abundance such, for being against Separation, and persuading men to come to the Common Prayer, (and many of them to kneel at the Sacrament,) and yet when you plead for their Silencing, even other mens words may serve against them.

XVI. To conclude, in all he layeth the cause of their silence on themselves for not conforming, and yet will not tell us what we should do to help it. Would they have us Conform while we judge it as sinful as I have mentioned in my first Idea for Peace? No; they profess the contrary. Would they have us believe all to be lawful? We cannot: Our Judgments are not at our Command: What would they have us do to change? Worldly Interest makes us too willing! We study as hard as they! We
We earnestly beg God's Illumination to save us from Error. We read all that they write to convince us: And the more we read, study, and pray, the more heinous the Sin of Conformity seems to some. I ask Bp. Morley the same question when he forbade my preaching, before the ejecting Act; and he bid me read Bilson and Hooker: I told him that was not now to do: and in both of them I found the Principles which are made the cause of my Silencing, my greatest Crimes, and in one of them worse. He then told me, If God would not give me his Grace he could not help it: And yet most of these men are against fatal, reprobating, necessitating Decrees.

The imposing Papists use men worse: Of whom will you pardon a Fable.

A Bee and a Flie were catcht together in a Spiders Web: The Spider when they were tired with striving, claimed them both for her Food, as a punishment for breaking into and troubling her Web: And against the Bee she pleaded that she was a hurtful Militant Animal, that had a Sting; and against the Flie that she was noifome and good for nothing. The Bee answered that her melliflying Nature and work was profitable, and Nature had armed her with a Sting to defend it. And the Flie said, as she did little good so she did little harm, and could make her self no better than Nature had made her. And as to the Crime alleged against them, they both said, that the Net was made by a venomous Animal, spun out of the Air and the Venom of her own Bowels, made for no use but to catch and destroy the Innocent, and they came not into it by malice, but by ignorance and mistake, and that it was more against their Will than against the Spiders, for they contrived not to fall into it; but she contrived to catch them; and that it was not to break the Net that they strove, but to save their Lives. The Master of the House overheard the Debate, but resolved to see how the Spider would judge, which was quickly done without more words; she took them for Malefactors, and killed them both. The Master of the House so disliked the Judgment, that he ordered that for the time to come, 1. The Bees should be safely hived and cherished. 2. And the Flies, if not very noifome, should be tolerated. 3. And all Spiders Webs swept down.

I need to give you no more of the Exposition of it, than by the Spider I mean the Papal noxious Canon-makers, and that by the
the Net I mean their unnecessary and ensnaring Laws and Canons, which are made to catch and destroy good men, and are the way to the Inquisition, or Bonner's Coal-house, or Smithfield Bonfires. But I must desire you not to imagine that I speak against the Laws of the Land.

§ 27. As to the Conclusion of his last Chapter, I shall now add no more but this: If what I said before and to Mr. Hinkley satisfy him not, of what Religion and Party both sides were that began the War, and Mr. Russwouths Collections, and other Histories of former Parliaments be not herein useful to him, let him but secure me from burning my Fingers with Subjects so red hot, by mens misinterpreting and impatience, and I will (God willing) give him so full proof, that (to say nothing of latent Instigators and consequent auxiliaries on either side, nor of the King himself, whose Religion is beyond dispute,) the parties else that begun the War in England did differ in Religion, but as A. Bps. Laud, and Neal, and Bromhal, and such others; and A. Bps. Abbot and Williams, and Bp. Bilson, on the other side; and as Dr. Mainwaring, Sibthorp, &c. on one side, and Mr. Ri. Hooker and such on the other side differed. And if my proof be confutable I will not hereafter undertake to prove that English is the language of England.

But my Bargain must be thus limited. 1. I will not undertake that from the beginning there was no one Papist on the Kings side, or no one Presbyterian on the Parliaments: I could never yet learn of more than one in the House of Commons, and a very few Independents, but I cannot prove that there was no more.

2. You must not put me upon searching mens hearts: I undertake not to prove what any mans heart in England was; but what their Profession was, and what Church they joined with in Communion.

3. And you must not equivocate in the use of the name [Presbyterian,] or [Nonconformist,] and tell me that you take some A. Bps. and Bps. and such Divines as Ri. Hooker, and Bilson, and Bp. Downname, the Pillars of Episcopacy and Conformity, for Presbyterians.

And if it may be I would beg that of you, that you will not take the long Parliament for Presbyterians and Nonconformists, who made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation Act, the Militia
Militia Act, and those against conventicles, and for banishment from Corporations, &c. Notwithstanding their high Votes about the Succession and Jealousies of Popery, and that which they said and did hereupon: For I confess if it be such Nonconformists or Presbyterians as those that you mean, I'll give you the better. And I must also desire that you call not the next Parliament, which consisted most of the same Men, Presbyterians or Nonconformists; nor the other since them? Or at least that hereafter before we dispute we may better agree of the meaning of our terms.

And I declare to the Reader, that nothing in all this Book is intended against the Primitive Church-Government or Episcopacy, nor against the good Bishops, Clergy, Councils, or Canons, which were many; nor against King, Parliament, Magistracy, the Laws, or Liturgy, or Church Communion; nor against our peaceable and patient submission where we dare not practically obey: But only against the diseases and degeneracy of Bishops, Clergy, Councils, and Canons, and those dividing practices, by which they have for 1200 Years and more been tearing the Christian World into the Sects of which it now consisteth; and against the whole ascendent Change from the Primitive Episcopacy to Papal maturity: and against our swearing, Subscribing, declaring, covenanting, professing, and practising, where we understand not the Imposters sense, and are unwilling by our private Interpretations to deceive them, and where we are persuaded that it would be heinous sin to us, not meddling with the case of Lawmakers or Conformists, who have no such fears, but think all good.

Chrysostome (before cited) in Act. I. Hom. 3. p. (mihi) 472. speaketh harder than I ever did: [ἐκ δικλοκτηρίων, &c. which Eras- mius translaticeth, Ἐνον τεμενε νδεικτο, sed ut adfectus sum & sentio: Non arbitrator inter Sacertdotes multos esse qui falsi fiant, sed multo plures qui p. r eant. His reason is the same which some give why they think most Physicians kill more than they cure, because there is so much Wisdom, Goodness, Watchfulness, and Diligence required to their Calling, which few of them have.

Luther is much sharper than I ever was, when he saith, [Hieronymus & ali Patres vixerant in temporaliter Successione Ecclesiae, expertes Crucis & persecutionis. Episcopi enim jam tum coeperant crescre & angeri episkopos, existimatione & gloria in mundo: Et ple-

Et Cap. 27. p. 48. de Synodis. In posterioribus Conciliis nuncquam de fide, sed semper de opinionibus & questionibus disputatum, (after the first) ut mibi Conciliorum nomen pene tam suspectum & invitos sit, quam nomen Libri arbitrii.

What Melanthon thought of the Papal design of magnifying Councils, and pleading the necessity of uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Ordination, see in his Epistles, especially of the Conference at Ratisbone.

Dr. Henry Moore in his Mystery of Iniquity faith, p. 132. [* That Principle tends to the ruining of Faith, which sup-" poseth that without right Succession of Bishops and Priests, " there is no true Church, and therefore no true Faith: and " that this Succession may be interrupted by the Misordination " or Misconsecration of a Priest or Bishop, the Persons thus or-" dained being Atheists or Jews, or ordained by them that are " so---- As if a man could not feel in his own Conscience whe-" ther he believed or not the truths of holy Scripture, without " he were first assured that he was a Member of that Church, " that had an uninterrupted lawful Succession of the Priesthood " from the Apostles times till now.

Perhaps Episcopius and Carcellanus will be more regarded. Read that notable Preface of Carcellanus to Episcopius Works, p. 12, 13. [* Resp. Experientiam docere nullas unquam Controversias de Religione inter Christianos exortas auctoritate synodali faciliter terminatas suffe---& certiores multo pacis viam esse---- Next he shews how little good even the Nicene Council did, and how much worse things were after: Hierome saying, that the whole World was Arian, And Constantius reproaching Libe-" rius for being with one man against all the World: The Vulgar Dicterium being, Omne Concilium parit Bellum. Whence he ga-" thers that Councils, such as the World hath hitherto had, non esse idoneum componendis Religionis difficilis Remedium: Et quam-" diu illud usurpabitur perpetuas in Ecclesi & Republica turbas fo-" re.

Episcopii & precipuorum emicuit fides & animi magnitudo; quod ne promissis quidem solutionis ejusdem quo anquea fustenaturn stipendii, induci poterint ut se ad silentium quod imperabatur servan-
Co-copious and sharp is Episcopius, Q. 52, p. 56, b. in maintaining that the Magistrate hath no Authority to forbid sacred Assemblies to tolerable Dissenters, and that Ministers and People forbidden them must hold on to the death, that I will not recite the words, but desire his Admirers to read them.

§ 1. To give my Character of you whom I know not, as you do of me, is none of my work: But your Stile alloweth me to say, that by it you seem to me to be a man of Conscience, fearing God. And yet your Matter assureth me, that you speak abundance of Untruths confidently; I suppose, partly by not knowing the persons and things of which you speak, and partly by thinking that you ought to believe the false Reporters, with whom you are better acquainted.

§ 2. The strait which you cast us into is unavoidable: Either we must seem to own all the false Accusations brought against us, which will hurt others far more than us; or else we must deny and contradict them, and that will pass for an intolerable addition to our guilt, and we shall be supposed such intemperate, fierce abusive Persons as you describe me, while you think we give you the Lye, or make you Slanderers. But we cannot cure your Misrepresentations, but must be content to bear your Censures, while we call you not Liars, but only acquaint you with the truth.

§ 3. For my own part my final Judgment is so near, and I am conscious of so much evil in myself, that I have no reason to be hasty in my own Vindication, but much reason to take all hints and helps for deeper search, and will not justify my Stile. And God knows I am afraid left selfishness or partiality should hinder me
me from finding out my sin: and I dayly and earnestly beg of
God to make it known to me, that I may not be impenitent:
But either Prejudice, Converse, or somewhat else, maketh a ve-
ry great difference between your Judgment and mine, of Good
and Evil: And I cannot help it: If I err it is not for want of
willingness to see my Error, and openly retract it; nor for
want of an ordinary Diligence to know the Truth.

The Sum of our difference, as far as I can understand you, is in
these particulars.

I. Whether there be no sin imposed by the Laws or Canons
on Ministers and People here?

II. Whether it was well done by the Bishops and other Cler-
gy-Men to do what they did to cause those Laws, which silenced
the whole Ministry of England, unless they would conform to
all things so imposed in the Act of Uniformity; and actually si-
enced about 2000, and made those other Laws against their
Preaching to more than Four, and against coming within Five
Miles of Corporations, and such others, as adjudge Nonconfor-
mists to Gaols and Ruine; and whether the Clergy do well still
to urge the Execution of those Laws, and are guiltless of the
doeful Divisions of this Land, and danger of its Relapse to Po-
pery?

III. Whether it be unpeaceable for a Nonconformist after 17
years silent suffering, to tell his Superiors why he dare not con-
form, when he is by them importuned to it? And to write a
Confutation of a multitude of Volumes of false Accusations
brought to justify the Executions?

§ 4. If you think you have proved all those Impositions fin-
lefs which I have mentioned in my first Plea for Peace, I think
you might as well have shortly said, [We Bishops are of so much
Wisdom and Authority, that you must hold them lawful, because we
say so.] And must all be ruined that would not be so convinced?
But if any of those Impositions prove to be sin, and so great sin
as we cannot chuse but think they are, is it a greater fault to
name them (when importuned) than to impose them? And a
greater fault to feel, and say we feel, than to strike or wound
men?

If we had taken it to be our Duty to have called those Cler-
gy-Men to Repentance, which we think are ignorantly undo-
ing themselves and the Land, how should we do it without
naming
naming their Sin? Yea, and the greatness of it? And if we think it our Duty to deprecate our Destruction, and beg of you to spare our Lives or Consciences, how can we do it without telling what we suffer? If it be well done of you, and be no perfection, but your Duty for the Churches good, (as no doubt the Executioners think) the History is your praise, and you need not extenuate the Fact: Valiant Souldiers glory in the multitudes they kill: Had you silenced the other 7000 that conformed, when you silenced but 2000, your Victory had been the more famous. Some think those that are here against your ways, are not half the Land; were it murdering of one man, that another is judged for, it were not unpeaceableness to say, that he deserveth to be hanged: But the judge deserveth praise if he condemn an hundred such. But when those men who should be the tenderest Peace-makers, and skilfullest therein, shall be the men that bring such a Land as this into the Case that we are in, and will not be intreated, nor by any Experience be persuaded to consent to its Relief, I know not how to shew mercy to the Land or them, but by persuading them to repent. And if all sin were made a matter of Controversie, and many learned men were for it, this would not alter the Case with me. If I may compare great things with small, who sinned more? The Irish for murdering 200000, or Sir John Temple, Dr. Henry Jones, the E.of Orery, for recording and reporting what they did? Was it the sin of the Savoyards and others to kill and ruin the Protestants in Piedmont? Or of Perrin, and Sir Sam.Moorland to write the story? Did Thuanu, Davilah, &c. sin in recording the French Massacre? Or the French in doing it? Is it the French Protestants now that are criminal for describing and complaining of their Sufferings? Was John Foxe the Malefactor for writing the Sufferings of the Protestants under a lawful Queen? This day came out (Mar. 10.) a Narrative from Bristol how they are crowded in the Gaol on the cold ground, &c. Is the Report the Crime? Do you find a Justification in humane nature of such terms as these, [You shall suffer whatever we will inflict on you, but shall not tell any that you are hurt, or who did it, or why?]

§ 5. I have told the World so often over and over, that it is not all the Conformists, no nor all the Bishops that Impute our Sufferings to, that I must suppose you to understand it, specially when the Prefatory Epistle of the Book which you fall upon tells.
tells it you of many Bishops by name: Therefore when p. 68, you say, [I apply to you more than once, 2 Thes. 2. 15. They please not God, &c.] and add, [I believe in my Conscience he is mistaken.] Either by [to us] you mean, all the Conformists or Bishops, and that is not true, as the words tell you: Or you mean, [Us that procured or own, and execute the aforesaid silencing, afflicting Acts:] which your words seem to mean. And then I do but say, Oh! What may temptation bring even good men Judgment to? Is the silencing of 2000, the afflicting of many times more of the Laity, the Jealousies, Distractions, and Dangers of this Land, so small a matter, or so good, that God is not displeased with it? And can you in your Conscience own what the Bishops did towards it? No wonder then if Ceremonies be called things Indifferent. Certainly this cannot be Indifferent? It is a most meritorious or excellent work, or else a heinous Crime: It is either such a Cure as the cutting off a Cancerous Breast, or else if it be a sin, it must be as great as contributing to the endangering of as many score Thousand Souls as 2000 Ministers were likely to have helpt to save, and to the corrupting of the Church, and the Introduction of Popery. And few Christians think that Nathan sinned by unpeaceableness more than David by Murder and Adultery, though but once; or Samuel more than Saul; or the Prophet that reproved him more than Jeroboam; or Christ Matt. 23. more than the Pharisees; yea, or than Peter, Mat. 16. when he said, Get behind me Satan, thou savourest not the things that be of God; or Paul more than Peter, Gal 2. or than the Jewish Teachers, whom he called the Concision & Dogs; or John than Diotrephes, &c.

Guilt is tender, and they that think God is of their Mind when he is silent, Psal. 50. 21. will think men should be so too: And man dare not bid defiance to God, and openly proclaim a War against him, and therefore hath no way to sin in peace, but by a conceited bringing the Mind and Law of God to his. What sin is there that Learned Men father not on God: And then they must be praised and not reproved, and then it's worse than unpeaceable to aggravate that which they say God owneth; such men as I, would think it scarce credible that the Spanish Inquisition, the French Massacre, the Powder-Plot, the Murder of 200000 in Ireland, the Perjuring of a Nation, the silencing of Thousands of faithful Ministers, should have one word of Justification.
lication ever spoken for it. But we are mistaken: No doubt men can write learned Volumes to defend any of these; and if one do but say, They please not God, men may be found that can say, [I believe in my Conscience that you are mistaken, and speak unpeacably: God is pleased with it all.] Sure the day of Judgment will be much to justify God himself, who is thus slandered as the Friend of every man's Sin. What wonder is it if there be numerous Religions in the World, when every selfish man maketh a God and a Religion of his own, fitted to his Interest and Mind? But when all men center only in one God, and bring their Minds to his, and not conceitedly his to theirs, we may yet be One.

And if we could make men know, that God is not for them, and accepteth not of a Sacrifice of Innocent Blood, however men think that they do him good Service, yet they would not have this known: It's long since unhumbled Sinners turned Church-Confession into Auricular; If Saul do say at last, I have sinned, he would yet be honoured before the People. But the time is near when those that honour God he will honour, and those that despise him shall be lightly esteemed.

Few men living can easier bear with others for different forms and Ceremonies than I; but I take not the silencing and ruining of 2000 Ministers for Ceremonies (were that the worst of it), to be a Ceremony.

§ 6. Pag. 69. You say, We are not all of one mind yet: A sad word from a Bishop. Do you think that any two Men on Earth are of one mind in all things? Were those agreed whom Paul persuadeth, Rom. 14. to receive each other, but not to doubtful Disputations, and not to judge or despise each other, (much less to silence, imprison, and destroy.) We are agreed in all that is constitutive of Christianity, and agreed that all Christians should love others as themselves, and do as they would be done by. I confess if you have such eminent Self-denial, as to be willing, if ever you differ from the publick Impositions, about the lawfulness of any one thing, to be not only cast out of your Lordship and Bishoprick, but to be silenced, imprisoned and destroyed, I cannot accuse you of Partiality but of Error. I have known too many Conformists who needed no Bishop to silence them, (they never preached.) But that will not justify their desires that others be silenced.

I have:
I have oft enough told you in how many things the Conformists are disagreed: I now say the Bishops themselves are not agreed of the very Species of the Church of England: To say nothing of their disagreement of the Constitutive, national Head or Governor; they are not agreed whether it be only a part of an universal, humane, political Church, subject to an universal humane supreme Power, who hath the right of Legislation and judgment over them, or whether it be a compleat national Church of itself, a part only of the universal as Headed by Christ, but not as by Man, or as humane Politie, having no foreign Governour, Monarchical or Aristocratical, (Pope or Council.)

Overdoing is illdoing and undoing. He that would make such a Law of Concord, as that none shall live out of Prison who are not of the same Age, Complexion, Appetite, and Opinion, would depose the King, by leaving him no Subjects. The Inquisition is set up in Love of Unity: But we know that we shall differ while we know but in part: Only the perfect World hath perfect Concord. I greatly rejoice in that Concord which is among all that truly love God. They love one another, and agree in all that is necessary to Salvation: The Church of the Conformists is all agreed for Crossing and the Surplice, and for the Imposed Oaths, Professions and Covenants: Oh that all our Parishioners who plead for the Church were agreed that the Gospel is true, and that Christ is not a Deceiver, and that Man dyeth not as Dogs, but hath a Life of future Retribution.

§7. P. 69. Asking, [Were not almost all the Westminster Assembly Episcopal Conformable men when they came thither?] He can say, [No, not in their hearts, as appeared by their fruirs.] And he cites some words of the Sense of the Parliament, Jan. 12. 1643.

Ans. 1. See here a Bishop that knew the hearts of hundreds of men, whom he never saw, to be contrary to their Profession and constant Practice.

2. And he can prove by their reporting the Parliaments words what was these Ministers own Judgment.

3. And he can prove by those words in Jan. 1643. what was their Judgment a Year or two before, and is sure that the Scotch Arguments did not change them.

4. And he can prove that those are no Episcopal Conformists who are for the ancient Episcopacy only (described by Bishop Usher,) and
and take the English frame to be only lawful, but not unalterable, or best. And if really he do take him to be no Episcopal Conformist, who is for enduring any way but their own, it is he and not I that gave them so bad a Character: It is he and not I that intimate, that those moderate Conformists who had rather Church-Government were reformed, than such Confusion made by silencing and hunting Christians, are at the Heart no Episcopal Conformists: Their Hearts I confess much differ from the Silencers and Hunters.

§ 8. He maketh me a false Historian for fixing the War on the Erastian Party in Parliament. Ans. Did I lay it only on the Erastians? Have I not undeniably proved that the War here began between two Episcopal Parties? Of which one part were of A. Bp. Abbots, Mr. Hookers, and the generality of the Bishops and Parliaments mind, and the other of Bp. Lands, Sibthorps, Maynwarings, Heylings, A. Bp. Bromballs, &c. mind: And the first sort some of them thought Episcopacy pure Divino; but the English Frame not unreformable: And the other sort thought it was but pure humano, and these were called by some Erastians. Let him give me leave to produce my Historical proofs, even to single men by name, that the English War began between these two Parties, and I defie all his false Contra-diction: Only supposing, 1. That I speak not of the King, nor of the War in Ireland or Scotland. 2. That I grant that the Nonconformists were most for the Parliament, and the Papists most against them.

But when I have said so much to Mr. Hinkley already to prove this, did this Lord Bishop think to be believed without confuting it?

§ 9. But it transcends all bounds of Historical credibility, that he answereth this by saying, [He and all his Abettors must know the Catalogues of that Parliament, and that Assembly are still in our hands, the Copies of their Speeches, and Journals of their Votes, &c. ] Ans. They are so to the Shame of such Historians. You have many of them in Whitlocks Memorials; I knew so great a number my self of the Parliament, Assembly, and Army, as makes me pity the Ignorant World, which is abused by such Historians as you and yours.

§ 10. As for your assuring me that you look one day to answer for all you say, it minds me of the words of your Dr. Abboton,
Chaplain to the Duke of Ormond, who (as going to the Bar of God) undertakes to prove, that it is through Pride and Covetousness that we conform not. The Inquisitors also believe a day of Judgment. And what is it that some men do not confidently ascribe to the most holy God?

§ 11. Your praises of me are above my desert: I am worse than you are aware of: But mens sins against Christ's Church and Servants in England, Scotland, and Ireland are never the less for that.

§ 12. You shew us that you are deceived before you deceive: You do but lead others into the way of falsehood which you were led into your self, when you say, I am [said to have asserted, that a man might live without any actual Sin.] A Lord Bishop (Morley p. 13.) told it you, and you a Lord Bishop tell it others, and thus the poor World hath been long used; so that of such Historians men at last may grow to take it for a valid Consequence, [It is written by them: Ergo it is incredible.] I tell you first in general, that I have seen few Books in all my Life, which in so few Sheets have so many Falsehoods in matters of Fact done before many, as that Letter of Bishop Morley's; which upon your Provocation I would manifest, by Printing my Answer to him, were it not for the charges of the Press.

2. And as to your Instance, the case was this: Dr. Lany impertinently talkt of our being justified only by the Act of Faith, and not the Habit: I askt him whether we are unjustified in our sleep? which led us further, and occasioned me to say to some Objection of his, that men were not always doing moral Acts good or evil: and thence, [that a man is not always actually sinning, viz. In a man's sleep, he may live sometimes and not actually sin; as also in an Apoplexy and other los of Reason.] Hence the credible Bishop Morley printed that I said, A man may live without any actual Sin: Yea, and such other Reasons are given for his forbidding me to preach the Gospel. And now another pious L. Bp. going to answer it at Judgment, publisheth it as from him. O what a World is this, and by what hands are we cast down? Is my Assertion false or doubtful? Dr. Bates and Dr. Pacombe who were present are yet both living. By such men and means is the Church as it is: Arise O Lord and save it from them.

§ 13. You tell me, as Bp. Morley, of being the top of a fallion of my own making, neither Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independ
I hop my but nor thought limited narchy your wrong you or the own break latifts Independents, Anabaptifts, plain. had had Aflembie Bagjhavo you it in who to as But a or dene, Apollinarian, the the ocefane to as fticb, bear Monothelite, or Macedonian, nor a Neftorian, or Eutychian, or Monothelite, or a Papift, &c. Conclude ergo I am the top of a new Herefie, and silence and imprison me for it, and your Diocesane Conformity will be past all fpisicion (even at the heart.) But you will one day know, that to be againft all Faction, and yet to bear with the Infirmities of the weak, and love all Chriftians as such, is a way that had a better Author.

§ 14. P. 73, 74. As to your extolled Friend a Nonconformift, who you say, told you that [I am not able to bear being gainsaid in any thing, for want of Academick Disputes, &c.

Anf. 1. Was your great Friend fo excellent a man, and was it a good work to silence him, with which in your Conscience you think God is pleased?

2. Now you name him not, he cannot contradict you: Mr. Bagshaw faid somthing like it of Mr. Herle, Prolocutor of the Aflembie, which his Acquaintance contradict:

3. I jufifie not my Patience; it is too little: But verily if you had silenced me alone, and Gods Church and Thousands of Souls had been spared, I think you had never heard me twice complain. Judge you whether I can endure to be gainsaid, when I think there are Forty Books written againft me by Infidels, Socinians, Papifts, Prelatifs, Quakers, Seekers, Antinomians, Anabaptifts, Sabbatarians, Separatifs, and fome Presbyterian, Independents, Erafians, Politicians, &c. which for the far greatest part I never answered, though some of them written by Prelatifs and Papifts have fpoken fire and Sword: Nor to my Remembrance did any or all these Books by troubling me ever break one hour of my sleep, nor ever grieve me fo much as my own fin and pain (which yet was never extream) have grieved me one day. Alas Sir! How light a thing is the contradiction or reproach of man who is speaking and dying almost at once?

§ 15. P. 75. As to my Political Aphorifms I have oft told you I wish they had never been written: But all in them is not wrong which Bifhops are againft. The first passage challenged by your Bifhop Morley is, My calling a pretence to unlimited Monarchy by the name of Tyranny, adding my rea fon, because they are limited by God who is over all. Minifters were never under Turks thought worthy of punishment for such an Affertion: But Bisho
shop Morley is no Turk. If Monarchs be not limited by God, they may command all their Subjects to deny God, or blaspheme him, to take Perjury, Murder, and Adultery, for Duties: and they are unwise if ever they will be sick, die, or come to Judgment.

§ 16. You say, ["I was told by a Reverend Prelate, that at the Conference at the Savoy, Mr. Baxter being demanded what would satisfy him, replied, All or Nothing: On this I reflected on what that grave Divine told me."]

Ans. Alas good man! if for all other your historical notices you are fall into such hands, what a mass of Untruths is in your Brain? But why will you dis honour Reverend Prelates so much as to father them on such? I never heard the question put [What will satisfy you?] nor any such answer as All or Nothing: When the King commissioned us to treat of such Alterations as were necessary to tender Consciences, the Bishops, 1. Would not treat till we would give them in writing all that we blamed in the Liturgy, and all the Alterations we would have, and all the additional Forms we desired. 2. When thus constrained, we offered these on supposition, that on Debate much of it would be denied us, or altered; but they would not vouchsafe us any Debate on what we offered, nor a word against our additional Forms, Reply, or Petition for Peace. 3. To the last hour they maintained, that No alteration at all was necessary to tender Consciences.] And so they ended, and the Convocation doubled and trebled our Burden, and the Bishops in Parliament together.

Once Bishop Cousins desired us to lay by Inconveniences, and name only what we took for downright Sin. I gave him a Paper describing Eight such: We did but begin to debate one of them, ( Casting such from the Communion of Christ's Church that dare not take the Sacrament kneeling, though they be mistaken) and our time ended.

Dr. Pierce undertook to prove it a Mercy to them to deny them the Sacrament; and he made a motion to me, that he and I might go about the Land to preach men into satisfaction and Conformity: I asked him how I could do that when they intended to silence me? For though I scrupled not kneeling at the Sacrament, if they made any one Sin the condition of my Ministry, I should be silenced, though they abated all the rest. It may be this went for [All or Nothing.] And I am sorry that the
the Bishops be not of the same mind: St. James was, that said, 
He that breaketh one is guilty of all: And Christ was, who said, 
He that breaketh one of the least of these commands, and teacheth 
men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of God.

So that it was not All Inconveniences, but All flat Sins that 
we craved in vain to have been exempted from: Much less was 
it the Establishment of all that we proposed to have been treat-
ed of, openly professing our selves ready to alter any thing amiss 
or needless upon treaty, and supposing there would be many 
such words: But they would not touch our offered additions, 
nor entertain any treaty about them.

And now pity your self who have been drawn to believe such 
Reverend Prelates as you say, and pity such as your Writings 
will deceive.

§ 17. That you take it to be contrary to a Christian temper 
to be sensible of the Sufferings of the Church, and to name and 
describe the sin that causeth them, and that but in a necessitated 
Apology for the Sufferers, is no wonder, the Reasons and your 
Answer I gave you before § 4 and 5. I think it no breach of 
Peace with Persecutors or Silencers, to tell them what they do, 
especially when the Sufferers are feigned to deserve it all; and 
not to sin and that deliberately, is made a sin deserving all that 
we suffer and the Nation by it.

§ 18. But p. 77: tells us yet more whence your Errors 
come, even by believing false Reports, and then reporting what 
you believe. You say, [Some People have talked of a Combinar-
tion or Pact amongst themselves, that except they might have their 
own Will throughout, they would make the World know what a breach 
they could make, and how considerable they were.]

Anf. 1. Do you not think that Rogers, Bradford, Philpot, 
and the rest, did so in Qu. Marius days, and that it was they 
that made the Breach by being burnt? What is it that such His-
torians may not say?: So Luther was taught by the Devil, Bucer 
was killed by the Devil, so was Oecclampadius, Calvin was a stigr-
matized Sodomite, and what not: And even the most publick 
things are yet uncertain before our Eyes: Godfrey killed him-
self: The Papists had no Plot: The Presbyterians have a Plot 
against the King: The Nonconformists silenced themselves: And 
did not the Citizens of London burn their own Houses?: When 
you that are a Bishop cite other great Bishops for such things as
you do, may it not come in time to be the Faith of the Church, and thence to be necessary to all.

2. But how do you think all these that were scattered all over England, and knew not one another by name or Dwelling, should so confederate?

3. Do but think of it as a man. There were Nine or Ten Thousand Ministers that had conformed to the Parliaments way in possession: They were all to conform or be cast out. The Book and Act of Uniformity came not out of the Press till about that very day Aug. 24. Neither Conformists, nor (after) Nonconformists could see it, but those in or near London: What time was there to tell them all over England in one day? How knew we who would conform and who would not, when Nine Thousand were equally in possession? If we had written to them all, would not One Thousand of our Letters have detected it? Or at least some of those that conformed, with whom we prevailed not?

4. What was it that moved them all to this Confederacy? To suffer Ruine in the World? To make themselves considerable you say, and shew what a Breach they could make? And for what? Unless they might have all their own Wills? And what was their Will? Was it to be Lord Bishops? Or domineer over any? Or to get great Benefices? I think no high-way Robbers do any Villanies meerly to shew what mischief they can do, much less ruine themselves to shew that they can do Mischief by Suffering. Some such thing is said of some odd Circumcellians that they killed themselves to make others thought their Persecutors: But Persecution was more hated then than now. Did the former Life and Doctrine of these Two Thousand men signifie a Spirit so much worse than the rest?

5. And do you think that the other Seven Thousand or Eight Thousand that conformed did confederate beforehand to conform? How could they do it who declared Assent and Consent to every thing contained and prescribed in and by the Book which they never saw, unless they confederated at a venture, to do whatever was imposed? And if Seven Thousand could agree without confederating, why not Two Thousand? I could not then have my Post Letters pass without Interception: And it's a wonder that no Letter of this Confederacy was taken.

And I'lle tell (not you, but those that believe me) how far we were from it. When we were all cast out and some new mo-
tion was made for our service, one weak man moved here, that
we might draw up a consenting Judgment to how much we
could yield, that we might not differ. I answered that it was not
our business to make a Faction, or to strengthen a Party; nor
were we all of one judgment about every Ceremony, and therefore
no man must go against his judgment for a Combination with
the rest: If they would abate but so much as any one man's Con-
science would be satisfied in, that one man must serve the Church
accordingly. And if any were taken in, the rest would rejoice.] 
This Answer silenced that motion, and I never heard any move
it more: And I am fully assured there was never such a Com-

But with this exception: How far any thought the Covenant
bound them against our Prelacy I cannot tell. Those that I con-
vers'd with said, it bound them to no more than they were
bound to before. But I confess we did all confederate in our
Baptism, against willful sin: And I know of no other Confedera-
cies but these: which indeed was enough to make all men for-
bear what they judged to be sinful.

§ 19. You add, ["But yet it is not fair to over-reckon know-
ingly, and in ordinary course Two Hundred in the sum, as Mr.
"Baxter and others do, p. 155, 210. thereby to swell the ac-
count to the greater odium, by complaining roundly Two Thou-
sand: This I must conclude to be done knowingly, for sometimes
"he only mentions One Thousand Eight Hundred, p. 151, &c."]

Ans. I am persuaded that it is not knowingly that you speak
so much besides the truth; but for want of knowing what and
whom you talk of. I never medled with gathering the number,
Mr. Calamy did, and shewed us a Lift of 1800, upon which I
long mentioned no more, and seldom saw him afterward: But
Mr. Ennis who was more with him, assuring me that they had
after an account of at least 200 more, who were omitted; I
sometime to speak the least mention the 1800, and sometime
saw about 2000, and by his last account that was the least. Yet
with a Lord Bishop that knoweth nothing of all this, I know-
gly over-reckon: But if God be pleased with their silencing, why do
you take this ill?

§ 20. The next and great Accusation is my extenuating the B-
ishops Clemency, and aggravating our Sufferings, and that against
my Conscience I implore to the Bishops that bloodiness which they ne-
wer intended but abhor. And he will not believe what I say of the death of any by Imprisonment or want.

Ans. The good Lady that pittied the Beggars when she came in out of the Frost and Snow, when she had warmed her self, chid them away, and said, it was warm enough. I could name you those in London, that travelled out of the North in great want, and took up with such cold Lodgings here in great want of all things, that they were past cure before their misery was known. How many poor Quakers have dyed in Prison many know: It's like you never heard of the death of Mr. Field, a worthy Minister, in the Gate-house; nor of Mr. Thompson in the noisome Prison at Bristol, nor of Reverend Mr. Hughes of Plimouth's Death, caused by his Prison sickness; perhaps you never read the Life, Sufferings, and Death of excellent Joseph Allen of Taunton: I will not be the gatherer of a larger Catalogue, but I believe some others will. But these you know not of.

§ 21. The words in my Book which I speak argumentatively, shewing clearly whither their cause will lead them, if they trust to bring us to Unity by force, you unworthily feign that I speak as accusing the Bishops Inclinations. My Argument was, If you think by violence to effect your ends, it must be either by changing mens judgments, or by forcing them as Hypocrites to go against their judgments, or else by utter destroying them till there are no Dissenters: But none of these three ways will do it: Ergo Violence will not do it. 1. I prove that force will not change their Judgments. 2. I prove they are such men as will rather suffer death than sin against their Consciences; and so less Sufferings which cure not do but exasperate the Disease. 3. I prove that if, when less doth no good, you would destroy them, that would not do your work but crofs it. And doth this signifie that I charge the Bishops with bloody purposes? They openly tell us that it's pu

ishing us that must bring us to Concord. I tell them, Lesser will not do it, and greater will but hurt themselves. A man would think that I hereby rather infer that Bishops will not be bloody, than that they will, when I argue ab incommodo. Truly Sir, I see nothing in your Book which tempted me to lament, that I miss the happiness of your Academical Education or Disputes: Nor do I envy those that now enjoy it. God save his Church from the worser part of them.

§ 21. You say, p. 79. You must needs look on my aggravating
my own and the Dissenters Sufferings beyond Truth, you are sure beyond Probability, to have proceeded from want of temper. As for saying that some have lived on brown Bread and Water.

Anf. I find it still that our difference lieth in matter of Fact, done in the open sight of the World: And if it were whether we are English-men, I have no hope of ending it! O what is History! My own Sufferings by them are very small, save the hindering of my Labour: Leave to work is all the Preference that ever I desired of them: What I have had hath been against their Wills, who have called out for my greater restraint. God hath enabled me by the Charity of others to send some small relief to a few of those whose Case he will not believe. Some of them have Seven or Eight Children, and nothing at all of their own to maintain them, and live in Countries where scarce two Gentlemen of Estates within their reach do befriend them; and the People are generally poor; and many of these have none to preach to, being not permitted, And when they attempted to meet with some few secretly, to fast and pray in some case of need, have had their few Goods carried away by Distress. Good Alderman Aisburst, now with Christ, took care of many, and hath shewed me Letters and Certificates of undoubted credit, in the very words which I named. One is now near us, that was put to get his Living by Spinning. Mr. Chadwick was the last of whom I read those words in a just certificate, that he and his Children had long lived on meer Rye Bread and Water. It is now above a dozen Years since Dr. Vermuxden told me that Mr. Matthew Hill was his Patient, with Hydropical swell'd Legs, with drinking Water and using answerable Food through meer Poverty: But God turned it to good; for necessity drove him (when a little strengthened) to Mary-Land, where he hath been almost the only able Minister they have. We that know them our selves, and beg Money to relieve them, are supposed to be Lyars: for telling that which all their Neighbours know. Through Gods Mercy few in London suffer so much, (though divers are in great freights.) But great numbers in the Countrys who live among the poor, had not some of them now and then a little Relief from London, were like to beg for Bread, or fall into mortal Diseases by Food unfit for Nature. Even in London they that knew Mr. Farnworth, Mr. Spinage, and some others, and how they lived and dyed, understand me, I'll name Mr. Martin
tin formerly of Weedon, *very poor in London, to tell you of your impartiality; though he lost one Arm in the Kings Army, he had not a day abated him in Warwick Gaol for preaching.

§ 22. As to his repeating all my mention of their dealings, and my blaming the Bishops at the Savoy for our present divisions, and my aggravating the evils which Violence will produce if they trust to that way, I judge it all necessary to be spoken: Unknown sin will not be repented of nor forborn; nor unknown danger prevented; nor the unknown needs of the Peoples Souls relieved.

He asketh, Is this the way to be at Peace with us? I answer, There is no other way: What Peace can we have with them that think they are bound to silence us, and keep us six Months in Gaol for every Sermon, and so on for the next, and for the next? Or to pay 40 l. a Sermon, and to banish us five Miles from Corporations, and must not be told of any such thing? He was not unpeaceable that said, He that feeth his Brother have need and shutteth up the Bowels of Compassion from him, how dwelleth the Love of God in him? Nor for saying, He that hateth his Brother is a Murderer: Nor Christ for telling us how he will judge them that did not relieve and visit him in his little ones; and how he will use him that beat his Fellow-Servants. It is with you and not with your sins that we would have peace. Not only Massonius and Platina, but even Genebrard, and Baronius speak far sharplier of the faults of many Popes themselves, and all Historians of their Prelates, and yet are taken to be peaceable men. Either those that I mentioned will repent here or hereafter, and then will say far worse of themselves than I do. And may I not foretell it them, when it is but in necessitated deprecation of the miseries of the Land?

§ 23. One of their Champions wrote that he was not bound to deny his own Liberty, because others would pievishly take scandal at it. I shewed the sinfulness of that Conclusion, and that a mans Liberty often lay in as small a matter as a game at Chess, a Pipe of Tobacco, or a Cup of Sack: and most scandal is taken by pievish persons: and yet even a pievish mans Soul is not to be set as light by as such things. Christ and Paul made more of Scandal: And this very arguing of mine is numbred with my unpeaceable distempered words.

§ 24. As to his talk about our Controversies of passages in Conformity
Conformity, he confesseth that he hath not read my Plea for Peace, in which I have partly opened them: And much less what I have said since of them to divers others; and I confess I have neither mind or leisure to say all over again in Print, upon the occasions of such words as his, which have been oft answered.

§ 25. I named the Martyr-Bishops Hooper, Ridley, &c. as Nonconformists to the Laws of their Persecutors, to shew that such Sufferers leave a sweeter name than their Persecutors; and he feigneth me to have made them Nonconformists to our Laws, and faith, [Ingenuity and Christian Veracity would blush to own this Art.] Thus still false History is that which assauleth us.

But I humbly ask his Lordship, 1. Whether he think that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, were more for Conformity than Jewel, Bilson, and Hooker, and Abbot? And 2. Whether he will so far reproach these men as to say, that Jewel, Bilson, and Hooker would have conformed by approving that which they most expressly wrote against? I have oft enough transcribed their words.

§ 26. To shew that since my expulsion I drew not the People of Kidderminster from the Bishops, I said that I [never since came near them, nor except very rarely sent them one Line; which he pretends I contradict, by saying, I sent them all the Books I wrote. One might have found historical errors enough in his words without a Rack or Quibble. 1. Sure Books are somewhat rarer written than Letters. 2. An ordinary Wit would have understood that I spoke of one Line of Manuscript, or one Letter, and not of Printed Books, I delivered them to Mr Simmons, or their Neighbours to send them without Letters. And few of those Books were written before this Apology.

§ 27. As a Self-contradicter he faith of me, sometime I am against all Subscribing, as p. 60, 113. &c. and sometimes not.

Anf. Still untruth! P. 60. The words are [If men were not driven so much to subscribe and swear as they are at this day.] Reader, is it true that this is against All Subscribing?

Pag. 113. The words are, [If we had learned the trick of speaking, writing, and swearing in universal terms, and meaning not universally but particularly, as many do, we could say, or subscribe, or swear as far as you desire us.] And [Take off the penalty
§ 28. Whether to profess our tenderness of other men's Reputation, and yet to name the nature and aggravations of the sin which we fear ourselves, when we are importuned to it, be contradictory, let the impartial judge.

§ 29. P. 91. He faith, as my judgment, [To subscribe and declare, that it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King, or that an unlawful Oath cannot bind men to unlawful Actions, is Perjury, some of the greatest that Hell suggesteth.] Ans. Not one true word? I believe all this to be as he faith: Both in my first and second Plea for Peace, I have largely told him what it is, and what it is not which I own; but he hath seen neither, and yet feigneth me to say or hold what I have so oft renounced.

§ 30. P. 94. He might have known how oft in Print I have retracted the Book called, The Holy Common-Wealth, wishing the Reader to take it as Non-scriptum: Yet he faith, [as far as is generally known I have not done it.] And how should I make it generally known more than by oft Printing it?

§ 31. P. 95. He pittieth me for calling the Author of the friendly Debate, the Debate maker: And I pitty England for such pittiers.

§ 32. P. 96. Whereas the Convocation hath imposed on all Ministers a Profession of undoubted certainty of the Salvation of dying baptized Infants, without excepting those of Atheists or Infidels, I ask whether all the young, unstudied sort of Ministers have arrived at this certainty any more than I, and how they came by it? and crave their Communication of the ascertaining Evidence. And what doth his Lordship but pretend that I call the Convocation these young, unstudied men, as if they had made this Rubrick for none but themselves?

§ 33. And he hath found another fault which exceedeth all, and that is, the Title and Dedication of my Methodus Theologiae, where I say, that I dedicate it not to the slothful, hasty, tired Sectaries, &c. but to studious, ingenium, humble, &c. young men, as being the persons that are above all others born, disposed, consecrate to Truth, Holiness, and the Churches Peace, &c.] Exceeding bad!
Will you hear the proof that this is excessive Pride? 1. The Book in the front indirectly and sily calls the Reader, slothful, rash, foolish, &c. Ans. Is this true? 1. It is only those that I would not have to be the Readers. Yea, 2. Only those that I say it is not dedicated to.

And do you think there are none such in the world? Will not his foresaid Debater, and Dr. Parker, and Dr. Sherlock, and abundance more, tell you that the Nonconformists are many of them such, and will you now deny it? If not, am I bound to dedicate my Book to such? By what Obligation?

But he faith so voluminous and emboft a Title will deter the Readers. But do you not know the Dedication from the Title, only because it is printed on the Title Page? Is that unusual?

But the odious Arrogance followeth, [Could any thing easily be said with more (appearance of) Arrogance; in the very Title Page too, than that his Book is above all others of the same Subject, (I know not how otherwise to interpret his supra omnes, viz. Methodus Theologiae Christianae,) &c. framed, disposed and hallowed to the propagation and growth of Holiness, to the Peace and Honour of the Church.] I will now for ever acquit him of hypocritical Modesty.

Ans. I desire Mr. Morrice to compare this Ld. Bp’s Translation with that oversight of Theodoret’s words which he fasteneth on in me. What if I had said that this Bishop knoweth not how to interpret a plain Latine Sentence, as he faith it of himself? That which I most expressly say of pious, ingenious Youth, he feigneth me to say of my Book. Reader, look on the Book and judge whether Methodus, the Nominative Case singular, agree with nata, disposita, consecrata, the Dative Case, when juvenitis Parti studiose, sedula, with many other Datives, went before it: There are no less than Twelve Adjectives joined to Parti in the Dative Case, and yet he construeth the three last a agreeing with the very first Title-name in the Nominative Case. And is this the way to make me lament my want of his Academical Education? Is it any wonder if these men prove us Liars and proud, and if they sentence us for lesser Crimes?

Yea, here he concludes that I write [so piously, so v. seriously and unconstantly to myself, so blindly, as if willfully blind and not penitent of my own guilt, and so arrogantly, and disdainfully, &c.] You have heard the proof.
§ 34. Pag. 99. He proveth my unpeaceableness from the Petition for Peace, and Additions to the Liturgy: The Crime here is, [There’s not one Office, no not one Prayer of the old Liturgy, and is tilled A Reformation of the Liturgy, and little more than a Directory.

Anf. O miserable World! What cure is there for thy Deceits? This good man talks as he hath heard, and so all goes on.

But 1. he knoweth not it seems what Title our Copy had, but judgeth by that which some body printed.

2. It seems he knoweth not that this Draught was only offered to debate, expecting abundance of Alterations: We openly declared that it was done on supposition of obliterating and altering all that they had any just exception against, were it but as needless. And for the clauses, [These or the like words] we professed, that we expected an Obliteration of them, but had rather the Bishops did the imposing part, if it must be done, than we.

3. He knew not it seems that ours were offered but as additional Forms, that such of them as both sides agreed on, might be mixt as Alias’s with the old Liturgy. And doth his Lordship then exclaim with reason, that [Not one Office, not one Prayer of the old was in, when all (after correction) was to be in, and none left out. Oh what is History! and what men are its corrupters?

And (that his work may be homogeneal) p. 100, 101. having recited my Commendation of their Liturgy as better than any in the Biblioth. Patrum, he addeth as an Accusation, [Yet p. 219. he complains of such failings in it, that IT IS A WORSHIP which we cannot in faith be assured God accepteth.]

Reader, This is one of the leffer sort of deceiving Accusations. I said that (among greater sins which we fear in our Conformity) we fear least by Assent and Consent to all things contained and prescribed. &c. we should be guilty of justifying all the failings in that worship, and also of offering to God a Worship that we cannot in faith be assured God accepteth. This Lord so wordeth it, that the Reader who peruseth not my words would verily think that I had said this of the Liturgy in the Substance of Worship there prescribed, which I said only as to the things which we dare not conform to: And I explained it by saying, [We dare not justify the best Prayer we put up to God in all things.] E.g. To dedicate Infants to God without their Parents express Dedication, or consent, or their promise to educate them as Chris
Christians, and this upon the false covenanting of Godfathers: that never owned them, nor ever mean to educate them as promised, (as is known by constant experience, neither they nor the Parents intending any such trust in the undertakers) and to dedicate them by the sacramental Sign of the Cross, or a badge of Christianity, and to refuse all that will not be thus baptized. This we fear is a worship that God will not accept. But is this therefore said of the substance of the Liturgy?

And if the Lord Bp. be wiser or bolder than we, and be beyond all such fears, should he not suffer Fools gladly, seeing he himself is wise? And if he like not our fearing an Oath, Subscription, Declaration, Covenant, or Practice, which he thinks to be true and good, and we think to be false and evil, why may he not endure our timorousness while he may rush on himself and venture; should he not rather pity us, while St. Paul, faith, He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not in Faith.

§ 35. P. 108. He questions whether their communion be my practice: and p. 110, giveth me two friendly Councils. 1. To peruse my Books, and retract what's amis. 2. To tell the World now my sober Thoughts, what I could and would do were I to begin the World again.

I heartily thank him for his Counsel, for it is good and honest. But alas, what a thing is it to write of things which men know not! 1. He knoweth not that I have retracted much already; partly by disowning, and partly by large Obliterations: Of the first sort are my Aphor. of Justification, and my Polit. Aphorisms (though not all that's in them.) Of the 2d he may see many and large Obliterations in my Saints Rest, my Key for Catholicks, &c.

2. He seemeth not to know what bloody Books, to prove me one of the worst men living, their Church Advocates have written against me, fetched mainly from these retracted Books and Words. Nor how they that commend Augustine, reproach me as mutable for those Retractions.

3. It seemeth he knoweth not that I have already performed his second Advice, in my Cure for Church-Divisions, my Second Plea for Peace, (about Government) Yea, Bishop Morley before the King, Lords, and Bishops at Worcester-house, speaking of Ceremonies and Forms, caused my Disputations of Church-Government, produced and said, No man hath written better than Mr. Baxter, (as if it were against my self.) And in Doctrinals,
my Carol: Theol. and Methodus Theol. and Christian Directory have expres-
fed my maturest, calmest thoughts. But he that consults me to it knows
not that it is already done. And more for Revising and Retraction I
would do, if necessity did not divert me, even the want of time and
strength.
the generality of Nonconforming Divines seemed themselves unwilling to en-
ter on Dispute, and seemed to like much better another way, tending to an
amicable and fair compliance, which was nobly frustrated by— a cer-
tain persons furious eagerness to engage in a Disputation.] This was it seems
the sense of both sides at that time.]
Anf. How far from Truth? It was the sense and Resolution of the
reconciling Party, called by them Presbyterians: We all desired no-	hing but an amicable Treaty— We were promised by— they should
meet us half way. When we met, Bishop Sheldon declared the Agree-
ment of his Party, that, till we had brought in all our Exceptions against
the Liturgies, and our additional Forms, they would not treat with us. Mr.
Calamy, Mr. Clark, and others, would have taken that as a final Refu-
sal, and meddled no more, left Dispute should do more harm than good:
I was against such an untimely end, and said, They will report that we
had nothing to say: It's better let the case be seen in writing, than to break off.
The rest wrote the Exceptions about the Liturgies: some Agent of the
Bishops answered them without the least concession for alteration at all.
I wrote a Reply, and the Additional Forms, and a Petition to the Bishops, and
they would treat of never a one of them: But at the end, put us to dis-
pute to prove any Alteration necessary, they maintaining that none at all
was necessary to the case of tender Consciences. (Of which before.)
§ 37. I had thought to have proceeded, but truly the work which
the Bishop maketh me is so unpleasant, almost all about the truth or
Falsity of notorious matter of Fact, that I have more Patience to bear
his Accusations (whatever his learned Friend said of my impatience)
than to follow him any further at this rate. But whereas he faith, that
[some will think that many things in his Book want truth.] I am one of
those, and leave it to the Readers Judgment whether they judge not tru-
ly: And whereas he lays so much stress on Bp. Morley's words, if any
Printer shall be at the charge of Printing it, I purpose while he and the
Witnesses are yet alive, to publish the Answer to his Letter, which I
cast by to avoid Displeasure. And if they will still be deceived, let them
be deceived. I cannot help it.
It is no wonder that heathen is described, Job. 8. 44. should carry
on his Kingdom accordingly in the World: But must his Dial be set
on the Steeple of Christ's Church, and have a consecrated Finger for its
Index? O lamentable Case!
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p. ult. l. 9. r. efs. besides mis-accenting some Greek words, and other mis-pointings;
Dissenters are accused of Schism by some of this Church; both these and the other are branded not only as Schismaticks, but as Hereticks by the Papists; who upon this account judge us unworthy to live, and had actually destroyed both together, if God in Mercy had not discover'd their devilish Plot. The discovery gave them some interruption, and put them upon an after-game, to retrieve what had miscarried. And this was so to divide us, as that our selves should help them in their design to ruine us all, when they had less hopes to do it alone. In pursuance hereof such influence they have had upon too many, as to raise in them a greater aversion to Dissenters than to Papists. These the Conspirators count their own, and think they may well do so, since they...
they are too ready to concur in their design to exterminate those, who are true Protestants in every point, and differ no more from this Church than those in France do, who by the same Counsels are at this time in extreme danger to be utterly extirpated. Others are so far prevailed with as to make use of one of the sharpest weapons they have against dissenting Protestants, and that is the charge of Schism, lately renewed and re-inforced.

In these hard circumstances, while we do what we can against the common Enemy, we are put to ward off the blows of such as (notwithstanding some present distemper) we will count our Friends. Amongst other expedients, sufficient to secure us against this attaque, it was thought not unuseful, to answer the allegations out of Antiquity, concerning two points, wherein only the Antients were made use of to our prejudice, viz. 1. For Diocesan Churches; and then 2ly. Against the Election of Bishops by the people in the primitive times. Something was performed and published in reference to both these in a late discourse. One half
of which, where the latter is discussed, concerning the popular Elections of Bishops, hath yet passed without any exception that I can see or hear of; yet this alone is enough to defend us against the aforesaid charge: For those who will not make the primitive Church Schismatical, must not condemn any as Schismaticks for declining such Bishops as that Church would not own.

Against the former part of the Discourse, concerning Diocesan Churches, some exception hath been made, but very little; a late Author in his Preface to a Treatise of another Subject, hath touched about 5 pages in 40. but so as he hath done them no more harm, than another, who to find one fault therein, runs himself into two or three, about a page, render'd indefinitely according to the mind of the Author who uses it, and the most common use of it.

I disparage not the Gentleman's Learning who attacks me in his Preface, he shews that which, (with answerable care and judgment,) might be serviceable in a cause that deserves it. But much more than he shews, would not be enough to support what he would establish. And he might have forborn the vili-
vilifying of those, who are known to be Masters of much more valuable Learning, than appears in either of us. The neglect of some accurateness in little things, remote from the merits of the cause, in one who is not at leisure to catch flies, is no argument that he is destitute of Learning.

I complain not of his proceeding with me; but am obliged by him, that he treats me not with so much contempt as he does others, who less deserve it. I wish he had dealt more temperately with M. B. it would have been more for his reputation, and no prejudice to his undertaking; a good cause, when it hath a sufficient Advocate, does not need any indecent supplements.

After I have cleared my Discourse from this Gentleman's exceptions, I thought it not impertinent to shew what in reason cannot be counted competent proofs of Diocesan Churches; that if any will pursue this debate farther, instead of opposing us, they may not beat the Air, and amuse those that enquire after truth, with what is insignificant. Withal I have given an account of what other allegations out of Scripture and Antiquity this Author hath
The Preface.

hath brought in other parts of his Treatise for such Churches; and shew'd that there is no evidence in them, as to the purpose they are alleged for.

In short, I find nothing in this Author, or any other before him, which may satisfy a judicious and impartial man, that in the two first Ages of Christianity, any Bishop had more than one particular Church or Congregation for his proper charge; or that in the third Age, there was any Bishop which had a Church consisting of more than are in some one of our Parishes, unless it was the Church of Rome (nor is there sufficient evidence produced for that.) Or that in the middle of the fourth Age there were 4 Churches, each of which comprised more than could assemble in one place (though if they had contained more, that might be far enough from making them Diocesans;) Or that afterwards, within the time of the four first General Councils, where there were several Churches belonging to one Bishop, he did exercise jurisdiction over them alone, or only by himself and his Delegates. It will be time enough to censure us as Schismaticks for declining Diocesan Churches, when they have made it appear.
bear, that there was such, in the best ages of Chris-
tianity: (which not appearing, the censure falls
upon the primitive Christians, from whom it will
slide of upon themselves.) If they will forbear us,
till this be performed, we need desire no more. Un-
less we may prevail with those who sincerely profess
themselves Protestants, to regard the securing
themselves and their Religion from the destructive
designs of the Papists, more than those things
which are not properly the concern either of Pro-
testant or of Religion.

As for those who prefer the Papists before Dif-
fenters, and revile these as worse, though they differ
in no one point of Religion from other true Prote-
stants: We need not wonder if we meet with no
better treatment from them, then from declared Pa-
pists; since by such preference they too plainly declare
the Protestant Religion to be worse than Popery,
in their account. The following sheets have lain by me
many Months, and bad done so still; but that the
importunity of some, and the misrepresenting of my
silence by others, forced me to publish them.
Diocesan Churches not yet discovered in the Primitive times.

To shew that many Presbyters in one Church was not enough to prove it a Diocesan, I made it manifest that it was usual in the ancient Church, to multiply Presbyters, beyond what we count necessary; (not beyond what is necessary, as it is too often misrepresented:) For this I offer'd two Testimonies, one asserting it to be so in the First Age, the other in the Fourth, and thought these sufficient, if they could not be denied, (as they are not) to evince it to have been so in the Third: For who can reasonably suppose, but that had place in the Third, which was usual both in the Ages before and after? The first was that of Bishop Downham, who says, at the first Conversion of Cities, the number of people converted were not much greater than the number of Presbyters placed amongst them. But this, its sayed can be of little use; 'because, 1. This was not the case of the Church of Carthage, it was not a new converted Church, but settled long before, and in a flourishing condition.

The Church of Carthage by the fierce persecutions in Cyprians time (which is the time we speak of) was brought so low, and reduced to so very few, as if it had been but new converted, and how was it in a settled and flourishing condition, when it was so lamentably wasted, and still harrassed one year after another? or who can believe
lieve it, that reads Cyprian lamenting; Pressura istius tam turbidam vastitatem, que gregem nostrum maxima exparte populata est, adhuc & usque populatur, and that they were positi inter plangentium ruinas, et timentium reliquias, inter numerosam & languentium stragem, et exiguam stantium paucitatem? (a) Was not this much the case of the Apostolical Churches, unless this of Carthage was worse, and so less for our Author’s advantage? Or if this were otherwise, the Churches in Nazianzen’s time were not newly converted, but settled long before, and in a flourishing condition; which yet cannot be denied to have had more Presbyters than we count needful. So that this was the practice in every condition of the Church, whether flourishing or not.

2. He sayes, many more Presbyters may be ordained in a City, than is necessary for the first beginning of a Church, with respect to future increase. &c.

And who will question, but the many Presbyters in the Church of Carthage were for future increase both in City and Country? So that herein the case is not different; And the design of that number of Officers might partly be for other Congregations, (Episcopal Churches, though not Diocesan) to furnish them with Officers. This is apparent afterwards in the practice of the African Churches, who when a new Church was erected, supplied it with a Bishop or other Assistants from places better stored with Officers; And it is exemplified particularly (as we shall see hereafter) in the provision which St. Austin made for Fusala.

He sayes further, the multitude of Presbyters belonging to one Congregational Church, might be occasion’d by the uncertain abode of most of the Apostles and their Commissioners, who are the Principal, if not the only Ordainers of Presbyters mentioned in Scripture.
But herein he does but guess, and had no reason to be positive, unless the Apostles and their Commissioners, (as he calls them,) had been then the only Ordainers, which he will not venture to affirm, knowing what evidence there is against it.

'Lastly, he says, if this opinion of Bishop Downham had any certain ground in Antiquity, we should probably hear of it with both ears, and we should have it recommended upon antienter Authority than his.

This of Bishop Downham hath certain ground in the best antiquity, if the New Testament be such; where it is plain there were many Presbyters in diverse Churches, such as are not yet, nor ever will be proved to be Diocesan.

To that of Nazianzen; he says, 'it hath received its answer,' and adds, he that cannot answer it to himself, from the great difference between the condition of the Church in Cyprian, and in Nazianzen's time, hath a fondness for the Argument.

This is the answer it received; Pag. 51. and this difference was thus expressed a little before; 'But that any Church fixt and setted, having its Bishop always present, should multiply Presbyters beyond necessity, in the circumstances of the Primitive Christians before Constantine, is altogether incredible; for the necessary expenses of the Church were very great, the poor numerous, the generality of Christians not of the Richest, and the Estates they had being at the discretion of their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual persecution, &c. He says, multiplying Presbyters beyond necessity, and without necessity; while he alters my words so as to change the sense, he disputes against himself, not me; But this looking more like an Argument than anything before, I shall take a little more notice of it. 1. Is not all this applicable to the Churches in the Apostle's times,
when it cannot be denied Presbyters were multiplied beyond what we count necessary? The poor numerous, the generality of Christians not of the Richest, and the Estates they had being at the discretion of their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual persecution.

Further, the Church before Constantine and Carthage particularly, supposing these to be its circumstances, might have many Presbyters without any great charge: For 1st. the Church Stock was reserved only for those in want, tois ἀναγκαῖοι, as is determin'd in one of the Canons which pass for Apostolical, (b) and the same decreed in the synod at Antioch. (c) Ambrose even in the 4th. Age, will have none to have a stipend who hath other revenues, Qui sibi exercet militiam, agelli sui fructibus, si habet, debet esse contentus; si non habet, stipendiorum suorum fructu. (d) And Chrysostom tells us that in Elections, those of the Competitors that had Estates did carry it, because the Church would need to be at no charge in maintaining of such, ἐν ὑπνίκαισιν τρέφεσθαι ἐν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσώπης. 2ly. When they had no Estates, and the Church could not maintain them, they were to provide for themselves by some honest employment. The Council of Elvira allows all sorts of Clergy men to drive a trade; for their living, provided they did it only in the Province where they lived, (f) and in the 4th. Council of Carthage it is ordered, that the Clergy, though they be learned in the word of God, shall get their living by a trade: (g) and in the next Canon that they shall get food and rayment by a Trade or Husbandry, with this proviso, that it be not a prejudice to their Office. Our Author sayes indeed, (h) that this is contrary to the usage of all other Churches; how true this is may be seen by the Canon before cited. He sayes also, that this is forbidden by the 3d. Council of Carthage; but neither is this so, that Canon adds but another restriction, viz. that they get not their livings by
by an employment that is fordid or dishonest, where the
Latine and Greek both agree in it. 3ly. The Church
was to allow none of them, no not Bishops more than ne-
cessary, even after Constantine's time. That Canon call'd the
Apostles, and the other Antioch forecited, express it in the
same words, the Bishop may have of the Church Stock what
is needful, if he be necessitous, τὰ διωταί δύο τοις ἀνασκα-
λεπτας for necessary uses, and these are afterwards ex-
plain'd to be food and rayment. Zonaras expresses it fully
and clearly, whom he that the Canon doth not satisifie,
may consult.

Having shew'd out of Justinian, that 60 Presbyters
belonged to the great Church in Constantinople, and
thence inferr'd they were numerous in Constantine's time,
the number (layes he,) was become extravagant in Ju-
stinian's time; but what is this to their number in Cy-
prian's?

He should have asked the Dean this, who to prove
Diocesan Churches from the number of Presbyters, im-
mediately after Testimonies out of Cyprian, brings this of
Justinian.

'For this very edict of Justinian shews that this multi-
plying of Church Officers was an innovation, and there-
fore would have them reduced to the first establish-
ment.

Justinian took order to retrench the numbers of Pres-
byters, not therefore because it was an innovation, but
because the Church revenue could not maintain so many,
which is express in the Novel.

'But that first establishment it seems admitted great
numbers, for one Church had 60. True; but it must also
be noted first, that these 60 were to serve more than
one Church.

Some may be ready to ask how it can be true, that
one Church should have 60, and yet more than one had
these 60 amongst them.
For there were three more besides St. Sophia to be supplied by these Presbyters. &c.

True; but this still confirms what I answered to their argument from the multitude of Presbyters, that in the antient Church the Officers were multiplyed above what we count needful: For it is not now thought needful that any 3 or 4 Churches in a City, should have 60 Presbyters, 100 Deacons, 90 Subdeacons, Readers &c.

Yet after all, there is no argument to be drawn from this number, for these were Canons of a particular foundation, design'd for the service of a Collegiate Church; and no measure to be taken from thence concerning the numbers of Presbyters belonging to the Diocess. This is evident from the Preface of the said Novel.

If no argument is to be drawn from this number, why did the Learned Dean draw one from it? 2ly. This seems scarce consistent with the former Period: there, these Presbyters were for 3 or 4 Churches; here they are but for one Collegiate Church of which they were Canons, and this said to be evident in the Preface, where I cannot see it. 3ly. Since no measure is to be taken from hence concerning the numbers of Presbyters belonging to a Diocess; it seems there may be this number of Presbyters in a place which cannot be counted a Diocess, (as this one great Church never was, nor can be) and then no argument drawn from the number of Presbyters at Rome, Carthage, Edessa, &c. will prove a Diocesan Church; for here was the greatest number, which any where we meet with.

Dr. St. to prove Diocesan Churches from the numerosness of Presbyters, mentioned 60 in C. P. in Justinian's time; from hence on the by, I thought it reasonable to suppose they were numerous in Constantine's time, when yet Theodoret says, all the Brethren met together with the Bishop. That the number of Presbyters is no
proof of a *Diocesan* Church was evinced sufficiently before: this fell in occasionally, and was added *ex abundanti*; Yet upon this supernumerary stragler he turns his main force, spending about 12 Pages on it. I am little concerned what becomes of it, since the main Hypothesis is already secured by the premisses; but that this Gentleman may not quite loose all his labour, I am willing to loose a little, intaking some notice of it.

'I must confess that what is added concerning the *Church of C. P.* is somewhat surprizing, no doubt fayes he, that the Presbyters were *more numerous* in *C. P.*

Indeed it might have been surprizing if I had said as he reports me, that they were *more numerous*; but I saw reason not to say so, though what reason there was to impose it on me I know not: I cited *Soc*: misprinted *Soz.* saying, *Constantine built two Churches at C. P.*, but laid no stress on it at all. *(k) It is true, he fayes not that *(k) Soc. l. i.* he built no more than two, but his expression plainly implies it, and he was concerned if he had known any more to have mention'd it, when in the fame Line, he fayes *Constantine intended to make it equal to Rome*. Eusebius's words agree well enough herewith, he fayes *Constantine adorn'd it, ἀναδεικνυ, with more Churches*, and that's true, if he built but *two* more, or any more than was there formerly, or any more than was usual. And these more Churches were not in the *City*, but *(as the Historian speaks) partly there, and partly ἐξ ἄλλων, which as the word is used, may denote places many Miles distant from the City, as the Gentleman elsewhere observes after *Valerius*. Sozomen fayes he built πλαστικά, many Churches, *(not very many as he will have it)* but if he thereby meant more than are named by *Socrates*, we need not understand that done before the time *Theodore* speaks of; Nor should a lax expression be more relied on,
on, than one that is punctual and definite; unless we have a mind either to be misled, or to set the two Historians, together by the ears. Sozomen names but one Church more than Socrates did, and that not in, but a good distance from the City, (70 Furlongs by Land,) and 3 may pass for many, when it was a rare thing for any City to have more than one. The best Authors, as they sometimes express very few by none, and a generality by all; so they express more than ordinary by many; and two or three such Churches in one City were more than ordinary at that time, when one City in a Hundred had not two Churches, and one in a Thousand had not three Churches, that could be styled μεγίστα: all that Constantine built here were such, both Eusebius his more, and Sozomen’s many, are said, by them to be very great, μεγίστα. But no considerable Author that I meet with in that Age, or some Hundreds of years after, names more than two very great Churches erected by Constantine in that City. And if comparison be made, there is no Historian of those times, to be more regarded in matters which concern c. P., than Socrates who tells us, that he was born and educated in c. P., and continued there (as an advocate) when he wrote his History.

But if we should suppose that Sozomen intended more than 3 or 4 Churches, or that the Emperor built no more than was requisite, and only consulted conveniency, and design’d not State or Magnificence, (which yet our Author a little after says he did;) and we know nothing is more ordinary than for great Cities to have more Churches than are needful: it was so in London before the Fire, and the retrenching of their number since shews it:) yet this will be so far from proving Alexander’s Church in c. P. to be Diocesan, that it will not prove it greater than some single Congregations: for there were 12 Churches in Alexandria, when yet the Church
in that City adhering to Athanasius consisted of no more than are in some one of our Parishes. For which such Evidence has been brought, as is not yet, nor I think, can be defaced. Nor can we imagine that two Churches, much less one, could suffice all the Christians in C. P. when the City of Heliopolis being converted to Christianity required more, and Constantine built several for them, ἐνειληκτὴς ἀντίκειται.

The word plurally expressed is much improved by our Author, he makes out of it diverse Churches, and all these Churches, when yet all these were but one Church, as Socrates himself makes it plain a little before; for having related how Constantine ordered a Church to be built near the Oak at Mambre, he adds, that he ordered another Church (not Churches) to be erected at Heliopolis, ἐπειδὴ ἐνεχειληκτὴς ἐγενομένος ἐνεπικύρωσεν. And to put it past doubt, Eusebius whom the Emperor employ’d about those structures, and from whom in all likelihood Socrates had the Relation, gives an account but of one Church there founded by the Emperor, which he calls τὴν ἐνεχειληκτὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and that it was furnished with a Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons. So that the Bishop of Heliopolis had but one Church for his Dioces, which our Author should not be so loath to own, since it cannot be proved that at this time one Bishop in an hundred, had more.

Valesius (whom our Author much relies on) in his Notes upon this place, is so far from thinking that Constantine built more Churches in Heliopolis, that he judges this one at present was not necessary for it, the Town having then no Christians in it: and assigns this as the reason why Eusebius speaks of it as a thing unusual, that it should have a Bishop appointed, and a Church built in it. His words are, Fortasse hoc novum & inauditum fuisse intelligit, &c. He may think this new and unheard of,
of, that a Church should be built in a City, where as yet there were no Christians but all were alike idolaters. Therefore this church was built at Heliopolis, not for that there was any necessity of it, but rather in hope that he might invite all the Citizens to the profession of the Christian Religion. So that the Bishop here had none for his Diocese but one Church, and that empty, there being then no Christians in that one Parish; which yet was all he had to make him a Diocesan.

The better to confute Theodoret, who saies (for they are his words, not mine) that Alexander with all the Brethren met together, he endeavours to shew the state of that Church about the latter end of Constantine, &c. this he does here and after by an undue Application of some passages in Sozomen. For the account which that Historian gives of that City is not confined to Constantine's time, but reaches beyond it, ay, and beyond Julian's too, which appears, as by other passages, so by his mentioning the heathen Temples in the time of that Emperour. And with respect to the time after Constantine must that expression be understood, which makes C. P. to exceed Rome, not only in Riches, but in the number of Inhabitants, otherwise it will be apparently false. For when Chrysofomus was Bishop there, about 70 years after (when it is like the number of the Inhabitants were doubled, it cannot be questioned but they were far more numerous) he who best could do it, reckons the Christians then to be an 100000; our Author will have us look upon the Jews and Heathen there to be inconsiderable but let us count them another 100000. Yet both put together will fall incomparably short of the number in old Rome, which by the computation of Lipsius was at least two millions. And in Constantine's time new Rome was as far short of the old as
as to its greatness in circuit, for whereas Herodian declares that Severus quite demolished Byzantium for siding with Niger, and reducing it to the state of a Village subjected it to Perinthus, we cannot in reason suppose it to be extraordinarily spacious; yet as Zosimus reports, all the enlargement which Constantine gave it, was but the addition of 15 Furlongs, now suppose it was 30 or 40 Furlongs in compass before (and so larger than one City in an hundred) yet this addition will leave it less than Alexandria, which, as Josephus describes it, was 80 Furlongs, that is, ten miles in circumference, yet Alexandria was four times less than Rome, for by Vopiscus's account, in Aurelian's time, not long before Constantine, the walls were made by him near 50 miles in circuit. So it will be in comparison of Constantinople when first built, rather like a Nation than a City, as Aristotle said of the other Babylon, ἐξαίων πεπερασθείς μᾶλλον ἔθνος, ἡ πόλεως. If then we will have this passage of Sozomen to have any appearance of truth, it must be extended far beyond Constantine's time, when, as Zosimus tells us, many of the succeeding Emperors were still drawing multitudes of People to that City, so that it was afterwards encompassed with walls far larger, πολλά μελζον, than those of Constantine. And in an Oration of Themistius, it is made a question whether Theodosius junior did not add more to C. P. than Constantine did to Byzantium.

Many of the Jews and almost all the Heathen were converted and became Christians.

The expression of Sozomen does not hinder but as the main body of the Jews remained, so the numbers of the Heathen might be considerable. Tertullian speaks of Citizens in his time as if they were almost all Christians,
penet omnes cives christiani n; yet no instance can be given of any one City where the Christians were the major part of the Inhabitants: those that take his words in a strict sense are very injurious to him, and make him speak that which no antient Records will warrant. Sozomen also may suffer by straining his expression; but I will not digress to take further notice of what is not material; for I design not, nor have any need, to make any advantage of the numbers of the Heathens in this City.

He tells us of 950 Work-houses whose rents were allowed to defray the Funeral expenses of all that died in the City (for so it is expressed in the Constitution, πεσεναν de οικητον διάρκων οικητών διεργασίας το νεκρότα το αμφικτηρίου) these being performed with great solemnity, and multitudes of Attendants maintained by those rents for that purpose. How this here makes the Christians in C. P. to be so very numerous as he would have them, he should have shewed us; I am not yet so sagacious, as to discover it. The number of the Decani was determined by Honorius to 950. Our Author thinks it probable they were so many at the first establishment, but there's more ground to believe, they were much fewer in Constantine's time; for about 800 were counted sufficient in Justinian's Reign, 200 years after, when the City was both larger, and much more populous and in its greatest flourish. Those that consider the premisses, may well think, he might have form'd his conclusion in terms less confident, to say no worse of it.

Next he forms an Objection against himself: 'not withstanding the number of Christians in C. P. might be much too great for one Congregation, yet the major part might be Hereticks or Schismaticks, such as came not to the Bishop's Church, and therefore all
that adhered to him might be no more than could meet in one Assembly.

To which he answers, that the number of Hereticks and Schismaticks was inconsiderable, and will not except the Arians or Novatians. For the Arians, he saies, they had not yet made a formal Separation.

But if they did not separate themselves, the Church would have them separated, and did exclude them from communion, and withstood Constantine's importunity for their admission, both here and in other places: Athanasius was threatened by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and banished by the Emperor for this cause among others. And Alexander being secured by Arius his death from admitting him to Communion, was the occasion of this passage in Theodoret which gives our Author so much trouble. Now the Arians being debarred from communion, lessened the Bishop's Church, both here and elsewhere, as much as if they had separated themselves. And they were numerous here, this being the place where they had greatest favour; in Constantine's Edict against the Hereticks whose meetings he would have suppressed, the Arians were not mentioned when the other are named. Socrates writes that the People in this City was divided into two Parties the Arians and the Orthodox, they had continually sharp bickerings, but while Alexander lived the Orthodox had the better; as soon as he was dead (which was* while Constantine lived) it seems they appeared equal, for the contest saies he, was dubious, ἡμάρτησεν ἡ μάχη c. In Nazianzen's time so far they overtopt the Orthodox, that this great Diocesan Church appear'd but in the form of a private meeting, held in a very little house, where he kept a Conventicle with them, ἐν δικτυσμῳ μικρῳ δικτυσμῷ. So Sozomen d, and Socrates agrees with him in the expression, ἐν μικρῷ δικτυσμῷ, such a diminutive place seems as
unproportionable for such a Diocesan Church as a Nutshell for Homer's Iliads, or a Key-hole for a Witch, to use our Author's Elegancies.

As for the Novatians to which he will have no more allowed than a Conventicle, they were numerous in other places, they had once diverse Churches in Alexandria, many Churches in Rome and in other places. It is like they were numerous here, for here they had as much favour or more, and longer too, than in the Cities forementioned, here Socrates says they had three Churches e, and if three Churches would but make one inconsiderable Conventicle; it is possible the other Orthodox Churches (though he will have them to be many) might be comprized in one vast Congregation.

I might observe how much Sozomen is mis-represented in what he says next of those concerned in the Edict, the Novatians especially. He speaks not mincingly as our Author would have him, but fully that the Novatians did not suffer much by the Edict; he does not say only that it was probable they suffered little, but says this only of a reason himself gives, why they suffered not much. He gives other reasons for it than the opinion, the Novatians had of that Bishop. He does not say the other Heretics were altogether extirpated. He does not confess that the Novatians suffered the same measure with others everywhere, no, nor any where else, it is the Montanists that he says this of. He dares to affirm they had a Conventicle or more, for he affirms they had an eminent Bishop in C. P. and were not only numerous theretofore the Edict, but continued so after. The Gentleman was in too much haste here, as himself will perceive, by observing how much his account differs from the Historians.

At last he comes to that passage of Theodoret which occasioned all these lines, but Theodoret affirms they were
were no more than could meet in one Church, and that they did actually do so, 'I answer, says he, that Theodoret does not say so, and the passage cited does not conclude it.

I did not say Theodoret affirms they were no more, than could meet in one Church, but he says the same in effect, viz. that all the Brethren assembled with Alexander. His words are, Alexander, the Church rejoicing, held an Assembly with all the Brethren, praying and greatly glorifying God. The words are plain, and the sense, I take them in, is open in the face of them. Nor do I believe that any disinterested person would put any other sense upon them than this, that the generality of Christians of which the Church at Constantinople consisted, assembled together with their Bishop Alexander, to praise God joyfully for their deliverance by the death of Arius. But he will not have the words taken in a general sense, but will suppose them taken with respect to that particular Congregation, in which Arius was to be reconciled. Yet this supposition hath no ground either in the words, or in the contexture of the Discourse, or any where else that I know of, or our Author either; for if he had, we should have heard it with both ears, as he speaks elsewhere. He will not have all the Brethren, to be all the Believers at C. P. yet he knows that Brethren and Believers are Synonymous terms both in Scripture and ancient Authors. And those were the Believers or Brethren of the Church of C. P. which had occasion to rejoice, and that was the whole Church there: as for render'd Universal, I do not take it for all and every one of the Christians there; for in all Assemblies, of great Churches especially, many are always absent. He had dealt more fairly with Theodoret, if by all he would have understood the generality of Christians adhering to Alexander at C. P. or the greatest part of them, and about
about such an abatement of the full import of the word, there had been no need to contend; but his restraint of it to a particular Congregation agrees not with the words, nor the occasion of them, nor hath any support elsewhere.

Nor is that better which follows, unless you will say that with all the Brethren, does not signify their personal presence, but only their unanimity.

This looks more like a shift than a plain answer, and therefore he was well advised in not venturing to own it.

Theodoret could not think that all the Believers of C. P. could come together to the Bishop's Church, for he cites a Letter of Constantine's a little after, where he gives an account of the great increase of that Church. In the City that is call'd by my name by the Providence of God, an infinite multitude of People have joined themselves to the Church, and all things there wonderfully increasing, it seems very requisite that more Churches should be built; understanding therefore hereby what I have resolved to do, I though fit to order you to provide 50 Bibles fairly and legibly written.

He does not say an infinite multitude, the words of the Letter are μέγιστον πλῆθος, that there was a very great multitude of Christians is not denied, nor that he intended to build more Churches; but this confirms what is signified before, that these very many Churches were not yet built, but only in design, and that with a prospect of Christians there still increasing. And the Bibles, if they were intended only for C. P. might be for the future Churches, not the present only.

His Conclusion is, where Christians were so multiplied that it was necessary to build more Churches, and to make such provisions for the multitude of their Assemblies, it could not be that they should all make but one Congregation.
He should have concluded that which is denied, otherwise all he hath premised will be insignificant, and to no purpose: it is granted that all the Christians at C.P. did make more than one Congregation, and for their conveniency met at other times in several Churches. That which is denied is, that the main Body or generality of Christians there could not meet in one Assembly, or did not so meet at this time with their Bishop Alexander, as to this he hath proved nothing, and therefore did well to conclude nothing against that which is affirmed to be the plain import of Theodoret's expression.

And it may be supposed that Theodoret, if he had not expressed it, might well think (though the contrary be suggested) that as great multitudes, as Constantine's Letters signified, might meet together at the Bishop's Church; for himself declares what a vast Congregation he preached to at Antioch, having an Auditory of many Myriads f. I will not ask him what Eusebius could think, f Ep. 83. when he tells us the Christians had μυσίαρνες ὀπανναγωγας, Assemblies consisting of Myriads g. Nor what Socrates Lib.3. Cap. 11 thought, when he tells us long after, of C.P. that the whole City became one Assembly, and meeting in an Oratory, continued there all day h, ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἑγένετο καὶ τὸν Ἐνκυπεσμόν Μυριάδος, &c. But I would have him tell me how he understands that passage of Chrysostome, τὸν τὸν Ἱερόν καιρὸν εἰς δίκαιον μισθὸν ἐφιλον ὑπὲρ τοῦ καίνητα συναγώνων τελὼν i. What is the import of these words? Do they signify that ten Myriads were assembled in one place to hear Chrysostome? If so, there will be no question but that the generality of Christians might meet in one Church with Alexander in Constantine's Reign; for that then, (about 70 years before) there was any thing near so many Christians as an 100000; adhering to one Bishop in this City, cannot with any reason be imagin-
ed. Or does he mean only, that there were so many
Myriads of Christians contained in that City? If so,
then he saies here no more than in another Homily fore-
cited, where the number of Christians in C. P. is com-
peted to be an 100000, reckoning all besides Jews and
Heathens. Now if they were no more in his time, they
cannot with reason be supposed to have been above
half so many in Constantine's (unless any can imagine,
that their numbers advanced more in 6 years than in
7c, when the succeeding Emperours multiplyed the
Inhabitants excessively, ὑπὸ τίνος χρόνου, as Zosimus tells
us κ., crouding the City so full as that they could scarce
stir without danger:) and a great part of these were
fallen off to Arius while Alexander was Bishop: the
Novatians also, were numerous, having several Church-
es; and these with other Sects being deducted, the
Christians there that communicated with Alexander
will be no more (if so many) than belong to some one
of our Parishes.

It would swell this Preface to too great a Bulk, if I
should answer the rest so particularly.

Since he designed to be so breif, and to have so
short a Preface, I wish he had employed more of it a-
gainst that which is the strength of the Discourse he
opposes, and of more consequence to the main Cause;
and not have spent so many leaves upon a by-passage,
for which we have little reason to be concerned: for if
he could make it appear, that the Christians at C. P. in
Constantine's time were more than could meet in one
Congregation, yea, or in two either; that would be
far from proving it a Diocesan Church, unless some one
or two of our Parishes can be counted so.

Let me add in fine, that our Author has done just no-
thing towards the disproving of what Theodoret was al-
ledged for; unless he shew, that C. P. exceeded old
Rome,
Rome, was furnished with such an infinite number of Christians, so many (more than two) magnificent Churches there erected, the 50 Bibles thought needful to be provided, and almost all the Heathen besides many Jews converted; before Alexander (who is said to hold this Assembly with all the brethren) deceased; and so unless he prove that all this was done (which himself I think can scarce believe) in less than a year. For Valentinus (upon whose authority this Gentleman takes much) proves at large (making it the business of one of his Books) that Alexander died (and yet must live some while after this panegyrical Assembly) in the year 331. And its manifest, that C.P, was not built, nor had that name till 331. For tho' it was building the year before, yet it was not finished till 25 of Constantine's Reign (as Jerome and others;) and the beginning of his Reign is chronic. reckoned from the death of Constantius his Father, who was Consul with Maximianus in the year 306, and died in the middle of it. There needs not a word more to shew that all his discourse on this subject is wholly insignificant, and not at all for his purpose, tho' this be the most considerable part of his Preface.

This Author gives several instances of several Bishops being in one City at the same time, in answer to the Dean of Paul's, who affirmed that it was an inviolable rule of the Church to have but one, &c. Jerusalem is the first instance, &c. I wonder to find a man of Learning cite this passage, than which nothing can be more disadvantageous to his Cause.

There is one who I suppose passes for a man of learning who for the same purpose makes use of this instance, since mine was published; We have, faith he, Examples in Ecclesiastical story of of two Bishop's at the same time in the same See; and yet this was never thought Schismatical, when the second was advanced by the consent of the first.
Thus Alexander a Bishop in Cappadocia was made Bishop of Jerusalem while Narcissus was living, but very old; and Anatolius at the same time, sate in the Church of Caesarea with Theotecenus, and this was St. Austin's own case, who was made Bishop of Hippo while there was another Bishop living. He says also, Nothing can be more disadvantageous to my cause than this passage. If it had been no advantage to my cause, I should have thought it bad enough; but if nothing could be more disadvantageous, I am very unhappy: let us see how it is made good.

Narcissus having retired, and the people not knowing what had become of him, the neighbouring Bishops ordained Dius in his place, who was succeeded by Gordius and after by Germanico, (it should be by Germanico, and after by Gordius) in whose time Narcissus returned, and was desired to resume his Office, and did so. What became of Germanico (he means Gordius,) is not said but probably he resigned or died presently.

There is nothing to make either of these probable, it is altogether as likely, if not more, that he continued Bishop there with Narcissus for some time; but because Eusebius says nothing of it, I insist not on it. But besides he tells us, Narcissus took Alexander, into the participation of the charge. That signifies Narcissus was not excluded from the Episcopal charge, both had their parts therein. No, but says he, Alexander was the Bishop, Narcissus retained but the name and title only, that is, he was but a Titular, not really a Bishop, and why so? because Alexander, says he, joined with him in prayers, and the Historian says he was not able to officiate by reason of his great age. He was not able it may be to perform all the Offices of a Bishop, but what he was able to do no doubt he performed. Now if they must be but titular Bishops, who perform not personally all the Offices
fices of a Pastoral charge (when they cannot pre-
tend more) how many real Bishops shall we find
in the World? But besides the Name and Title, did he
not retain the Power and Authority of a Bishop? If
not, how came he to loose it? Did he resign, or was
he deposed? That he resigned there is not the least in-
timation in this Historian or any other; nor any in-
stance in the antient Church, that ever any Bishop di-
veloped himself of all pastoral Power upon this account.
To have deposed him for his great age had been a barba-
rous Act, and such as the Church in those times cannot be
charged with. No doubt but he retained the Episco-
al power, though through Age he could not exercise
it in all instances; and if he had not only the Title but
the Power, he was really a Bishop, and there were two
Bishops at once in one Church, and then this instance
is so far from being most disadvantageous, that it serves
me with all the advantage I designed in allleging it.

As for the words of Valensius cited by him, if they be
taken in the sense which our Author would have them,
that learned man will not agree with himself. For but
a very few lines before, he says, these two were Co-
Episcopi, Bishops together in that City, superstitie episcopo
adjutor & coepiscopus est adjunctus. And tho' he says
(but says it doubtfully with a ni fuller) this was forbid-
den at Sardica (above 100 years after); yet he adds
that, notwithstanding it was still usual in the Church, nihil
ominus idemdem in ecclesia usurpatum est, which is all
that I need desire. And afterwards, where Eusebius in I. 7. c. 32
again mentions two Bishops in one City, he observes,
that in one of his Copies, the Scholiast has this note up-
on it in the Margin, ἕκαστον μὲν ἔποικος δυο ἔρχεται, here
also there were two Bishops of one Church. Valensius adds,
the Scholiast understands Alexander, who was Bishop of
Jerusalem together with Narcissus.

The
The next instance is of Theotecnus and Anatolius, who were Bishops of Caesarea together. Against this he hath little to say, I suppose because nothing can be said against it in reason. Only he seems willing that Anatolius should pass but as Episcopus designatus, whereby if he mean one, who is not yet actually a Bishop, but designed to be one hereafter, as Eradius was by Augustine, it is inconsistent with what Eusebius says and himself quotes, but one line before, viz. that Theotecnus ordained him Bishop in his life-time; for if he was not actually Bishop after he was thus ordained, he was never Bishop at all.

Another instance was of Macarius and Maximus both Bishops at once of Jerusalem.

He would not have Maximus to be Bishop while Macarius lived, because it is said he was to rule the Church after his Death.

But Maximus was to govern the Church not only after his death, if he survived him (as he was like to do being much younger) but while he lived; and so did actually together with him, contrâ duo, which denotes the exercise of the same function together: besides the Historian says, Maximus was before this ordained Bishop of Diospolis, and if he had officiated at Jerusalem, where they were so desirous of him, in a lower capacity; their kindness to him had been a degrading him; which it cannot be supposed they would either offer, or he yeild to.

I alleged Epiphanius, who signifies that other Cities had two Bishops together, and excepts only Alexandria. To which he answers, that Epiphanius cannot mean that all other Cities had two Bishops at a time, nor did I say that he meant this, but his expression imports no less than that it was usual for other Cities to have two Bishops. Nor is there any reason to think that Epiphanius respects only the
the cases alleged; it was quite another case that was the occasion of his words; and diverse other instances might be brought of a different nature and occasion, though this be sufficient to shew, that the rule against two Bishops in one City was not inviolable: He adds, 'I do not see what advantage can be made of this passage.

This passage shews that there was commonly two Bishops in a City at once, Alexandria is only excepted as varying herein from other Cities. And this is advantage enough for me, and it is enough against him too; and leaves no reason for his pretence that it was only in extraordinary cases. I affirmed it could not be Epiphanius his meaning (as a great Antiquary would have it) that Alexandria was never so divided, as that several parties in it should have their respective Bishops there, and brought several Instances to evince it: for so it was divided in the time of Epiphanius, when the Catholicks had Athanasius, the Arians had Gregorius, and then Georgius; and afterwards the one had Peter the other Lucius, and the Novatians had their Bishops successively in that City till Cyril's time.

'He answers however I do not see why that learned Antiquarie's opinion may not be maintained against this Gentleman's objections, he fayes that Alexandria was divided before Epiphanius his time between several Bishops (I said in Epiphanius's time) it cannot be denied. But that is not the thing Epiphanius speaks of, but that before the Election of Theonas against Athanasius, there were never two opposite Bishops as in other Churches.

But this doth neither agree with the one nor defend the other; it agrees not with Epiphanius, but makes him contradict himself, for he tells us there were two opposite Bishops at Alexandria before Theonas was chosen.
fen. For this was not till Alexander's death, but he layes Pifius was made Bishop there by the Arians while Alexander was living. And he could not be ignorant of what Eufebius declares, that upon the division in Egypt occasioned by Arius, in every City, ἄρη ἑξίστατον πόλιν, there was Bishop against Bishop, and People against People. Nor doth it defend the Antiquary, for he speaks universally without limiting himself to the Election of Theonas, Ecclesiam Alexandrinam nunquam in partes seis-fam quorum singulæ Episcopum suum habeabant, that Church was never divided so as to have opposite Bishops.

'The instances are all later than this Fact, and there-fore are insignificant, says he.

They are fully significant, both in reference to the Antiquary against whom they are brought to prove that he mistook Epiphanius, when he would have it to be his meaning, that Alexandria was never so divided as to have two opposite Bishops; for they shew it was often so divided: and also in reference to Epiphanius, they were so late as his time on purpose, to shew more unquestionably, that could not be his meaning, which was against his knowledge, and notorious instances in his own time.

But he will not deny the instance of the Novatians to be significant, only Socrates does not say that they had their Bishops successively to Cyril's time.

Nor do I say he does; but he layes Cyrill shut up the Novatian Churches there, and took away all the sacred treasure in them, and deprived their Bishop Theopom-pus of all he had. Now when our Author meets with Churches, and a Bishop over them; he is not wont to question a Succession, unless it appears he was the first.

'It may be they began there after this time, for there is little Account in Church-History, that I know, of any Novatians in Alexandria before Athanasius.
We are little concerned about this, yet it may be they began before this time, for there is no account at all in Church History, that the Novatians began there in, or after Athanasius his time.

I had produced evidence that many African Bishops declared, in the case of Valerius and Austin, that it was usual in all parts, to have two Bishops in a City at once; to this he answers, 'but suppose all this true, that this might be maintained by the Examples of several Churches, what is it that two Bishops may be in one Church? no, that is not the matter, but that a Bishop when he grows old, may appoint or ordain his Successour, to prevent the mischiefs, that are usually produced by popular Elections.

If what the African Bishops did alledge, were restrained to that particular case he contends for; yet this is enough to make good all I intend, viz. that usually in the ancient Church, there were two Bishops together in one place. For when one is ordained Bishop in the same place, when another is still living, with whatever design, upon what occasion foever this is done, yet there are two Bishops at once in the same place.

I see no reason why this should be restrained to that particular case, the occasion of what the Bishops affirm may clear it, and that was Austin's scruple, not to succeed Valerius, but to be made Bishop of Hippo, while his Bishop there was living, Episcopatum suscipere, suo vivente Episcopo, recusabat, for so there would be two together, which he took to be against the Custom of the Church, contra morem Ecclesiae; but they all persuade him that this was usually done, id fieri solebat, and prove it by examples in all parts. And Valerius his desire and proposal was, that Austin might be ordained Bishop of Hippo, Qui sua Cathedra non tam succederet sed Consacredos accederet, not as one that was to succeed him only, but to be Bishop together with him.
When he assigns this as the reason of appointing a Successor, to prevent the mischiefs that are usually produced by popular elections, he speaks his own fence, not theirs; for they were better advised than to brand the general practice of the ancient Church as mischievous, and how this suggestion becomes one, who undertakes to write a vindication of the Primitive Church, let himself consider. Others may judge it, a more intolerable reflection upon the universal Church in the best and after times, than any M. B. can be justly charged with. However the reason assigned for it by Possidonius is another thing than appears in this Author's whole account, it was because Valerius feared lest some other Church, should seek him for their Bishop, and get a person so approved, from him.

Whereas in fine he says, 'These Cases specified were not thought to violate the Rule that allowed but one Bishop to a City. Yet it was thought so by St. Austin, when he excuses his suffering himself to be made Bishop with Valerius, by this, that he knew not it was forbidden by a rule of the Nicene Council, Quod Concilio Niceno prohibitum fuisse nesciebam, and gives this as the reason why he would not so ordain Eradius.

Next he would prove, that this provision for a Successor does not destroy that Rule, by an instance, I need not transcribe it at large, the sum of it is this, when the Government is Monarchical, if it fall out once (in many Ages, as it did in England once in above 500 years) that another King be crowned, besides him who hath the Throne; yet it will be true enough, that it is the rule of those Kingdoms to have but one King. To which I say briefly, if it be usual to have two Kings in such a Government, it will scarce be thought true, that it is the inviolable Rule of those Kingdoms, to have but one King. And then how this instance will suit his purpose,
pose let those judge who take notice, that, I have already proved it usual in the antient Church for Cities in all parts to have two Bishops at once.

From pag. 12. he passes to pag. 23. To shew there were more Bishopricks than one in the Region or Diocess of Hippo I brought several instances; and might have produced more, but that I confined my self to those which the learned Dean allledged to the contrary. Fussala is one of them, and that alone this Gentleman takes notice of. St. Austin calls it Castellum diverse times in one Epistle. He finds fault that I translate Castellum a Castle. I did no more expect to be blamed for this, than if I had render'd Oppidum a Town. But I suppose he counts it no great crime, since he runs into it himself and in a few lines after calls it a Castle.

"But these Castles, says he, were Garrison Towns, with a good dependance of Villages belonging to them.

They were Fortresses, and sometimes had Villages depending on them, and might contain so many buildings as there are in some Village or little Town; however he calls them Castles, and may give me leave to do so too.

He adds, "It was 40 miles distant from Hippo, and was in St. Augustine's Diocess, and never had a Bishop of its own.

It is said indeed to belong to the Diocess of Hippo, but I do not find it said to be in St. Augustine's Diocess or Bishoprick; these are two things and should not be confounded. When it is said to belong to the Diocess of Hippo, so farr distant, Diocess is not taken as an Ecclesiastical sense as it is with us, for part of a Countrey under the Government of one Bishop, but as it was used in Africa in a civil sense, for part of a Province, without respect to one Bishop, or to any one Bishop at all. Some parts
parts there call'd Diocesses had no Bishops, nor were to have any by Decrees of the African Councils r. Other places called a Diocess had more Bishops than one. Petilian says, that in the place where his Colleague Jannarius was Bishop there were 4 Bishops besides, all five in und Diocess s. And thus it was in many other places, particularly in that called the Diocess of Hippo, as I shew'd by diverse instances, and St. Austin's own Testimony.

Hereby it appears that in Africa, a Diocess and a Bishoprick were not the same thing, though they be with us. There were diverse Diocesses and no Bishopricks and many Bishopricks where but one Diocess; so that Fussala and 20 other Castles and Towns might be in the Diocess of Hippo, at 40 miles distance or more; and yet St. Austin's Bishoprick, not one jot the larger for it, nor he more a Diocesan.

Whereas he adds, that it never had a Bishop of its own. It is unquestionable that Fussala had a Bishop of its own in Austin's time; and this renders it wholly unserviceable to their purpose; for the Bishoprick of Hippo, said to be of 40 miles extent, will not upon the count of Fussala be 40 yards larger. Nor will either of these Bishops, nor any other in that Region be Diocesans; unless there can be two Diocesans, and I know not how many more, in one Diocess.

I assigned this reason, why Fussala had not a Bishop sooner, because Austin declares, there was not one Catholick in it, and supposed this might serve the turn, not dreaming that those who count all the people in a very large Parish, or in an 100 Parishes little enough for a Diocesan could think his Diocess competently furnished when he had not one Soul (or but some few) in communion with him.

He says, the Town or Castle indeed had none, but the County belonging to it had some; he will have the Territory
tory or Parish depending on this Castle to be a County. I cannot but observe the admirable power of a fancy tinctured and prepossessed. It will turn a Parish into a County, and a Castle into a County Town; and since a County with us, was a Province with them, one Province must be as much as all Africa; and a very small part of Numidia, must be far greater than the whole. But there are some Hypotheses, which may stand in need of such imaginations.

However he likes not my reason, and why? because, though it had no Catholicks in it then, it might have some before and concludes it had, because it belonged heretofore to the Diocess of Hippo.

"But that it formerly had Catholicks, (saies he) we may conclude by Mr. Baxter's reasoning, because it belonged heretofore to the Diocess of Hippo.

If Diocess be taken in a civil sense (as it is frequently in African Authors) this will be no proof, that there had been any Catholicks in it, because in this sense Fufula might belong to that Diocess, though there had not been either Christian or Bishop in the whole Region: Nor will it be hereby proved, taking it in the Ecclesiastical sense; for that part of Hippo, which was under the Donatist Bishop, had no Catholick; and yet de jure, as he tells us, belonged to the Diocess, (as he calls it,) or charge of St. Austin. Yet since he allows Mr. Baxter's Argument, he must admit what it concludes, viz. that a place that hath no Christians or Catholicks in it, belongs to no Bishop; and then Fufula never belonged to St. Austin as its Bishop; and then Fufula never belonged to St. Austin as its Bishop; either before it had Catholicks, for against this the Argument is admitted to be conclusive: not after, for then it had a Bishop of its own. And so all they have to alledge for the largeness of St. Austin's Bishoprick comes to nothing.

" So
"So that I conceive the reason will not hold, for its having no Bishop of its own, since the same reason destroys its dependence upon the Diocese of Hippo, which is expressly affirmed. The reason I gave for its having no Bishop, was, because St. Austin declares there was no Catholic in it. This reason will hold, unless they think a place may have a Bishop where there are no Christians at all; when as yet they judge, that a place which hath Christians enough to make a good Congregation, or many, ought not to have a Bishop. Whereas he says this reason destroys its dependance upon the Diocese, I wonder what dependance he imagines, since it is such, as both the not having of Christians, and also the having of them, destroys it. The former he here affirms, the same reason (which is its not having of Catholicks) destroys it; the latter is undeniable, for when Fusala had a competent number of Catholicks, a Bishop was there constituted; and then it depended no more on the Diocese of Hippo, than one Bishop's Church depends on another, when both are independent.

The dependance of Fusala upon Hippo was such, as that of a Countrey place upon a greater Town well furnished with Officers for their help, to convert and reduce the Inhabitants, and when enough are converted to help them to a Bishop or Pastor. This St. Austin did for Fusala, he employed Presbyters to reduce the Donatists there, and when they were reduced, he adds them not to his own charge, would not have them Episcopo cedere, but advises them to have a Bishop of their own, and procures one for them. This was the practice of the primitive times, in these methods were Churches and Bishops multiplied; it was not out of use in the fifth Age, this of Fusala as managed by St. Austin is a remarkable instance thereof; and if other Bishops had imitated
imitated him, as he did the Apostles, and best Ages, the Church would not have been troubled with debates about Diocesans.

That Austin would not take the Charge of a Place so far off as Fusala, he will have it ascribed to his Modesty. But it was such Modesty as this excellent Person made Conscience of, being convinced certissima ratione, by most certain reason, that he was not sufficient for it. If all other Bishops had been so modest, so conscientious, there might have been, as Nazianzen speaks, when Bishops were multiplied in Cappadocia, Ἐπισκόπησις ἐπισκόπους, a much more desirable thing, to those that love Souls, than a great Diocese.

He gives a reason why this must be ascribed to St. Austin's modesty, because he discharged the Office of a Bishop there, in more difficult times, while the Presbyters he employed there, were barbarously used.

I need not deny that he performed the Office of a Bishop there; for it is the office of a Bishop to endeavour by himself or others, the converting or reducing of all that he can. Only this will not prove Fusala to be then a part of his Bishoprick, no more than it will prove Athanasius to have been Bishop of India; because he encouraged, and sent Frumentius with others thither, to convert the Indians.

The learned Dean had cited Austin as calling himself the Bishop of that Diocese (understanding by it a Region of vast extent) I observed that in the Epistle quoted he only faith he had the Episcopal charge of Hippo. By this the Gentleman changing my words, will have me to signify, that he was the Bishop of the Town only. This I did not intend, but that, he was not the only Bishop of that whole Region. But whether he was Bishop of part of the Town only, or of that and some part of the Region also, I am not much concerned. His words are
as if he had been Bishop of the Town only, nay, but of part of that neither, for the Donatists had their Bishop there: so this will strangely diminish the Bishoprick of St. Austin which at first appeared so large. Then he answers, for the Donatists having a Bishop there, it signifies little to our present purpose, since he was but an Usurper.

But this signifies as much to my purpose as I need; for the Donatists having a Bishoprick in Hippo, St. Austin's must needs be diminished thereby, and altogether as much lessened, as if they had not been Usurpers. And they were counted no otherwise Usurpers, but so that if the Donatist Bishop had been reconciled; by a Decree of the African Church he was to continue in his Bishop there, as a rightful Possessor, and there would have been still two Dioceses (such as they were) in one Town.

He would have us believe Austin as if he declared, that he was not the Bishop of the Town only; but his words are, Ut modum dispensationis meæ non supergregiar hoc Ecclesie ad Hipponensem Regioinem pertinenti prodeffe contestor, which, fayes our Author, plainly signifies, that all the Church belonging, not only to the Town, but but also to the Region of Hippo, belonged to him.

But if he please to view the words again which himself hath quoted, he will find it plainly signifyed, that Austin's Church belonged to the Region of Hippo, but not that all the Church both in Town and Region, belonged to him. Antonius Bishop of Fussala might have said this as truly of his Church there, as Austin did it of his Church at Hippo; it did ad Hipponensem Regionem pertinentem, belong to the Region of Hippo. And it may be as justly inferred from hence, that all the Church both in the Town and Region of Hippo belonged to the Bishop of Fussala. If our Author will allow of this (as he must if he will stand
stand to his own account of this passage.) Austin's Bishoprick will be strangely diminished indeed, it must be confined to a part of Hippo, and made less than I represent it. For I did not say, nor had I any need to assert, that he was Bishop of the Town only. We may allow him besides his part of the Town, diverse Villages in the Country (though I have not seen it proved) without any danger of assigning him a Diocesan Church. For Kidderminster (as one tells us, who very well knows it) hath 20 Villages belonging to it, and some thousands of Souls therein, yet according to our modern measures will scarce make a Diocesan Church.

To shew that there were more Bishops in the Region of Hippo, than St. Austin, besides particular instances (which he passeth by) I allledged a passage of his where the Donatists were desired to meet together with the Catholic Bishops, that were in that Region, and who there suffered so much by the Donatists: to this he answers, "That these Bishops who are said to be in Regione Hipponesti, were not the Bishops of that Region, but some Bishops of the Province met together there.

But that these were Bishops of the Province met together there, is a meer conjecture of his own, without the least ground either in this passage or any other in that Epistle. It will not be hard to answer any thing at this rate. If there had been a Provincial Council then held in that Region, there might have been some pretence for what he sayes; but there is not any hint of this in the whole Epistle. That which is desired is a Meeting for conference, Hoc est ergo desiderium nostrum, &c. Primum si fieri potest ut cum Episcopis nostris pacificè conferatis—, ideo nos conferre volumus—, and the prime occasion of it was the outrages committed in that Region by the Donatists, wherein the Bishops of that place were particularly concerned. This is signif—
fyed, as in other parts of the Epistle, so particularly in the passage cited, Episcopos nostros qui sunt in Regione Hippoensf, ubi tanta mala patimur. This Meeting was to be with the Catholick Bishops upon the place, in Regione Hippoensf, not any to be call’d from other parts. And these words seem brought in to prevent an objection which the Donatists might make against a more general, or more publick meeting, as that which might bring them in danger of the Laws in force against them; An forte iste leges Imperatoris vos non permittunt nostros Episcopos convenire, and then immediately follows these words in answer to it, Ecce interim Episcopos nostros qui sunt in Regione Hippoensf, &c. so that this to me seems the plain sense of both Objection and answer; If because of the Laws you dare not meet us in a more General or Provincial Council, yet give a Meeting to the Bishops of this particular Region, where there can be no apprehension of danger. All which makes me judge, what he sayes concerning the Bishops of the Province as here intended, to be no better than an Evasion.

To prove that there was but one Bishop in the Region of Hippo, he tells us, "That the Clergy there called in the Inscription of an Epistle, Clerici Regionis Hippoensium, speaking of the Bishop of Hippo, do call "him their Bishop, and not one of their Bishops, &c.

But the Clergy so called, may be only the Clergy of Hippo, and so they are in the Title of the Epistle Clerici Hippone Catholici: and well may they of Hippo be called the Clergy of the Region, both because they were in that Region, and were the Clergy of it. But if the expression should be extended to more or to all in the Region, their calling him Episcopus nostor, will be no proof that they had no other Bishop, but him at Hippo. For that phrase
phrase Episcopus nostri or Episcopi nostri, all along in this Epistle, doth not denote the Bishop of that particular Church to which they belonged (as he would have it) but a Bishop of their party or persuasion. So they call Valentineus nostrum Catholicum Episcopum, who yet was not Bishop of Hippo. So they call them Episcopos nostros, whom they desired the Donatists to meet once and again, and thrice in another page, where our Author finds Episcopos nostros x. He may have many more instances hereof in that Epistle. If there was so many Bishops in Hippo or in that Region, as the Clergy call Episcopos nostros, he must grant many more Bishops in that Region than I need desire. So that this phrase however it be understood, is a medium unhappily chosen: if it be taken in my sense it is impertinent and can conclude nothing for him; if it be taken in his own sense, it will conclude directly against him.

He passes to Alexandria, and to pag. 32. The instance of Mareotis he says little to, so our Author, I might think it enough, where there was so little occasion.

"He infinuates as if Mareotis might not have number enough of Christians to have a Bishop, but this Athanasius does sufficiently shew to be a groundless conjecture."

I had no intention or occasion to signifie that Mareotis had not Christians enough to have a Bishop, I knew that it both had many Christians, and a Bishop also, and named him too; and therefore the groundless conjecture may be fixed somewhere else.

"And even before Athanasius, the generality of the People there were Christians.

How long before? Dionysius in the latter part of the third Age declares it ενεχθε ἡ ἡ παλαια πόλις τοῦ Αθηναίων, quite destitute of Christians, y, and the gaining the generality there, to yEnseb. 17. A. 1. the Faith, required some considerable time, and it is
like proceeded not far, till Christianity generally prevailed.

Besides Isbyras, I had mentioned Dracontius, both Bishops in the Territory of Alexandria (as Agathammon also was) of Dracontius he takes notice, and says, possibly he was a Chorepiscopus.

But a Chorepiscopus is elsewhere with him a Diocesan a, and here he says that he did accept a Bishoprick. Now these put together will go near to make a Diocesan Bishop. But then if there were two or three Bishops in the Diocess of Alexandria, besides Athanasius; they will scarce be so much as half Diocesans.

He says Athanasius pressed him to accept it. If so this great Person was no more unwilling to have another Bishop in his Diocese, and in a Country place too, than Austin was to have one at Fussala. He says further this was an extraordinary case, though what was extraordinary in it I cannot imagine; to prove any thing there mentioned to be so, will be an hard task.

"And allowing this man a Country Bishoprick, that of Alexandria would be a great deal too big for the Congregational measure.

And so it might be, and yet be no Diocesan Church; if that will satisfy him which is too big for those measures, he seems content to drop his cause, and may leave it in the hands of Presbyterians. And he is in the more danger, because he seems not apprehensive of it, but counts it enough if he thinks a Church is any where found larger than one Congregation.

I had given instances of several Towns that had Bishops, and were but two or three or four &c. miles distant one from another this he denies not: but asks what does this conclude? might not those Diocesses be yet much larger than one Congregation?"
I might conclude that these were just such Diocesses as our Countrey Parishes are; and had such Congregations as those Parish Churches have. And some of them in time might have provision (as some of ours have) for more Congregations than one. And if our modern Diocesses were of this proportion, they would be much more conformable to the antient Models.

"Suppose the chief Congregations of Holland had each a Bishop, yet I conceive they would be Diocesan, though those Cities lie very close together.

He might have laid the scene at home, where we are better acquainted, and supposed this of our Countrey Towns; or of both the chief, and lesser Towns in Holland; if he had designed what would be most parallel. But to take it as it is formed, though those Cities lay not further distant, and had each of them a Bishop, yet if their Churches were governed in common by Bishop and Presbyters, as the antient Churches were; they would not be Diocesan, but more like the Model of the Churches and Government which Holland hath at present.

"And now after all this, though we have several instances out of Egypt, how near Cities were together in some parts; yet upon the whole account the Diocesses do appear to be large enough, from the number of them.

He would have us think where Cities are so near together (as I had shewed) yet because of their number the Diocesses might be large enough. But where they were so near together, they could not be large enough to make any thing like the modern Diocesses, no, nor larger than our Countrey Parishes if they had Bishops in them. And the Ancients thought themselves obliged by the Apostle's rule to have a Bishop, not only in some but in every City,
Stome, ὃς ἔχειν πέλευν ἀνέφολομεν ὅ, and Theophilus expresses ἕρμα πέλευ by ἔχειν πέλευ, without exception of the smallness of the place or its nearness to others. The reason diverse Cities had none, was the want, or the inconsiderable number of Christians in them. Nothing but this hindered any City from having a Bishop in the four first Ages; though the greatest part of their Cities (as may be made manifest) were no greater than our Market-Towns or fairer Villages. And upon this account many Cities might want Bishops, and it may be did so, in Egypt particularly; Heathenism prevailing in many places there, even in Athanasius his time; for which I could produce sufficient evidence; but will not now digress so far. Afterwards the affection of greatness in some, was the occasion of new measures; and orders were made that Towns which had no Bishops before should have none after: though the reason why they had none before was gone; and those places had as many or more Christians in them, than most Episcopal Cities had of old.

"For in Athanasius his time there were not an hun-
catan. Apol. 2. dred Bishops in all Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis c. I was a little surprized to read this, and see Athana-
sius cited for it. For I knew that Athanasius reckons 95 Bishops from Egypt besides himself, at the Council of Sardica; and others from Africa, wherein Lybia and Pentapolis are usually included; and it was never known that a major part or a third of the Bishops in a Countrey, did come to a Council at such a distance as Egypt was from Sardica. It is scarce credible that Athanasius would so far contradict himself, as to say there were not so many Bishops in all those three Countreys, when he had signified there were many more in one of them. Some mistake I thought there must be, and con-
sulting the place I found it not entirely represented. There
There is this Clause (immediately following the words he cites) left out,  
whereby it appears that the meaning of the whole passage is this,  
there was an hundred Bishops in the Dioces of Egypt who appeared not against him, or that  
favoured him. But those who favoured Arius (whom he calls Eusebians) and Meletius, to say nothing of Coluthus (for into so many parties was that Countrey then divided) are not taken into the reckoning; otherwise it would have amounted to many more than an hundred. Sozomen says the Bishops there, who took Arius his part were many, πᾶσιν τῶν ἑισυνέκτων, and in Athanasmus Lib. i. c. 14. there is an account of many Meletian Bishops by name; and in Epiphanius it is said, that in every Region through which Meletius passed, and in every place where he came he made Bishops f.

The next thing he takes notice of is the defence of Mr. Baxter's Allegation out of Athanasmus, to shew, that all the Christians of Alexandria (M. B's words are, the main body of the Christians in Alexandria) could meet in one Church.

"It is to be confessed that the expressions of that "Father seem to favour him, νῦν εἰς τοῖς ἔκχεισιν and that "the Church did ἔγαρ ἔχασε hold all, &c.

I am made more confident by all that is said to the contrary, that the evidence is really such, as will need no favonr, if it can meet with Justice.

"Now suppose that all the Christians in Alexandria, "the Catholicks at leastwise, could meet together in "that great Church, yet all the Dioces could not. All that was undertaken to be proved by the passage in question, was, that the main body of Christians in Alexandria adhering to Athanasmus could, and did meet in that one Church. If this be granted nothing is denied that he intended to prove. As for a Dioces in the Countrey,
Countrey, if he will shew us what, or where it was, and that it had no other Bishop in it, he will do something that may be considered; yet nothing at all against what this Testimony was made use of to evince.

He fayes 2dly, "Suppose this great great Church could receive all the multitude, yet if that multitude was too great for Personal Communion it is insignificant.

Upon this supposition it might be too great for an ordinary meeting in the Congregational way, yet not big enough for a Diocesan Church. But the supposition is groundless and contradicts Athanasius who fayes they had Personal Communion, they all prayed together, and did not only meet within the Walls, but concurred in the worship, and said, Amen.

He fayes 3dly, "Before the Church of Alexandria met in distinct Congregations, but we are told that those places were very small, short and strait places.

All these save one, I said, which he ought not to have omitted. And they were so small, because those who were wont to meet in them severally, so as to fill them, could all meet in one Church, and did so as Athanasius declares.

"But that they were such Chappels or Churches, as some of our Parishes in England have as great a number as Alexandria, is hardly credible.

I know not how those places could be well expressed with more diminution than Athanasius hath done it, he fayes they were not only strait and small, but the very smallest. If he will make it appear that our Churches or Chappels are less than those that were Cæsarea, I shall understand that which I could never before, that something is less than that which is least of all. But he will prove they were not so small, because first the Church of Alexandria was very numerous from the begin-
Why it should be counted so very numerous from the beginning, I know no reason, but the mistake of an Historian who will have a Sect of the Jews (which was numerous in or about Alexandria) to be Christians.

"And if they met all in one place it must consequentially be very large.

The ground of the consequence is removed, Valesius his own Author saries they had but one Church to meet in, in Dionysius his time, almost 3 Ages from the beginning. If that one was large, yet it is not like that it stood till Athanasius his time; after so many Edicts for demolishing of all Christian Churches, and a severe Execution of them in Diocletian's Persecution.

"Nor is it likely they should divide till they were grown too numerous for the biggest Meeting-place they could conveniently have.

It is as likely as that Athanasius speaks truth, in a matter which he perfectly knew; he tells us they did divide, and yet were not too numerous for one great Church, in which they met conveniently too; yea, better than when dispersed in those little places, as he saries and proves, Τῷ ΚΎλίνον ὕψος, &c.

2dly, He saries, "Though before the Empire was converted they might be confined to little places, and "forced to meet severally; yet after Constantine became "Christian, it is not likely that the Alexandrians would "content themselves with small and strait Chappels.

Nor did they content themselves with those little ones, for besides this built in Athanasius his time, there was one greater than those small ones finish'd in Alexander's time, where the body of Catholicks assembled with Alexander, the other places being too strait, τοῦ Ους οὖν ἐνῷ τῶν ὑπατῶν, this is that one I excepted, when I said (after Athanasius) that the rest, all save one, were exceeding small. But is it any proof that these were not very
very small which Athanasius represents as such, because there was one (expressly excepted from that number) something larger? As for what he adds, that then every ordinary city, built very great and magnificent cathedrals, it is easily said, but will never be proved.

"3dly, Some of these churches had been built with a design of receiving as many as well could have personal communion in worship together.

Neither will this hold, unless some of those churches could have received all, which had personal communion with Athanasius in this greatest church; which he denies, and makes use of to CONSTANTINUS as a plea why he made use of the greatest.

"As Theonas is said by Athanasius to have built a church bigger than any of those they had before:

Where Theonas is said by Athanasius to have built a church, &c. I find not, nor does he direct us where it may be found, I suppose for very good reason. Indeed Athanasius in this apology speaks of a church called Theonas (it's like in memory of a former bishop of that place) where he says the multitude of catholicks met with Alexander, συνήλθεν δε τοις τοις πληθος; in like circumstances, as a greater multitude assembled with himself in the new church, which was greater, and pleads Alexander's example in defence of what he did. But Theonas could not build this church, for he was dead many years before, being predecessor to Peter whom Achillas and Alexander succeeded.

"And yet this and all the rest were but few and strait in comparison of the great multitude of catholicks that were in Alexandria.

I expected another conclusion, but if this be all, he might have spared the premises; for one part of it we assert, the other we need not deny, only adding with Athanasius, that the greatest church was capable of receiving this great multitude.
But here hesticks, and will wriggle a little more," But
"I conceive, sayes he, after all this, that the expressi-
"ons of Athanasius do not conclude that all the Chris-
"tians in Alexandria were met in this great Church.

That all and every one did come, was never imagined.
It is but the main body of the Catholicks that M. B. in-
tends, as our Author observes a little before.

"For the tumultuous manner in which they came to
"their Bishop to demand a general Assembly, makes it
"probable that not only Women and Children, would
"be glad to absent themselves, but many more, either
"apprehensive of the effect of this tumultuous proceeding,
"or of the danger of such a crowd.

The Women he will not admit; but was it ever
known that such a great and solemn Assembly for Wor-
ship consisted only of Men? Were not the Women in
Communion with Athanasius's Christians, that they must
be left out, when he says all the Catholicks met? Can
all be truly said to assemble when the far greater part
(Women, Children and his many more) were absent?
Are not the Women in the Primitive Church often
noted for such Zeal for the Worship of Christ, as made
them contend for greater dangers, than here they had
any cause to be apprehensive of? The supposed danger
was either from the Crowd or the Tumult. For the for-
mer, did the Women and many more never come to Chris-
tian Assemblies, when there was any danger of being
crowded? I think there was as great danger from a
crowd in Basiliscus his Reign, when the whole City of
C. P. is said to have met together in a Church with the Em-
peror, but yet the Women stayed not behind but crowd-
ed in with the men, as Theodorus Lector reports it, πάποι
ἐν τῇ πιλαις ἄνδρον ἄντι καὶ γυνῆς, καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ Βασίλειος
οὖν έσπεύδεις. Besides Athanasius here signifies the dan-
ger of a crowd was in the lesser Churches, (not in this)
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where they could not meet but ἐκκλησία ἔσωτρες, and so prefers their assembling together in the great Church as better.

As for the Tumults (which might have been concealed in a Vindication of the primitive Church) if there was any thing tumultuous, it was over when Athanasius had complied with their desires to meet in the great Church. And so no apprehension of danger left to women, or any else, upon this account.

"And even those that did assemble there were too many for one Congregation, and was an assembly more for Solemnity and Ostentation than for Personal Communion in Worship, and the proper ends of a religious Assembly.

Here he runs as cross, to the great Athanasius and the account which he gives of this Assembly as if he had studied it, debasing that as more for Ostentation than for Personal Communion in Worship, and the proper ends of a Religious Assembly, which Athanasius highly commends both for the more desirable communion which the Christians had there in Worship, and for the greater efficacy of it as to the proper ends of a Religious Assembly. Let any one view the passages k and judge. He sets forth the harmony, and concurrence of the multitude in worship with one voice. He prefers it before their assemblies, when dispersed in little places, and not only because the unanimity of the multitude was herein more apparent, but because God would sooner hear them, ἀνακρίνοντες ὥστε ἐκκλησία. For if, says he, according to our Saviour's promise, where two shall agree concerning anything it shall be done for them by my Father, &c. how prevalent will be the one voice of so numerous a people, assembled together and saying A-men to God? and more to that purpose, by which we may perceive, Athanasius being Judge, how true is it that this Assembly was more for Solemnity
Solemnity and Ostentation, than for Personal Communion in Worship and the proper ends of a Religious Assembly. And thus much to let us see through the Arts used to cloud a clear passage alleged out of Athanasius; if M. B. had betaken himself to such little devises, in like Circumstances; our Author would have taken the Liberty to tell him, that he was driven to hard Shifts.

Before we leave Alexandria I am to take notice of what is said by our Author, to part of a Letter writ by a Friend to M. B. concerning this city and the number of Christians therein in Constantius his time. The Writer of it observes a gross abuse put upon him in the Vindicator's Answer to it, and desires his defence may be here inserted. It contains an argument to confirm what was concluded from that passage in Athanasius here insisted on, that the Catholicks then could meet in one place. After that passage and to this purpose M. B. introduced it, as is very apparent. This our Author seems to observe when he begins with it; he adds, says he, to this of Athanasius (the very passage mentioned) another argument given him by a learned Friend. And after he hath done with it, because M. B. has endeavoured to represent the Church of Alexandria so inconsiderable even in Constantius his dayes, &c. And yet, how it comes to pass I know not, it is quite out of his thoughts while he is examining it. He was so hasty for confuting, that he states not to take notice what he was to confute, though the intent of it be most plain and obvious, both by the occasion and words of the Letter: But Forces that sense on it, and makes that the design of it; which I was far from thinking, would ever come into any man's Fancy, when he was awake. The words of the Letter are these; The City of Alexandria, says Strabo, is like a Soldiers Cloak, &c. and by computation about ten miles in compass, a 3d. or 4th. part of this was taken up with publick
publick buildings, Temples and Royal Palaces; thus is two miles and an half or three and a quarter taken up. He answers, "I will not say this learned friend hath imposed on M.B. but there is a very great mistake betwixt them. But the mistake is his own, and such a one, as I wonder how he could fall into it. He takes it for granted, that the Argument is brought to prove what Christians Alexandria had in Strabo's time. Here is not the least occasion given for this, unless the citing of Strabo shewing the dimensions of that City: but Primate Utter is quoted too, on the same account; and so as much reason to fancy the design was to shew what Christians Alexandria had in the Primate's time. Jerome, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen are also cited there; why could not these as well lead him to the right Age, which their words plainly point at, without the least glance at any Age before, as Strabo alone (cited without any respect to the time when he writ) so far mislead him? Nay, the 4th. age is expressly mentioned in the Letter; and the numeroseness of the Novatians and Arians in Alexandria at the time intended, is insisted on; could he think any man so stupid, that had but the least acquaintance with those things, as to speak of Arians, and Novatians in Strabo's time? But it may be, though I would hope better, our Examiner was too inclinable to fix an absurd thing upon the Writer of the Letter; that he might be excused, from giving a better answer when it was not ready.

But let us hear what he fayes to it; yet what can be expected to be said by one who makes his own dream the Foundation of his Discourse? However let us try if we can find any one clause that is true and pertinent in the whole, and begin with the best of it.

Though Strabo fayes that Temples and great Palaces took up a 4th. or a 3d. of the City, yet our Examiner will
will have us think there might be inhabitants there; when Epiphanius says, as I cited him, that part was destitute of Inhabitants, so he tells us Bruchium was. The Examiner denies not Bruchium to be that Region of the City which Strabo says, was taken up with Publick Buildings, but adds, what all the publick buildings of the Town in one Region? But who said all the Publick Buildings? This is his own fancy still.

"And that an outer skirt too, as it is described by the Greek Martyrology in Hillarion, &c.

If he mean it was not a Part or Region of the City Strabo and Epiphanius will have Credit before a story out of the Greek Martyrology, or him that tells it, when it appears not in the words cited. In Strabo it is part of the City, in Epiphanius it is a Region, in τοὺς ἐκείνους καλυμμένοις. For as Rome was divided into 14 Regions, and C. P. in imitation of it, so Alexandria was divided into 5, whereof Bruchium was one, and the greatest of all. So I understand Ammianus Marcellinus, who upon the loss of Bruchium saith, amidst regionum maximam partem que Bruchium appellatur, Alexandria lost the greatest of its Regions, which was called Bruchium.

"This Epiphanius says was destitute of Inhabitants in his time, and not unlikely, and perhaps destitute of Publick Buildings too, for it was destroyed after an obstinate siege in the Reign of Aurelian as Ammianus Marcellinus, or of Claudius as Ensebini.

When he hath granted all that I designed, that this part was destitute of Inhabitants, and more too, that it was destroyed, yet he would have the City no less, no necessity of this, sayes he, sure we are not yet awake? can a City loose τὸ μέγα τὶ τῆς ἐν πᾶντες περιεβαλλόμενος, in the Historian's words, a 4th. yea, or a third part of its largeness, and yet not be so much the less? He hath nothing to salve this, but it may be, and it might be, ground-
groundless surmises, without either reason or authority.

"They might inlarge upon another quarter, being it "may be forbid to build Bruchium—— they might "dwell closer than before, and so their multitude be un- "diminishes.

How far it is from being true, that their multitude was undiminish'd; and how needless either to inlarge—— or to dwell closer, may soon appear. The multitude must needs be much diminished in such a War, and a close siege of many years continuance, for so it is reported both by Eusebius and Jerome; and it was much wasted and in a consumptive condition, before it was thus besieged and dismantled by Claudius 2. or Aurelian.

It was greatly diminished in numbers by Caracalla who Mассacred a great part of the Inhabitants. Herodian says, τὸν ἐξ ἐξαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ ἀνατροπήθηκεν, &c. the slaughter was such that with the streams of blood, which ran from the place, not only the vastest outlets of Nilus, but the Sea, all along the Shore of Alexandria was discoloured o. Towards the latter end of the third Age, Dionysius gives an account of the strange diminution of the Alexandrians p, signifying that in former daies the elderly men were more numerous, than in his time, both young and old, comprizing all from infancy, to extream old age, ἀπὸ γενεαῶν ταιων, ἀντὶ τῶν ἄκακων γυναικῶν.

"However certain it is, that this City long after the "destruction of Bruchium, retained its ancient Great- "ness; and is represented by no Author as diminish'd either in Number or Wealth.

This is certain no otherwise than the former, i.e. quite the wrong way. For not long after the destruction of Bruchium, in the Egyptian War made by Diocletian upon Achilleus, which Eusebius, Sutropius and others mention: It was greatly diminish'd both in numbers and wealth. For Alexandria after a long siege, was taken by force and
and plundered, great execution done upon the Citizens,
and the Walls of the Town demolished.

A great part of the City (says the Letter) was assigned to the Jews, so Strabo indefinitely as Josephus quotes him, others tell us more punctually, that their share was two of the five divisions; though many of them had their habitations in the other divisions, yet they had two 5th parts entire to themselves; and this is I suppose the which Josephus says the Successors of Alexander, set apart for them; thus we see how 6 or 7 miles of the 10 are disposed of. To this he says, "The number of those Jews was much lessened within a little while after Strabo by an insurrection of the Alexandrians against them.

I suppose he means by that slaughter of them which Josephus mentions q, where 50000 were destroyed; but what were these to the vast number of Jews in Egypt, which Philo says amounted to no less than a million?

"The civil Wars afterwards under Trajan and his Successor had almost extirpated them.

It was in Palestine where these Tragedies were acted, and was so far from extinguishing them in Egypt or Alexandria, that thereby, in all probability; their numbers were there increased; for being divested of about 1000 Towns and Garrisons by Severus (Adrian's General) as Dion reports, and forbidden all access to Jerusalem as Aristobulus in Eusebius f, this made other places more desireable, those particularly where they might have good entertainment as they were wont to have at Alexandria, and what Dion Chryseostome says, confirms it.

But all this which he says, if there were truth in it, is impertinent; for the Letter is not concerned what Jews were there near Strabo or Adrian's time, but in
the fourth Age. Yet this is all that he hath to say to the rest of the Letter, besides the publishing and repeating of his own mistake, and upon no other ground making himself sport with the Writer of it.

Thus he begins, by the same rule he might have disposed of all at once, and concluded out of Strabo's division of the Town, that there was not one Christian in it: and repeats it thrice in the same Page, 

No matter what number of Jews or Heathens it had in Strabo's days,—it is kindly done to provide for Christians before they were in being, surely Strabo, who makes the distribution, never intended the Christians one foot of ground in all that division, and this learned Friend might have spared his little Town of 8 or 10 Furlongs, which he so liberally bestows upon the Bishop of Alexandria, before our Saviour was born,—and he is at it again several times in the following discourse t.

How desirable a thing is it to have M. B. and his Friend render'd ridiculous? when rather than it shall not be done, our Examiner will publish his own indiscretion so many times over to effect it. But I will forbear any sharper reflections upon this Author, for taking him to be an ingenious Person, I may expect he will be severe upon himself; when he discerns his error, which I doubt not but he will see clearly by once more reading that Letter.

Next he would disprove M. B's representation of the Church of Alexandria in Constantius's time, by giving a view of that Churches greatness from the first Foundation of it; which because it may concern the Letter duly understood, I shall take some notice of it very briefly. But there is something interposed, between this and the Letter, which requires some observance; there we may have an instance of this Gentleman's severity upon M. B. and how reasonable it is; "His remark, says he, "upon two Bishops living quietly in Alexandria is so
"disingenuous a suggestion, that he hath reason to be "asham'd of it.

But what is there in this so disingenuous and shameful? Does not Epiphanius say this, and our Examiner acknowledge it b? Ay, but M. B. means that there were not only two Bishops, but their distinct Churches in this City. Well, and does not Epiphanius give him suffi- ground for it? Does he not tell us that Meletius made Bishops, who had their idia eunobas in every place where he came? Does he not signify that the Meletians in Alexandria had their distinct Churches or Meetings both in the time of Alexander and Athanasius? Sayes he not particularly of Meletius that being familiar with Alexander he stayed long in that City, having idia eunobas or

orion a distinct Meeting with those of his own Party? Were there not innumerable Cities in that Age which had two Bishops and their Churches, some three or four at once (those of the Arians, the Donatists, the Novatians, the Meletians, &c. besides those who were ity-ed Catholics) Would this Gentleman take it well if M. B. should tell him, that he who denies this is disingenuous if he know it, and hath some reason to be ashamed if he know it not? Ay, but Epiphanius was deceived in this account of the Meletians, and mis-represents them. Indeed our Examiner makes as bold with Epiphanius (a Bishop of great Zeal and Holiness, a Metropolitan, a famous Writer (as he does with M. B. charging him with much weakness (as one easily imposed upon) many oversights, gross mistakes, diverse absurd things, and such stories, that he will scarce with worse to his Adversary, than to believe him c. Nor does Epiphanius alone fall under his cenfure in his Vindication of the Primitive &c.

Church (as he calls it) he goes near to accuse more particular Persons (Bishops amongst others) of eminency in the ancient Church, than he defends; so that one may
may suspect his design was, not so much to defend eminent Bishops, as great Bishops such as the antient Church had none, and to run cross to M. B. more than to vindicate any.

"In St. Mark's time Alexandria had several Churches, though but one Bishop, &c. d.

What Eusebius says of Churches in Alexandria at that time, is grounded upon a mistake, as appears, because immediately after the words cited, he adds, so great was the multitude of Beleivers at Mark's first attempt there, that Philo in his writings thought fit to give an account of them, ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ. Eusebius conceived that the Essenes, as Scaliger, or the Therapeutæ, as Valesius, whom Philo describes, were the Christians of Mark's Conversion; and there being Assemblies of that Sect of the Jews in Philo's time, the Historian speaks of Christian Churches at Alexandria in Mark's time; but those who believe that he erred in the former, can have no reason to give him credit in the latter. Our Examiner does not deny that he was mistaken, but says, it is not material whether they were Jews or Christians; yet those who inquire after Truth sincerely, will think it material; and little value a Testimony which hath no better ground than a mistake.

The next is no better, that is an Epistle of Adrian, which others are puzzled to make sense of, or such sense as can have any appearance of Truth. That very passage in it, which is the only ground of our Author's Argument, himself acknowledges to be false; for he would shew the Christians in Alexandria to be numerous enough for his purpose, because it is there said that some (whom he takes to be Christians) did force the Patriarch (whoever he be) to worship Christ, and yet adds, there is no doubt but Adrian does the Christians wrong in this point, for they never forced any to their Religion.
Religion. Will he have us to rely upon reasonings, which have no better Foundation, than what is undoubtedly false by his own Confession? He says also it is not material to our purpose whether this Patriarch were Bishop of Alexandria, or Chief Governour of the Jews. If so, then it is not material with this Gentleman, either to argue from that which is not true, or else from that which is nothing to his purpose. For if this Patriarch was the Bishop of Alexandria, that they forced him to worship Christ, is not true, he did it of his own accord: and if it be not one, who was no Christian, that they forced; then is not any thing in this passage to his purpose, and Adrian's Epistle might have been waved as a meer impertinency.

That which follows, hath not the shew of a reason, "the great Catechists of Alexandria, as Pantenus, Clemens, Origen and Heracles, did not a little advance the growth of Christian Religion in that place, &c."

Must there needs be a Diocesan Church there because the Catechists did advance Religion not a little?

The next concerning Dionysius his Church meeting at Chebron (Cepbro it should be) and Coluthio, is already fully answered, as it is offered with better improvement than our Examiner gives it. It cannot easily be apprehended how a larger Church meeting with Dionysius, made up of those banished with him, and others from several parts of Egypt, at Cepbro, a Village in Libya, a distinct Province; should prove that he had a Diocesan Church in Alexandria, to any, but those who are very inclinable to believe it without proof. Nor will others understand that Dionysius is better proved to be a Diocesan by the Christians which came from Alexandria to Coluthio in Mureotes; (there being none there besides) for the Believers in Alexandria itself, were no more than one Church could hold, as Valesius collects from
from this very place to our Examiners regret, Ex huc loco colligitur, atate "quidem Dionysii, unicam adhuc suisse Alexandriae Ecclesiæ, in quam omnes Urbis illius fideles, Orationis causâ, conveniebant h.

In the next Paragraph our Examiner argues for the great numbers of Christians at Alexandria, from the multitude of Martyrs at Thebes.

"Under the Persecution of Diocletian what numbers of Christians might be at Alexandria, may be judged by the multitude of Martyrs that suffered at Thebes i, " &c.

But here he mistakes Eusebius, who gives an account not of the Martyrs which were in Óthebas, in the City Thebes, but ἐν Θηβαισ, the Province Thebais: which was half of that large Kingdom, according to the antient division of it into the upper and lower Egypt. The Superior Egypt was Thebais, the inferior was called sometimes the Delta, sometimes Egypt in a restrained sense, and this division in these terms we have in Eusebius (to go no further) a little before k, ἐν Θηβαισ ἐν Ἀἴγυπτον, where he begins his account of the Martyrs in this Countrey. Now if the Christians in that Province of large extent, and comprising very many Cities may be concluded to be very numerous from the multitudes of Martyrs which suffered there; yet nothing at all can be inferred for any numbers to his purpose in the City Thebes, by which he would conclude their numerousness in Alexandria. But if M. B. had mistaken one City for so large a Countrey with multitudes of Cities in it, and made that mistake the ground of his reasoning; it is like our Examiner would have exposed him for it in his Preface, as he does for some lesser matters.

In the following Paragraph l, there is a groundless supposition, that the division of Alexandria into Parishes was antienter than Arius, there being no mention of it by
by any antient Author: as also an accusation of Petavius as mistaking Epiphanius his words, without any cause that I can discern in those words, though he says, it is plain there. That which he says is plain, the learned Dean of Paul’s could not discern, but understood Epiphanius as Petavius and others did before him. These I took to be preliminaries and expected his Argument, but found it not, unless it be couched in the first words.

"The Division of Alexandria between several Presbyters, as it were into so many Parishes, &c.

But this signifies nothing for his purpose, if those in Alexandria thus divided could all meet in one place, as Athanasius declares they did; and that so plainly that any one will judge so, whose interest is not too hard for his judgment. Valesius (who had no byas unless what might lead him the other way) understood it as I do; and expresses it in these words. (deciding the matter so long insisted on, against our Author) Afterwards in the times of Athanasius, when there were more Churches built by diverse Bishops of Alexandria, the Citizens assembled in several Churches severally and in parcels, as Athanasius says in his Apology to Constantius; but on the great Festivals, Easter and Pentecost, no particular assemblies were held, sed universi in majorem Ecclesiæ conveniēbant, ut ibidem testatür Athanasius, but all of them assembled together in the great Church as Athanasius testifies.

So that there can be no pretence that the Church in Alexandria was Diocesan at this time, unless those who could meet together in one place might make such a Church. Yet this was then the greatest Church in the Empire save that at Rome, and what he adds makes that at Rome very unlike such Diocesan Churches, as are now asserted.

"Valesius"
Valeius infers from the same passage of Pope Innocent's Epistle to Decentius, which Petavius brings to prove the contrary, that though there were several Titles or Churches in Rome then, and had been long before, yet none of them was as yet appropriated to any Presbyter, but they were served in common as great Cities in Holland and some other reformed Countreys, that have several Churches and Ministers, &c.

The Advocates for these Churches, who assign the bounds of a Diocese with most Moderation, will have it to comprize a City with a Territory belonging to it; but there was no Church in the Territory which belonged to the Bishop of Rome, he had none but within the City, as Innocentius declares in the cited Epistle, whereas now the greatest City with a Territory larger than some ancient Province is counted little enough for a Diocese. Further it is now judged to be no Diocese which comprises not very many Churches with Presbyters appropriated to them; but he tells us none of the Churches in Rome were appropriated to any Presbyter, but they were served in common. How? as greater Cities in Holland and some other reformed Countreys, and then they were ruled in common as these Cities are. The Government of many Churches is not there, nor was of old, ever entrusted in one hand; and thus the Bishop of Rome was no more a Diocesan than the Presbyters of that City.

He concludes with two Assertions which will neither of them hold good. The first that it is evident out of Athanasius how the Bishop of that City had from the beginning several fixed Congregations under him.

This is so far from being evident in Athanasius, that he hath not one word which so much as intimates that the Bishop of Alexandria from the beginning had any such Congregations under him.
The other is that those of Mareotes must be supposed to receive the faith almost as early as Alexandria.

How true this is we may understand by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria towards the latter end of the third Age, who declares that then Mareotes was ἐπὶ τῶν αιθριῶν αὐθηναίων ὅ, it was so far from having any true Christians in it, that it had none of our Author's old Christians, i.e. virtuous, good men. Nor is it likely that the faith was there generally received till many years after; and therefore not almost so early as Alexandria, unless the distance of above 200 years will consist with his almost. For Alexandria received the Faith by the preaching of Mark, who arrived there, fayes Eusebius, in the 2d. of Claudius p., others in the 3d. of Caligula q. But in the time of Dionysius it doth not appear that Mareotes had so many Christians, as Bishop Ischyras his Church there consisted of, though those were but seven, ἐ πλίον ἐπὶ τῶν αὐθηναίων Ἐξαίν r. But enough of Alexandria, though our Author is far from bringing enough to prove it even in the 4th. age a Diocesan Church. He may be excused for doing his utmost to this purpose, considering the consequence of it, for if this Church was not now so numerous as to be Diocesan, it will be in vain to expect a discovery of any such Churches in the whole Christian World in those times; for this is acknowledged to be the greatest City and Church in the Roman Empire next to Rome. So that there cannot be so fair a pretence for any other inferior to this, such as Jerusalem, Carthage, Antioch, &c. much less for ordinary Cities, which were 10 times less considerable than some of the former, as may be collected from what Chrysostome fayes of one of them ἄρχα πόλεως πεποιθα διατίν ὅμοις ὄρθος, that it was able to maintain the poor of ten Cities.

So far the Writer of the Letter. Let me now return to our Author's Preface; To shew that the Christians

In Mat. Hom. 17.
in Alexandria adhering to Athanasius were not so exceeding numerous as is pretended, and not to be compared with the Christians now in London, I had said, that the greatest part of the Inhabitants of that City were at this time Heathens or Jews; of those who passed for Christians, it is like Athanasius had the lesser share u, the Novatians and other Sects, the Meletians especially, and the Arians, did probably exceed his flock in numbers, it may be the Arians there were more numerous. This last clause (which appears by the expression, I was not positive in,) he alone fixes on, and would disprove it by a passage out of Athanasius. But the Greek is false printed, and and the sense defective for want of some word, and so no Judgment can be well passed thereon, unless I saw it; and where to see it he gives no direction. My concern therein is not so great as to search for it through so voluminous an Author. It will serve my turn well enough, if the Arians were but very numerous, or as Sozomen expresses them, ἅπας ἡ λαός. which cannot be denied, though they alone were not more numerous. The last thing he would take notice of, is the Dioceses of Theodoret, but this is remitted to the Dean of Paul's, yet one thing he says he cannot omit; though some may think that he had better have passed it (as he had many other things); than being so much in haste, to slip at almost every line, as he does in those few which concern it.

If these 800 Churches, not 80 as this Gentleman reckons them (it was not he but the Printer that so reckoned them, as the Errata shew) belonged to him as Metropolitan, and they were all Episcopal Churches (I never met with any before, that took them for Episcopal Churches, and how he should fall into this mistake I cannot imagine; I will not believe that he creates it, to make himself work) this poor Region of Cyrus would have more Bishops.
Bishops than all Africa (not so neither, for by the conference at Carthage, and the abbreviation of it by St. Austin, much more to be relyed on, than the Notitia published by Simon, which is neither consistient with others, nor with it self, Africa had many more Bishops than 800) notwithstanding they were more numerous there than in any part of the World besides. Nor will this pass for true with those, who take his own account concerning their numbers in Africa (which he reckon but 466 taking in those of the Schismatics too; about 66 for each Province one with another, counting them as he does seven:) and the account which others give of their numbers, in the antient Roman Province, the Kingdom of Naples, the Island Crete, Ireland, to say nothing of Armenia, and other parts of the World.

That which follows, is I suppose, instead of an Answer to the other part of my discourse concerning the popular election of Bishops, which this Gentleman was as much concerned to take notice of, as of the few passages he hath touched in the former part, why he did not I will not enquire further, but satisfy my self with what is obvious; especially since he tells us he intends a discourse of such a Subject. If in this designed work he satisfies me, that it was not the general practice of the antient Church, for the People to concur in the choice of their Bishops, he will do me a greater displeasure, than the confusion of what I have writ, or any other that I can fear he intends me; by taking me off from further Conversation with antient Authors, as persons by whose Writings we can clearly know nothing. For if that point be not clear in Antiquity. I can never expect to find any thing there that is so.

I intended to conclude this discourse here, without giving the Reader further trouble; but considering there are misapprehensions about the Subject in question
tion, those being taken by diverse, for Diocesan Churches which indeed are not such, and arguments used to prove them so which are not competent for that purpose, (of which there are many instances, as elsewhere so particularly in the latter end of this Author's discourse) : I thought it requisite for the rectifying of these mistakes, and to shew the insufficiency or impertinency of such reasonings, to give an account what mediums cannot in reason be esteemed, to afford competent proof of Diocesan Churches.

In general, Those who will satisfy us that any Churches, in the first Ages of Christianity, were Diocesan, should prove them to be such Diocesans as ours are, as large or near as large; otherwise what they offer, will scarce appear to be pertinent. For the rise of this debate is the question between us, whether the Bishops of these times be such as those in the primitive Church. This we deny, because modern Bishops will have another sort of Churches or Dioceses, than were known in the best Ages. Not that we reject all Dioceses or Diocesan Churches, for both metropoli and dioecenses are used by the Antients for such Churches as we allow. It is those of a later Model, that we approve not, as vastly differing from the antient Episcopal Churches. The modern Dioceses, and Churches thence denominated are exceeding great and extensive, consisting of many scores, or many hundred particular Churches, whereas for the three first Ages we cannot find 3 Bishops that had two particular Churches in his Diocese, nor in the 4th. one in 50 (if I may not say one in a hundred) that had more. So that the difference is exceeding great, and more considerable in the consequence thereof, which I had rather give an account of in the words of the very learned D. St. than mine own. Dioceses generally, sayes he, in the primitive, and Eastern Churches were very small and
and little, as far more convenient for this end of them in the Government of the Church under the Bishops charge, x, wren p.376.

and elsewhere, Discipline, sayes he, was then a great deal more strict, Preaching more diligent, Men more apprehensive of the weight of their Function, than for any to undertake such a care and charge of Souls, that it was impossible for them even to know, observe or watch over, so as to give an account for them y, Men that were employed in the Church then did not consult for their ease and honour, and thought it not enough for them to sit still, and bid others work z. St. Austin speaking of the 3d Age, makes account of many thousand Bishops then in the World a. Our Author seems to treat that excellent Person something coursely on this occasion, and goes near to question his judgment or veracity for it, b some may think this not over decently done (to say no more) when it is his business, to vindicate some antient Bishops who need it, to reflect upon one, so untainted, as to need none. However since he sayes that Father judged of other Ages by his own, when Dioceses were exceedingly multiplied c, we may suppose he will grant there were many thousand Bishops in the 4th. Age. Yet among so many thousand Bishops I do not expect that any can shew me 20 (if I may not say 10.) who had so many Churches in their Dioceses, as some Pluralists amongst us may have, who yet never pretend to have a Diocesan Church. Those therefore who will make proof of such Diocesan Churches as are in question, must shew us some in the primitive times something like ours in largeness and extent. Amongst the instances produced for this purpose by former or later Writers, I find none any thing near to ours, save that only of Theodoret in the 5th. Age. But this in the former Discourse was shewed to be so insufficient to serve the ends it is allledged for, that I may hope it will be prest no more for this Service.

More
More particularly. 1st. It proves not a Church to be *Diocesan* because it consists of more than can meet together in one place, for there are Parishes in this Land that contain many hundreds or thousands more than can meet in the Parish Church, and yet are but counted single Congregations. Though multitudes in such Churches be far from proving them to be *Diocesan*, yet I think two instances cannot be given in the third Age of more in one Church than are in some single Congregations amongst us; nor many afterwards, till *Arianism* and *Donatism* were suppressed; which the latter was not in *Africa* till after the famous Conference at *Carthage*, Anno 410; nor the former in other parts during the 4th. Age; for though *Theodosius* made some sharp Declarations against them and other Hereticks, yet none but the *Eunomians* were prosecuted, if we believe *Socrates* d; that Emperor gave not the least trouble to the rest, forced none to communicate with him, but allowed them their *Meetings*, and even in *C. P.* when afterwards the *Arians* divided among themselves, each party had several Congregations in that City e; both that which adhered to *Marinus*, and that also which followed *Dorothius*, these keeping the Churches which they had before and the other erecting new Churches.

I know there are those, who from some passages in *Tertullian* f, would infer that the Christians in his time were the major part of the Inhabitants in all Cities, and so enough not only for vast Congregations, but for *Diocesan Churches*. But *Tertullian* was a great Oratour and frequently uses hyperbolical expressions, which ought not to be streined. Such are those insisted on, and by regular construction they import no more than that the Christians were very numerous in many parts of the Empire. Those that will have them streined, and understood
understood as they found, offer great injury to Tertullian, making him intend that which hath no warrant in any Records of Antiquity, Civil or Ecclesiastical, that I can meet with. Before they impose such a sense on him, they ought in reason to make it manifest, that the Christians were the major part of the inhabitants in some considerable Cities at that time; when I believe they cannot produce two instances in the whole Empire, I never yet could meet with one.

Our Author from these Oratorical expressions sticks not to conclude, that it is evident that the Christians were the major part everywhere, but in Rome more eminently so, and Dr. Downham signifies that Tertullian speaks chiefly of the City of Rome, this Gentleman says, that by his account it is made very probable, that they were the better half of the Roman Empire, and tells us, it is certain that the number of Christians at Rome was proportionably greater than in any part of the Empire. Now how far the Christians at Rome were from being the major part of the Inhabitants, we may judge by the vast disproportion between the poor in the Church at Rome, and those in the whole City. Cornelius near 50 years after Tertullian (when it was of more growth by half an Age) reckons the poor of his Church to be 1500; whereas out of Suetonius and others, the poorer sorts of Citizens, que à publico visitabant, are computed to be 320000.

Many take occasion from the thousands converted at Jerusalem, Acts 2. and 4. to conclude the vast number of Christians and exceeding largeness of Churches elsewhere. Our Author hath nothing from Scripture for Diocesan Churches but this, which is considerable; nor will this appear so, if but a small part of those thousands can be counted inhabitants of Jerusalem, and so fixed in that Church. And this is as demonstrable as any
any thing of this nature can be. For this miraculous Conversion was at Pentecost, one of the three great Feasts, when there was a vast conourse of Jews and Proselytes from all parts to that City. These converted were not only Inhabitants of Jerusalem but Forreigners; and in all reason more of these proportionably, as they exceeded the Inhabitants in number. And then those of the City will scarce be a 20th part of the 5 or 8000 Converts. For the Forreigners that resorted to Jerusalem at these great Solemnities are reckoned to be three millions, ἐκ ἐκάστου παραλόγου μυστηρίου, whereas the Inhabitants of that City were but about an 120000 μειονεκτήματος μυστηρίου, but of this elsewhere more fully.

The Author of the Vindication will not have so great a part of those Converts to be Strangers, and to return home when the Feast was over, and assigns something like reasons for it.

"1st, That the Scripture gives no countenance to this Conjecture, but says all those strange Nations were Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the Original word inclines most on this side.

That he should say the Scripture gives no countenance to this, is something strange. It is plain in Scripture, that God enjoyned the Children of Israel to repair to Jerusalem from all quarters of the Country where they dwelt thrice a year, for the observance of the three great Feasts. And it is apparent also that they were wont to come up to Jerusalem at those Solemnities, both Jews and Proselytes, ἅδη τὸ πέλαγος συνελήφθησαν τὰς ἡμέρας τὰ φυλάκια τῶν ἐξων α. And it is evident in that Chapter cited, Acts 2. The Feast of Pentecost being come, there was a resort of Jews and Proselytes from all those parts of the World to this City. Ay, but the Scripture says, all those strange Nations were inhabitants of Jerusalem.
He can't judge that the Scripture sayes this, but upon a supposition that the word ἐπικατοίκηται, Acts 2. 5. can signify no other thing than inhabitants, but this is a mistake, for the word denotes such as abide in a place, not only as inhabitants, but as strangers or Sojourners. Thus Dr. Hammond will have it translated abiding, rather than dwelling b, those that were there as strangers c, and here expresses those abiding at Jerusalem, to be Jews which came up to the Feast of the Passover, and Proselytes which had come from several Nations of all Quarters of the World. Thus also Mr. Mead d, for the word ἐπικατοίκηται, faith he, which I translate sojourning rather than dwelling (for so I understand it, that they were not proper dwellers, but such as came to worship at Jerusalem from those far Countreys, at the Feast of the Passover and Pentecost, and so had been continuing there some good time) it is true that in the usual Greek, ἐκκατοίκησις and ἐπικατοίκησις signify a durable mansion, but with the Hellenists in whose Dialect the Scripture speaketh, they are used indifferently for a stay of a shorter or longer time, that is, for to sojourn as well as to dwell, as these two examples out of the Septuagint will make manifest, Gen. 27. 44. 1 Kings 17. 20. there ἐπικατοίκησις is to sojourn only. In a word ἐκκατοίκησις and ἐπικατοίκησις answer to the Hebrew Verb יושב which signifies any stay or remaining in a place. Grotius faith it answers the Hebrew word which is render'd not only by ἐπικατοίκησις but περικατοίκησις, &c. adding, therefore it is not said only of them who had fixed their habitation, but of those who were come to the City for the celebrating of the Passover or Pentecost, staying there for a while. The best and most learned Expositors generally take it so in this place, as denoting, not settled Inhabitants, but such as resided there only for a time. Indeed when this Author would have the Scripture say all these strange Nations were inhabitants of Jerusalem, he makes it speak things inconsistent.
an occasional recourse of strangers, who inhabit remote parts or foreign Countreys.

If there had been more Christians in the Church of Jerusalem than could meet in one place, that would be no Evidence that it was a Diocesan Church, whereas the whole is said in the Acts to meet in one place. He hath nothing to say against this which is considerable, but that the all, may denote only those that were present, and so the sense will be, all that were in one place, were in one place, if this can please himself, I think it will satisfy none else. Let Dr. Hammond decide this business, for in such a cause we may admit a Party to be Umpire, What follows, faith he, of the paucity of Believers, and their meeting in one place, is willingly granted by us. What they say of the point of time, Acts 2. 44. that believers were so numerous, that they could not conveniently meet in one place, this is contrary to the evidence of the Text, which faith expressly ver. 44. that all the believers were ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ, which in the last Paragraph they interpreted meeting in one and the same place: the like might be said of the other places, Acts 4. 3. and 5. 14. for certainly as yet, though the number of Believers increased, yet they were not distributed into several Congregations.

Concerning the dispersion, Acts 8. 1. o he tells us, "Though they are all said to be scattered besides the Apostles, yet it cannot be understood of all the Believers.

No, but of the generality of them, all that could commodiously fly as strangers might do. Nor must it be confined to all the Officers only, the generality of Expositors are mis-represented if this be made their sense; nor doth it appear that Eusebius so understood it, used in Scripture and other Writers, and Eusebius himself, to denote Believers and not Officers only. As for the
the time of the dispersion (though I need not insist on it) probably it was nearer this great Pentecost than some would have it. On the first day of the week in the morning were the three thousand converted, the next or (as some tell us) the same day afternoon, at the ninth hour p, the number of the Converts was increased to five thousand. While this Sermon was preaching the Apostles are apprehended and committed to Custody till the next morning. Another, it is like the day after, they are imprisoned, but enlarged by an Angel in the night, chap. 5. In or near that week were the seven Deacons chosen, presently after the Disciples were thus increased and the Apostles imprisoned and dismissed. The expression signifies it, chap. 6. 1. It is not en euéwa, in those daies which may admit a latitude and some good distance of time, but en tautas, in these dayes, which denotes the time instant, or that which immediately ensues, without the interpositure of any such distance. And so the phrase is used by St. Luke both in the Gospel and in the Acts. It is Dr. Hammond's observation upon Luk. 1. 39. The phrase en tautas toutis hileus, in these dayes, faith he, hath for "most part a peculiar signification, differing from en hileus ekleves, in those daies. The latter signifies "an indefinite time, sometimes a good way off, but the "former generally denotes a certain time then present, "instantly, then at that time; so here, that which is "said of Mary's going to Elizabeth was sure immediately "after the departing of the Angel from her, and "therefore it is said she rose up very hastily, "so ver. 24. unto tautas toutis hileus, i.e. immediately Elizabeth conceived, so chap. 6. 12. en toutis hileus tautas, i.e. then, at that point of time he went out to the Mountain. See Chap. 23. 7. c. 24. 18. Acts 1. 5. c. 11. 27. and 21. 15.

Imme-
Immediately after the choice of the Deacons, Stephen one of the Seven is apprehended υπάνει τέχνης, as soon as ever he was ordained, as if he had been ordained for this alone, faith Eusebius (l. 2. c. 1.) And at the same time the Persecution began which dispersed that Church. Where- as he faith, ‘whosoever numbers were forced away; it is likely they returned, if he understand it of the strangers driven from Jerusalem, that they returned to fix there, or otherwise than occasionally, it is no more likely nor will be sooner proved than what he asserts a little after (pag. 444.) viz. that the empty Sepulcher preached with no less efficacy than the Apostles.

This is enough to satisfy what our Author would draw out of Scripture concerning the Church of Jerusalem. After some trifling about Objections which he forms himself, and then makes sport with, he comes to prove that Jerusalem was a Diocesan Church in the Apostles time. But first he would have us believe that James was the proper Bishop of that Church, and would evince it by two Testimonies, that of Clemens and Hegesippus. But what says his Clemens? He faith not only that James was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem presently after our Saviour’s Ascension, but what I think our Author was loth to mention. If he had given us the intire sentence it might have been better understood. After the Ascension of our Saviour, Peter, James and John, the most honoured by our Lord, would not yet contend for the first degree of honour, but chose James the just Bishop of Jerusalem, Apostolorum Episcopum. Ruffinus reads it, This seems to signify that his being made a Bishop there, was some degree of Honour above their being Apostles. A learned Romanist tells us, that the books where Eusebius had this did so abound with Errors, that they were not thought worth
worth preserving, and so are lost (as those of Papias and Hegesippus are for the same reason) this may prove one instance of those many Errors. That which seems to be the sense of his words is more fully expressed by one who goes under the name of Clemens too, James i. 2. Recognit. the Lord's Brother was Prince of Bishops, and by his Episcopal Authority commanded all the Apostles, and so the former Clemens in Ruffinus calls him the Bishop of the Apostles. If he means such a Bishop as ours (and otherwise his meaning will not serve our Authors purpose) then the Apostles were but the Vicars or Curates of James. This is bad enough if James was an Apostle, the abfurdest Papist will scarce ascribe as much to Peter. But if he was not an Apostle, it is yet more intolerable. If our Author can believe his own Witness, some may admire, but I think few will follow him.

Let us hear Hegesippus (not quite so antient as this Gentleman makes him, since he was alive in the Reign of Commodus) he says, James ruled that Church μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. If we take this as it is render'd in Jerome after the Apostles, it is not only against Grammar, but without Truth, and makes James to be Bishop when he was dead, for he was martyred about the 4th. of Nero, and all the Apostles but the other James survived him. But if the meaning be that he ruled that Church with the Apostles, it speaks him no more the Bishop of Jerusalem than the rest of the Apostles, who were not fixed or topical Bishops, but Oecumenical Officers of an extraordinary Office and Power and accordingly is James described. One antient Author says that he no less than Peter did ἀπετέλεσεν τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἀναστάσιν. And Epiphanius reports t, that Hyginus after Neros Cordon. James, Peter and Paul was the ninth Bishop of Rome successively, signifying that he was as much Bishop of Rome.
Rome as Paul and Peter. I need not quote that other Author who says he ruled the holy Church of the Hebrews, in Ep. to James, as also he did all Churches everywhere founded u.

"However certain it is that James was Bishop of Jerusalem, not only from Hegesippus and Clemens Alex. but also from St. Paul, who mentions him as one of the Apostles that he had Conversed with in Jerusalem, and it is likely there were no more there at that time but he and Peter.

This is no way certain from Clemens and Hegesippus, and so far from being certain by St. Paul, that his mentioning him as an Apostle makes it rather certain that he was not a Bishop; for the Offices of an Apostle and of a Bishop are inconsistent, as is acknowledged and proved by an excellent Person of your own. "The Offices of an Apostle and of a Bishop are not in their nature well consistent, for the Apostleship is an extraordinary Office, charged with the instruction and Government of the whole World, and calling for an answerable care (the Apostles being Rulers, as St. Chrysostom faith, ordained by God, Rulers not taking several Nations and Cities, but all of them in common intrusted with the whole world) but Episcopacy is an ordinary standing charge affixed to one place, and requiring a special attendance there, Bishops being Pastors who, as Chrysostome faith, do sit, and are employed in one place. Now he that hath such a general care can hardly discharge such a particular Office, and he that is fixed to so particular an attendance, can hardly look well after so general a charge, &c. Baronius faith of St. Peter, that it was his Office not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe to the Faith, and thoroughly to establish believers. If so how could he be Bishop of Rome, which was an Office in-
inconsistent with such vagrancy. It would not have
beemed St. Peter the prime Apostle to assume the
charge of a particular Bishop, it had been a degrada-
tion of himself, a disparagement to the Apostolical
Majesty for him to take upon him the Bishoprick of
Rome, as if the King should become Mayor of London,
as if the Bishop of London should be Vicar of Pan-
cras. And little before, St. Peter's being Bishop of
Rome (it holds as well of James's being Bishop of Jeru-
alem) would confound the Offices which God made di-
strict, for God did appoint first Apostles, then Prophets,
then Pastors and Teachers, wherefore St. Peter after he
was an Apostle could not well become a Bishop, it would
be such an irregularity as if a Bishop should be made a
Deacon.

Ecclesiastical History makes James the ordinary Bi-
shop and Diocesan of the place.

There is nothing in Ecclesiastical History for it, but
what is derived from Hegesippus and Clemens, whom o-
thers followed right or wrong.

It is strange to see Salmacius run his head so vio-
lently against such solid Testimonies as those of Hege-
sippus and Clemens.

That great person understood things better, and dis-
cerned no danger in running his head against a shadow,
and there is nothing more of Solidity in what is allledged
from those Authors.

Further he would prove it a Diocesan Church by a
passage in Hegesippus, who says, "that several of the
Jewish Sectaries who beleived neither a Resurrection
nor Judgment to come, were Converted by James,
and that when a great number of the Rulers and
principal men of the City were by this Ministry
brought to believe the Gospel, the Jews made an
Uproar, the Scribes and Pharisees saying, that it was

..."
to be feared that all the people would turn Christians.

He says many of the prime Sectaries were converted by James, but this will scarce prove such a Diocesan Church as he contends for. That which would serve his turn (that all the people would turn Christians) was not effected, but only feared by the Jews, who took a course to prevent it by killing James. But if this were for his purpose, Hegesippus is not an Author to be relied on, part of the Sentence cited is false, that the Sects mentioned (and he had mentioned seven) did not believe the Resurrection nor Judgment, whereas the Pharisees and others of them believed both, which Valesius observes. One false thing in a Testimony is enough to render it suspected, but there are near twenty things false or fabulous in this account he gives of James, many of them marked by Scaliger, divers by Valesius, and some acknowledged by Petavius.

He would not have us suspect that the numbers of the Church at Jerusalem were not so great as he pretends, because Pella, an obscure little Town, could receive them all besides its own Inhabitants, "but we must understand that Town to be their Metropolis, and the Believers all scattered through the whole Countrey, and this as Epiphanius writes.

But where does Epiphanius write this? Not in the place cited, he writes the contrary both there and elsewhere, that all the Believers (in one place) that all the Disciples (in another place) dwelt beyond Jordan in Pella. Archbishop Whitgift brings this as a pregnant proof that the Christians at Jerusalem were but few in comparison (and no more than could all meet in one place, as a little before he affirms..."
firms again and again) his words are how few Chris-
tians was there at Jerusalem not long before it was de-
stroyed, being above Forty years after Christ? Does
not Eusebius testify d that they all were received into a
little Town called Pella? yet the Apostles had spent
much time and labour in Preaching there; but the
number of those that did not profess Christ in that
City was infinite e. This might be farther cleared by
what Epiphanius faith of that Church in its return from
Pella, but I design briefness.

Our Author adds one Testimony more, to shew that
under the Government of Simeon great numbers were
added to that Church, many thousands of the Cir-
cumcision receiving the Christian Faith at that time,
and among the rest Justus, &c. pag. 448.

But those who view the place in Eusebius will see,
that he does not say those many of the Circumcision
were converted by Simeon, or were under his Govern-
ment, or belonged to that Church; and so it signifies
nothing for his purpose. And so in fine, the account
wherewith he concludes his Discourse of Jerusalem will
not be admitted by any who impartially consider the
Premisses.

As for his other Scripture instances, there is not so
much as the shadow of a proof shewed by him, that
there were near so many Christians as in Jerusalem, or
as are in some one of our Parishes, yea, or more than
could meet in one place, either in Samaria (where he
says it appears not what kind of Government was establi-
shed, pag. 451.) or in Lydda, which was but a Village,
though a fair one, and far from having Saron for its pro-
per Territory, that being a plain between Joppa and
Caesarea; or in Antioch, pag. 452. much less in Corinth
and Ephesus which he advisedly passes by, pag. 456.
Our Author does in effect acknowledge that in Scripture it appears not that these Churches were Episcopal, much less Diocesan; "It is to be confessed, saies he, "papg. 461. that the Scriptures have not left so full and perfect an account of the Constitution and Government of the first Churches, &c. Thus we have no more notice of the Churches of Samaria and of Judæa (Jerusalem excepted) than that such were founded by the Apostles; but of their Government and Constitution we have not the least Information. What information then can we have that they were Diocesan or Episcopal? He goes on, "And the prospect left of Antioch in Scripture is very confused, as of a Church in fieri, where a great number of eminent persons laboured together to the building of it up; but only from Ecclesiastical Writers, who report that this Church, when it was settled and digested, was committed to the Government of Euodius, and after him to Ignatius, &c. So that after what form the Church at Antioch was constituted does not appear (it may be Congregational and not Diocesan, for any thing this Gentleman can see in Scripture) but only from Ecclesiastical Writers.

But his Ecclesiastical Writers do so contradict one another as renders their testimonies of little value. Nor is there much more reckoning to be made of the traditional account they and others give concerning the Succession and Government of the first Bishops, than this Author makes of Eusebius his traditional Chronology, pag. 454. Some make Euodius the first Bishop and he being dead Ignatius to succeed him; on the contrary some will have Ignatius to have been the first, and make no mention of Euodius; others will have them to have governed that Church both together; some will have Euodius ordained by Peter, and Ignatius by Paul, others report Ignatius ordained by Peter, and some modern
modern Authors of great eminency, both Protestants and Papists (not only Baronius but Dr. Hammond) find no more tolerable way to reconcile them, than by asserting that there were more Bishops than one there at once, which quite blasts the conceit of a Diocesan Church there.

And what is alleged for the numbers of Christians there, to support this conceit of a Diocesan Church, is very feeble, pag. 452, 453. A great number believed, Acts II. 21. and much people, ver. 24. The next verses shew, that there were no more than Paul and Barnabas assembled within one Church; meeting ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, for a year together, and there taught this ἑκατὸν or πολὺν ὀχλον. The same divine Author fayes, Acts 6. 7. πολὺς ὀχλὸς, a great Company of the Priests were converted, and will this Gentleman hence conclude that there were Priests enough converted to make a Diocese?

He hath no ground from Scripture to think otherwise of Rome (that we may take in all his Scripture instances together) however he would perswade us that there were several Congregations there in the Apostles times. Let us see how. "By the multitude of "Salutations in the end of that Epistle he makes appear "the numbers of Christians in that City. Salute Pris- "cilla and Aquila with the Church that is in their "house.

The Dean of Pauls will have this Church in their house to be but a Family, this Author will have it to be a Congregation, as if it might be either to serve a turn. I think it was such a Congregation as removed with Aquila from one Countrey to another, for this Church which was in their house at Ephesus before, (1 Cor 16.) is said to be in their house at Rome, Rom. 16. that is, there were some of the Church which belonged to their Family.
Family. It is a question whether there was now at Rome any one Congregation such as our Author intends, Gro
tius. i thinks it probable there was none at all. But let us suppose this to be a Congregation, where finds he his several others? why where another person would scarce dream of any? "It is not improbable, faith he, "that several that are mentioned with all the Saints that "are with them, may be the Officers of several Congreg-
gations, pag. 457. 458.

But it is manifest that in the Apostle's times one Congregation had many Officers, how then can several Officers be a good Medium to prove several Congregations? The antient Authors which count those Officers (mentioned Rom. 16.) do make them Bishops (and some except not Narcissus nor Prisca, i. e. Priscilla, tho' her Husband also hath an Episcopall Chair assigned him) Now if they were not Bishops at Rome but other places, they are alledged to no purpose; if they were Bishops at Rome, there will be very many Bishops in that one Church (it may be more than Priscilla's Congregation consisted of) which rather than our Author will grant, I suppose he will quit his plurality of Congregations here. Indeed what he adds next doth no waies favour them, and this number was afterwards in-
creased considerably by the coming of Paul, who con-
verted some of the Jews, and afterwards received all "that came, whether Jew's or Gentiles, and preached "to them the Kingdom of God for the space of two "whole years, no man forbidding him, pag. 458.

Paul preached at Rome in his hired house for two years, all this while he received all that came to him; there is no question but that all the Christians there did come to hear this most eminent Apostle: so that it seems from first to last there were no more Christians at Rome than a private House could receive.
He would prove what he intends from *Nero's Per-
secution*, who is said to have put an infinite multitude
of Christians to death upon pretence that they had
fired *Rome*, pag. 458. *Tacitus* speaks of the Christi-
ans as guilty, and says they confessed the Crime, and
detected many others.

Now those who suffered, either confessed that they
fired *Rome* and then they were no Christians; or they
did not confess it, and then he wrongs them intolerably, and deserves no credit. But our Author to excuse
him (against the sense of such who best understand him, *Lipsius* particularly, besides *Baronius* and others)
says, they confessed not that they burnt *Rome*, but that
they were Christians. Whereas the inquiry being con-
cerning the burning of *Rome*, the question was not
whether they were Christians, but whether they fired
the City, of this last *Tacitus* speaks, and will be so un-
derstood by those who think he speaks pertinently.
But for truth in those accounts he gives of Christians,
it is no more to be expected than from other Heathen
Authors of those Ages, with whom it is customary on
that subject *splendidè mentiri*. Some other instances here-
of we have in this report of *Tacitus*, which I suppose
our Author will scarce offer to excuse, as when the
Christian Religion is called *EXITIABILIS SUPERSTITIO*, and
when the Christians are said per *flagitia invisos vulgo
suffs*

But suppose he speaks truth, what is it he says? *Nero put an infinite multitude of them to death*, but *INGENS
MULTITUDO*, which are his words, may be far less than an
*INFINITE MULTITUDE*. Two or three hundred may pass for
a great multitude, and extraordinarily great, when
that which is spoke of them is extraordinary. The
Martyrs burnt in *Queen Mary's* dayes were a great
*MULTITUDE*; and few may be accounted very many, to
suffer
suffer in such a manner, as these did by Nero's Cruelty, Ferarum tergis contentium laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi desecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis uterentur, in the words of Tacitus.

To this he adds the general account which Eusebius gives of the success of the Christian faith immediately after the first discovery of it, that presently in all Cities and Villages Churches abounding with innumerable multitudes were assembled, &c. pag. 459.

If he will not deal unkindly with Eusebius he must not set his expressions upon the Rack, nor stretch them beyond his intention, nor forget what is observed to be usual with him; Oratorum more rem amplificare. These Churches consisting of innumerable multitudes are said to be not only in all Cities, but Villages; now I believe it will be an hard matter for our Author to shew us any Villages, even in Constantine's time, where there were a Thousand, yea, or 500 Christians. Those who will not abuse themselves or their Readers must give great allowance to such expressions, and not rely on them in strict arguing.

And here it may not be amiss to take notice of what he saies of Rome in another Chapter, M. B. had declared, that he found no reason to believe that Rome and Alexandria had for 200 years more Christians than some London Parishes (which have 60000 Souls) nor near, if half so many. The chief, if not the only argument to prove them at Rome more numerous, is a passage in Cornelius his Epistle shewing the number of the Officers and of the poor, this was in the middle of the third Age, and so not within these 200 years, but yet proves not what it is allledged for in Cornelius's time, near Anno 360. The number of Officers signifies no such thing, as hath been made evident, the number of
the poor, being 1500 rather proves the contrary. This was cleared by comparing the proportions of the poor with the rest in other places, at Antioch in particular, as was shewed out of Chrysostome, who reckons the poor to be a tenth part of the Inhabitants, and if it was so at Rome in Cornelius's time, the Christians were about 15000. This will serve M. B's purpose well enough. But the time and circumstances being exceeding different, makes it most probable that the Christians then at Rome did nothing near so much exceed the poor in number. It is far more likely that the proportions were nearer that at Constantinople, where Chrysostom says, the poor was one half; this would spoil all our Authors pretensions, and so he advisedly takes no notice of it.

However something he would say against M. B. if one, could understand it. It is about the word ἄνεξοντίς in Cornelius's Epistle render'd the poor. Valesius observes the word is used by the Roman Clergy in an Epistle to those at Carthage, sive Videae sive Thlibomeni, i.e. indigentes, faith he, as Rufinus translates it, and tells us also that Cyprian calls them pauperes & indigentes qui laborant. These, says our Author, were not only poor, but sick and diseased, alluding that of the Roman Clergy for it after Valesius, and if he mean not only the poor, but the sick also and the diseased he is right, for Cornelius signifies those that were maintained by the Church, Widows and Indigent whether sick or well. But when he says these poor were such only as were not able to come abroad, he seems to confine it to the sick and diseased, and then it contradicts the former, and is without reason, against the use and import of the word, as render'd by all Interpreters former and later that I meet with, and indeed against common sense; for the number Cornelius speaks of is fixed, as that of the Presbyters and Deacons.
such as may be constantly known and a certain account
given of it, whereas the number of the sick is not fixed,
but such a contingency as is very uncertain and various.

But Cornelius says in the same Epistle that the people
of his Church were innumerable. True, that is, according
to the frequent use of the word, very many (it is
granted they were more than in any other Church) as
when Dio says the Nations conquered by Trajan were
innumerable, and Socrates expresses those wounded in
the fight between the Christians and Heathen in Alex-
andria about the demolishing of an Idol Temple were
ἀναστάτωσα τας, which in Sozomen is but many n; and an-
other antient Author says there were innumerable Bishops
in Africa, which yet this Gentleman can easily count,
and tells us that Schismatucks and all were but 466 o.
M. B. may allow him what he falls short in this rec-
koning, which is more than half, and may grant there
were many more hundreds of Christians in Rome than
any of these innumerales come to, and yet make good
what he supposes.

The great liberality of the Roman Church is offered
as no small argument of its greatness, they sent to a great
many Churches, relieving those that were in want, and
sending necessaries to such as were condemned to the Mines;
thus in Severus's time, and in the time of Dionysius the
Provinces of Syria with Arabia were thereby relieved ev-
ery one, pag. 53.

M. B. need not doubt, but some one Parish near
him might do what is equivalent to this, if the an-
tient Charity were revived, which opened the hearts
of Christians in those times further than their Purves
could well extend.

But the words are oddly stretched, for they did not
relieve every one in all those places, but such as were in
great want, and those particularly who were condemned
to the Mines; and Παναθήναι must denote as it were the sufficiency of the Roman Church, which some would say is, as it were Blasphemy, but our Author meant better, the proper import of the word is no more than stipend conferre.

He alludes to two passages in Eusebius p, the former concerns not Rome more than any other place in the Empire, the import of it is this, that not every soul of every sort were lead to the Christian Religion, if πάνων ψυχῶν be stretched to every soul Eusebius is made to speak what is in a manner notoriously false, and monstrously extravagant. The later which concerns Rome does but signify, that more of Good quality for Riches and Birth with their Families and Relatives came over for Salvation q. These he will have to be of the Nobility, but those were counted noble who descended from such as had been Magistrates in Cities or free Towns. How this can make that Church near so great as our Author would have it, or greater than M. B. supposes, I don't understand.

What he subjoyns is very surprizing and must seem strange to those who are acquainted with the state of Church in those times, that the Christians were the better half of the Roman Empire, that they were the major part every where, but in Rome more eminently. This hath no good warrant from antient Authors, no, not from Tertullian, though he writ many years after Commodus. He like an Oratour draws something bigger than the life (as our Author fayes of Nazianzen, pag. 137.) and must have allowance on this account by those who will not be injurious to him. In that very Age wherein Commodus reigned, it is said the Christians were so often slaughtered that few could be found in Rome who professed the name of Christ r. And near 150 years after, when Constantine had reigned near 20 years in Rome the gene-
ality of the Inhabitants shewed such disaffection to Christianity, as that is given for one reason why he transferred the seat of the Empire to Byzantium.

He runs beyond M. B's bounds towards the middle of the third Century, and tells us the greatest part of Alexander Severus his Family were Christians. And so they might be, and yet no more Christians in Rome for that, if they were Christians before they came into his family, which is more likely than that they were converted in it. However many more such Additions will not increase that Church beyond M. B's Measures, nor make it near so numerous as that Parish to which Whitehall belongs.

What he next offers neither concerns Rome, being general expressions, nor M. B. referring to the Ages after those which he is concerned for, whether by μετανόεις διάνοιασι we understand the great multitudes which were gathered into the Christian Profession (as Valerius) or that assembled together for Christian worship (as our Author) is not material; though the former is more likely, unless we can think Eusebius, an elegant Writer, would use so much tautology in so few lines. That from which he may expect more service is the next expression, which he renders the multitude of their Meetings in every City, but may with better reason be rendered, the numerousness or multitudes of those that assembled in several Cities. For it is so far from being true, that every City had many Congregations of Christians in it; that there were many Cities long after, which had no Christians in them. And two instances cannot be given of any Cities in the whole Empire that at this time had more Congregations than one; unless where they all might have assembled in one place, they thought it better in Prudence to disperse themselves into several Meetings. For in Alexandria, which was the greatest City next to Rome,
Rome, and the most populous Church in the whole World, there is no appearance of more assemblies till the end of the tenth Persecution, and the death of Peter Bishop there, who suffered in the ninth year of it. And therefore the elegant gradation, in discovering of which this Gentleman would have us take notice that he has a more comprehensive faculty than Valesius, seems not very well founded:

That which follows is an hundred years or more beyond the time to which M. B. limits his Assertion, "About this time or not long after Rome had above 40 Churches, which we must not imagine to be built all at the same time, but by degrees, according as the number of Believers did require; &c. pag. 55."

From the number of Churches he can't reasonably conclude such a multitude of Christians as he contends for. There were many Churches in Alexandria when Athanasius was Bishop of it, and yet there were no more Christians in his communion than could meet together in one place. Baronius tells us, that there was a City in Germany which had 400 Churches in it; and yet no reason to think that Town was comparable for Circuit and Populosity, either to Rome or Alexandria. If I should say that in Optatus there were not so many Churches, but the number mistaken by the Transcribers, this would be as good an answer as that of our Author, who will have the 12 or 14 years of Athanasius his Banishment in Epiphanius not to be so many moneths, and that years are put instead of moneths by the mistake of the Copies, pag. 113. Or that other about the number of Bishops in the Council at Antioch, where he will have 30 in diverse Authors to be a mistake of the Transcribers for, 90 (or 97 or 99, u) Onuphrius must have liked such an Answer to this of Optatus, who tho' he was as much concerned for the greatness of the Roman Church
Church as any, and no less inquisitive into the antient state of it, yet delivers it as a thing manifest and certain, that Rome had but 28 Titles, and this number not completed till the fifth Age. But there's no need to insist on any thing of this nature, it is not so material how many Churches there was, as when there was so many, and about the time he will have Blondel to mistake, and M. B. to follow him therein; he had been nibbling at Blondell a little before upon a small occasion and with as little reason, as might be shewed, if it were fit to follow one in his Vagaries. Let us see whether here he doth not follow Valesius in his mistake, who will have Optatus to speak of the Churches at Rome in the time of Diocletian's Persecution, tempore perfecutionis Diocletiani \( ^{w} \). But Optatus speaks of those Churches when extant and capable of receiving Congregations, as is plain by his words; but what Churches were at Rome or other places, in the very beginning of that Persecution, were all quite demolished, and that in one day, says Theodoret \( x \), or the Paschal days, as Eusebius \( y \); and there's no probability they could rebuild them while the Persecution lasted, or that so many could be raised in less than many years after. Nicephorus speaks but of 14 Churches at Constantinople in the reign of Theodosius junior, nor meet I with any Author that gives an account of more, yet this was about an hundred years after Byzantium was re-edifyed, and both Constantine and the succeeding Emperours endeavoured to make that City as populous as could be, and furnished it with Churches answerable to the numbers of the Inhabitants. So that there's no likelihood there could be 40 Churches in Rome at any time nearer Dioclesian's than Optatus's.

But to help this our Author tells us out of Optatus, that
that there were three Donatists Bishops at Rome successively before Macrobius, who was Contemporary with Optatus, and that the first of them was Victor Garbienis, and he will have Optatus to speak of the State of Rome (the 40 Churches there) not as it was in his own time, but in that of this Victor, when this was, he says, is not easie to fix. pag. 56.

Yet this is certain, it cannot be in the time of Dioclesian's Persecution, for the Schisme of the Donatists did not break out till Majorinus was ordained (who was the first Bishop of the Faction made in Africa or elsewhere) and this was sometime after the Persecution was there ended, as Optatus and Valerius after him, and others declare; and sometime must be allowed after this for the Donatists settling in Rome, and such an increase of them there as to need a Bishop. Baronius makes this Victor to be Bishop in Silvester's time, which might be long enough after Dioclesian's Persecution, for he lived till 335. All which our Author hath to alledge for the more early date of Victor's Bishoprick, is that there were two or three Donatist Bishops between Victor and Optatus; but this will scarce serve his turn. For there were four Bishops of Rome in the former part of that very age wherein we are now concerned, who held not the Chair ten years among them, Marcellus, Eusebius, Melchiades and Marcus. But we may allow the three Donatist Bishops at Rome near ten years a piece from the time of Optatus, 378 (as both Blondel and Valerius agree) and yet Victor Garbienis may not be Bishop till Anno 350 and so nearer to Optatus his time, than Dioclesians.

2dly, It is no proof of Diocesan Churches that those who belong to it, do occasionally divide themselves into distinct Meetings, A large Church, and sometimes
times a small Congregation may have occasion to divide and meet in parcels for their convenience or security. Particularly in time of Persecution, that they may assemble with more safety, and be the better concealed from those who would disturb or apprehend them. The people that belonged to Cyprian did meet all together on several occasions, as is apparent in his Epistles; yet when Persecution was hot, he thought it advisable, cautæ non glomeratim nec per multitudinem simul junctam, conveniendum, they durst not in some parts, in the beginning of Constantine's Reign.

Damascus, the supposed Author of the Pope's lives, says, Euaristus Titulos Presbyteris divisit, divided the Titles in Rome to the Presbyters, and by Titles some will have us to understand Parish Churches. But it is incredible that the Christians in Trajan's time, when Evarisus was Bishop, could erect any structures in form of Churches, or had any distinguishable from other houses, so as the Heathen might take notice of them, as used or designed for the religious exercises of Christians. Who can imagine that when it was death for any one to be known to be a Christian, they should frequent any known places for Christian Worship? It is far more reasonable which Plutina says of Calistus's time, more than an hundred years after, that then the meeting of Christians were all secret, and rather in Chappels, and those hidden, and for the most part underground; than in open and publick places. Cum eà tempestatæ ob crebras persecutiones occulta essent omnia, & facella potius, atque eadem abdita & plerunque subterranea; quam apertis in locis ac publicis fierent. Dr. St. lays, I confess it seems not probable to me that those Tituli were so soon divided as the time of Evarisus, who lived in the time of Trajan, when the Persecution was hot against the Christians; but Damascus seems
seems not to believe himself for in the life of Dionysius be faith, Hic Presbyteris Ecclesias divisiit. His reason concludes as much or more against the Titles under this notion ascribed to Marcellus 200 years after (which some will have to be 25, but Onuphrius shews they could not be more than 15 n) for Marcellus was Bishop of Rome for six years of the tenth Persecution begun by Dioclesian, which was the longest and fiercest that ever befel the Church; when the Christians were so far from erecting any Churches, that all before erected were by severe Edicts to be quite demolished. But what is said of Titles divided by Euaristus may be true in this sense, that since they could not safely meet together in the Persecution under Trajan, they dispersed themselves into distinct meetings, and had Presbyters assigned to officiate in each of them. And yet the Christians at Rome were then no more, nor long after, than might all meet together for Worship, and did so when it could be done in safety. In the time of Xystus who had the Chair at Rome under Adrian, it is said because of the frequent slaughters of the Christians, there were few found who durst profess the name of Christ, proper frequentes cades pauci reperirentur qui nominem Christi profiteri audent o. And there was an order in that Church that when the Bishop celebrated, all the Presbyters should be present. Zepherinus voluit Presbyteros omnes adeesse celebrante Episcopo, quod etiam Euaristo placuit, this is said to be made in the time of Euaristus to whom this division of Titles is ascribed, and it was in force an hundred years after, being renewed by Zepherinus who was Bishop till Anno 218 about 30 years before Cornelius, who speaks of 46. Presbyters at Rome. Now the Lords Supper was frequently administered in those times; at least every Lords-day, and when the Bishop was present, he himself did celebrate, and if all the Presbyters were:
were to be present when he did celebrate, then all the People likewise were to be present, or else they had no Publick Worship, for they could have none without Bishop or Presbyters.

3dly, A Church is not proved to be Diocesan by the numbers of Presbyters in it, this I have made evident before, and made it good against our Authors exceptions. But he brings a new instance p, and will have Edessa to have been a Diocesan Church because of the numerous Clergy, the Clergy, fays he, of the City of Edessa was above 200 persons, not reckoning that of the Countrey within his Diocese, and this was a Diocesan Bishop to purpose. He did well not to reckon that of the Countrey in his Diocese: unless he had known that something of the Countrey was within his Diocese. It was not unusual for the Bishops charge to be confined to a Town or City Rome it self is an instance of it q, cum omnes Ecclesiae nostrae intra civitatem constituere sunt. But why it should be judged to be a Diocesan Church because 200 such Persons belonged to it, seeing the great Church at C. P. had above 500 Officers asign'd it after Justinian had retrenched the numbers r, and yet was never counted a Diocese, I do not well understand. But he hath some other reasons for it, and because he thinks they prove the Bishop of Edessa to have been a Diocesan to purpose, let us on the by a little examine them; these he gives in summarily. This was a Diocesan Bishop to purpose, who besides a large Diocese, had excommunicating Archdeacons, and a great revenue.

I find nothing alleged to shew he had a large Diocese or any at all, but this, the City of Battina was in the Diocese of Edessa, for Ibas is accused of having endeavoured to make one John Bishop of it, &c.
Battina had a Bishop of its own, how then can it be said to be in the Diocese of Edessa, unless Province and Diocese be confounded? Edessa was the Metropolis of Mesopotamia, the Bishop of it was the third Metropolitan in the Patriarchate of Antioch, as they are ordered in the antient Notitia. The Bishop of Battina was one of the many Suffragans belonging to that Metropolitan. How then comes the Diocese of Edessa to be any ways large upon this account? Is the Diocese of Canterbury one foot the larger, because there is a Bishop of Peterborough in that Province? These things are not easily apprehended nor can be well digested.

2dly, The greatness of his Revenue is no more apparent, there is nothing to prove it but the riches of that Church, and its great Revenues, and hereof our Author gives us no clear account, no value of the Numismata, nor is there any Evidence in the Council for the Manors he speaks of but only the selling of some wood in a certain place there named. But where there was a Diocesan and Archdeacons, decorum required there should be Manors and vast Revenues for the Bishop. Nor do I quarrel with it, only this breaks the squares a little, and disturbs the correspondence between those and our times; that if the Revenues of that Church had amounted to ten times more, yet the Bishop would scarce have been one jot the richer for it. This will not seem strange to any, who take notice of the antient Orders, concerning the revenues of an Episcopal Church. The Bishop was to have nothing thereof if he could maintain himself otherwise. When he was necessitous, nothing was allowed him for himself but necessaries, food and raiment. He was to purchase nothing while he lived, nor to leave any thing got by his Bishoprick when he died, to his Relatives or others, but only to the Church that maintained him. The Bishop of

Edessa.
Edessa, or any other in these Circumstances, must be a poor Diocesan, and one in a good English Rectory or Vicaridge, is in a fairer way to be rich, than any in the antient Bishopricks, so ordered. And if Riches or Revenues be good Arguments to prove a Diocesan, one of our Vicars may be a better Diocesan than the Bishop of Edessa. It is true there is some intimation from Rome, that the Bishop should have the 4th. part of the Churches revenues, but there's no appearance of such a distribution, till after the time of the four first general Councils; nor in any Countrey but Italy till an hundred years after: Nor did it ever obtain (that I can discover after some inquiry) in the Greek Churches.

3. The other proof that Ibas was a Diocesan, viz. because he had excommunicating Archdeacons, our Author would make good by telling us, that one of his Archdeacons excommunicated Maras. Now this though it prove not what it is alledged for, may prove more than he likes. An Archdeacon in the antient Church (though he be another thing now) was not so much as a Presbyter, he was but in the lower Order of Deacons, though chief amongst them, and chosen by them, as Jerome signifies u, Diaconi eligunt de se quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocant, the Deacons chuse from amongst themselves one whom they know to be industrious, and call him Archdeacon. Now if a Deacon had the power to excommunicate, there can be no doubt but the Presbyters had it, being of a Superior Order and Power. And excommunication being counted the highest act of Jurisdiction, it cannot be questioned but the other acts thereof belonged to them; and so the Presbyters having all the Jurisdiction of Bishops (all the power of Government) what did they want of being Bishops but the honour of presiding in their Assemblies?
And if they were no farther from being Bishops, they will go near to be as much *Diocesan*, and so the Gentleman may chuse, whether he will have all of both sorts to be *Diocesan*, or none of either.

4ly, It is no Argument to prove a Diocesan Church to shew that it consists of such who live at a good distance one from another. *Dionysius* had a great Congregation at Cepbro, a Village in Lyibia, but those which made up this Church were of another Countrey, coming partly from Alexandria, partly from other parts of Egypt, as *Eusebius* shews us, yet none ever esteemed that to be a *Diocesan Church*. In *Justin Martyr's* time those that were in the Countrey, and those that were in the City, when those were no more than made one Congregation, met together in one place, *ἐν τοῖς άρχισταῖς καὶ οἰκονομίας* the Meeting consisted of such as lived at a good distance, but none will imagine it to be a *Diocesan Church*, but those who will have a single Congregation to be such a Church. *All the Christians in City and Countrey*, says *Dr. Downham*, if they had been assembled together, would have made but a small Congregation.*\(^\text{w Defense 1.2. c.4 p.59.}\)

Our Author would prove the largeness of *Basil's Diocese* by the distance between Caesarea and Safima. *x pag.546,547* He makes much of it and takes the pains to measure the distance between these Towns, or rather, as he says, to make some guess at it out of an Itinerary and Putinger's Tables; yet tells us the distance must be as great at least as between Hippo and Fussala, that so *St. Basil's Diocese* may be as great at least as that of *St Austin's*. I think they will prove much alike; for as I have shew'd that *Austin's Diocese* was not one foot larger for Fussala, so it will appear that *St. Basil's* had not the least enlargement upon the account of Safima. That he might not be out in his measures nor have lost all his labour, two things...
things should first have been cleared, neither of which is (or I think can be proved; first, That Sasima was in Basil's Diocese, for if it was but only in his Province, how far soever it was from Caesarea, his Diocese can be nothing the larger for it, though his Province might. To prove it in his Diocese I find nothing but his own assertion, that Sasima is said expressly to be taken out of the Diocese of Basil; but where is this said expressly, or by whom, except by himself? The words in the Margin signify no such thing, but only some attempt to deprive a Metropolis of Sasima. For a Metropolis may be deprived of a Town which is in any part of the Province, when another Metropolitan seizeth on it. And I believe our Author is yet more out in taking the Metropolis which Nazianzen speaks of to be Caesarea, when it appears by the Epistle to be rather Tyana. For as the whole Epistle is writ to Basil, to these words cited, after many others by way of sharp expostulation, are directed to him as endeavouring to deprive a Metropolis of this Town, called ironically τῶν ἀμφετῆν Σασίμων: Now Caesarea was not the Metropolis which Basil would have deprived of Sasima, he earnestly endeavoured to have it annext thereto; but he would have deprived Tyana of it, if Anthimus the Metropolitan there, had not made a stout opposition. 2dly, He should have proved, that after this part of Cappadocia was divided into two Provinces, Sasima was in that Province which fell to Basil's share (for if it was not in his Province how could his Diocese be any larger for it?) but instead of this our Author offers what may serve to disprove it, telling us that in the antient Greek Notitia, Sasima is set down in the second Cappadocia (which belonged to Anthimus as the first did to Basil) and so, says he, it is not likely to be very near Caesarea. No indeed, it is thereby proved to be so far from Caesarea, that it did not
not enlarge Basil's Province, much less his Diocese. Thus it is also placed in the Annals of Leo Sophus under the Metropolitan of Tyana, not of Caesarea. It is true Basil laid claim to it, but after some contest he yielded, and Anthimus carried it, placing Eulalius there as one of his Suffragans, when Nazianzen had quitted it.

He goes farther on to shew the largeness of Dioceses in Basil's Province.

"It is plain by Nazianzen that Cappadocia had but 50 Bishops, for so many he says Basil had under him, and considering the extent of that Countrey the Dioceses must needs be large.

He does not say Basil had no more under him, nor that he was making no more; he knew Basil was constituting more Bishops in that part of Cappadocia which was his Province, and Nazianzen commends him for it as an excellent undertaking on several accounts."

"Considering the extent of that Countrey, the Dioceses must needs be large, for the Countrey as Strabo computes, is near 400 miles in length, and little less in breadth.

If he means Basil's own Province, where he told us there were 50 Suffragans under him besides Saisma, &c. z: (as I know not what he can mean else, if his Discourse be not impertinent and inconsistent; for Basil as Metropolitan had no Bishops under him, but those in his proper Province;) Strabo is strangely misrepresented to serve a turn; for it is the whole Countrey which passed under the name of Cappadocia, that the Geographer gives us the dimensions of in the place cited, and tell us it was divided into ten Prefectures, Meletena, Cataonia, Cilica, Tyantitis, Isauritis, &c. whereof Basil's Province was but one, viz. that called Cilica, and that of Anthimus, Tyantitis, another, &c. Mazaca (afterwards
(afterwards called Caesarea) being Metropolis of Basil's and Tyana of Tyantu, &c. and after he hath given some account of these ten Prefectures, he adds the dimensions of the whole Countrey, in these words, the extent of Cappadocia in breadth from the Euxine to Taurus, is 1800 Furlongs, in length 3000. So that our Author will have the extent of Basil's Province to be no less than that of the whole Countrey, when it is but the tenth part thereof. And as if this were not enough, he makes the breadth of the whole Countrey, to be near twice as much as it is in Strabo; but he hath some falvo for this, such as it is.

"And little less in breadth, as Causabon restores the reading of 1800 Furlongs in the 12th. Book, by a passage in the second where the breadth is made 2800.

It is true Causabon observes some difference in the places cited, but he shews how they may be easily reconciled, without changing the Text here, or making the Countrey broader than it is here described, viz. by taking Pontus in one place for the Sea, in the other for the Region so called, separated from Cappadocia by mountains parallel to Taurus; and then concludes, Sic non erit descedendum à vulgata lectione. So that he hath no relief by Causabon without curtailing the Passage.

"And in this compass Bishops may contrive 50 Dio-

ces of very competent extent, and not inferiour to many of ours.

Let him try how in Basil's Province of about 40 miles in length, he can contrive room for above 50 Bishops, with as large Dioceses as those he pleads for. That which is now thought little enough for one Bishop Basil conceived too big for Fifty.
What Dioceses Basil (and others before him) thought sufficient for Bishops both then, and in former times, appears by a passage which our Author next cites, where Amphilochius Bishop of Iconium, is directed to constitute Bishops for the Province of Iconium, in little Corporations and Villages. A Hundreds of instances might be brought of Bishops elsewhere, in such little places and Villages, but I will go no further now, than the instance himself offers us, whereby it is manifest that a little Corporation, or a Village might furnish a Bishop with such a Diocese, as was then thought competent, both by Basil, and the Church before him. For in such little places there was Bishops before, as Basil there signifies, and he gives direction that it should be so still. Yet he, that would advise the reducing of Bishops to such Sees now, would be counted an enemy to Episcopacy; and his advice destructive to Bishops. So much do we now differ, both from the judgment and practice of the antient Church, and the most eminent Bishops in it.

Hereby also it appears that the multiplying of Metropolitans was no such occasion of multiplying Bishops, but that their numbers increased, when there was not that occasion; And this in Cappadocia, which is our Author's eminent instance. For Bishops were multiplied by erecting Episcopal Sees in Villages, and little places, this was done in Iauria, a Province in Cappadocia, as appears by these passages in Basil, before the contest between him and Anthimus, upon the constituting of a new Metropolitan: and after that difference was Composed, Basil thought it adviseable that it should be done still. And the like may be said of Africa, the instance he most insists on, and spends many Pages upon it, pretending the occasion why Bishops were so numerous there, was the Schisme of the Donatists, Whereas
Whereas the rule by which the African Fathers proceeded in erecting Bishopricks in little places, and to increasing the number of Bishops, was as themselves declare, who best knew it, the increase of the number of Christians: where these were multiplied, and desired a Bishop, they thought themselves obliged to let them have one: not excepting the meaneness or smallness of the places, where he was to be constituted. And we must believe (if we have any reverence for those Fathers) that they would have done, what they judged themselves obliged to, though there had been no Donatists amongst them. And when there can be no such pretence of occasion from the Donatists, the practice was continued, as appears by St. Austin’s procuring a Bishop for Fussala, which he calls a Castle, upon some increase of the Catholicks there, diverse years after the noted conference at Carthage, where the heart of the Donatists was broken; Nay, many years after the invasion of the Vandals, and the death of St. Austin they proceeded in the same methods, or rather exceeded their Predecessors in multiplying Bishops, by erecting Episcopal seats in smaller, and more inconsiderable places, if Leo his Epistle may be credited.

But to return to our Author, and the passage of Basil, insisted on, by which says he, ‘it appears that Isauria was part of Basil’s Province;’ How this appears by any thing therein, I cannot imagine, our Author signifies before that Isauria was a distinct Province, the Metropolis of it (as he supposes) Selencia, which had a metropolitan and suffragans before, and being now destitute, the Bishops in the Vicinity were careful to provide others. Which being so, that it should be part of Basil’s Province seems as incongruous, as if it were said, that the Province of York, is part of the Province of Canterbury: but if this could be digested, that
that one Province is part of another, yet Isauria would rather be part of Amphiloctius his province, who (as he tells us) was to constitute a Metropolitan and other Bishops therein, than of Basils, who is only represent-ed as giving advice about it. Or if giving advice and direction, would prove any thing of this nature, the Papists might think it a good argument, that Africa was part of the Roman Province, because Leo Bishop of Rome gives advice, how Bishops should be there con-
stituted. 

Next he brings in the Chore-piscopi in order to his de-
sign, and tells us f they were Countrey Bishops, and their Church consisted of many Congregations, and those at a good distance one from another, and also that some of them had the inspection of a large Ter-
ritory, no less it is like than the County of Fusala.

But not a word for proof of this, save Basils men-
tioning a Chor-episcopus τον τον νοι of some places; Whereas if he had been the Bishop of two or three Villages, this might be enough to satisfy the import of that ex-
pression. Yet he knows there is some one Countrey Parish, that hath ten times as many, or more Villages in it, but never pretended to be a Diocesan Church, and that such a pretence would be now counted ridi-
culous.

He adds, that which, if it were true, would go near to dethrone these Countrey Bishops; (for Basils speaks of them, as having their Thrones in Villages) and ren-
der them less than antient Presbyters, for all their large Territory, and there being Diocesans.

But yet these were but the Deputies or Surrogates of the City Bishops in point of jurisdiction, for they were to do nothing of moment without their Bishop.
If this be so, it would be less wonder that the Pope will have Bishops to be but his substitutes; and that some Bishops will have the Pastors of Parochial Churches to be but their Vicars or Curates. I hope our Author intends better, however it is well that such odd Hypotheses have no better support than that which is added, for says he, they were to do nothing of moment without their Bishop; this is his argument, and he is not alone in urging it. Let us see whether it will not do the Bishops (for whose advancement it is designed) as much disservice, as it can do the Chorepiscopi, orPresbyters; divesting them of that which is counted more necessary and advantageous to them, than a large Dioceze. The Provincial Bishops were obliged to do nothing, μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπὶ χερέων, ἔκειν αὐτῶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, without the Bishop of the Metropolis, this the Synod at Antioch decrees, according to an ancient Canon of the Fathers. By this argument we must conclude, that the Bishops in a Province were but the Deputies and Surrogates of the Metropolitan. And it may proceed proportionably against the Metropolitans with respect to the Εξαρχοί or Primates; and also to their prejudice in reference to the Patriarchs. It will go near to destroy the Bishops likewise, if we follow it downwards. In the antient Church the Bishops were to do nothing of moment, without the Presbyters, this the most judicious and Learned Asserters of Episcopacy acknowledge; Nay further, in the best Ages of the Church, the Bishops were to do nothing without the people, that is, without their presence and consent. This is most evident in Cyprian's Epistles, and is acknowledged by such Prelatists as are otherwise reserved enough. Now by this Argument we may conclude that Bishops were but the Deputies or Surrogates of the Presbyters; or which will be counted more intolerable, that Bishops had


B. Bilson, Dr. Field, Dr. Downham, B. Hall, M. Thorndike, B. & her. Vide defence of Dr. St. Pag. 497.
had their jurisdiction from the people by *Deputation and Vicarage.* It may be this Gentleman will not like his argument so well, when he sees what improvement it is capable of, yet in pursuance of it he adds, *'Basil is so resolute upon his prerogative, that he will not endure they should ordain, as much as the inferior Clergy, without his consent; and if they do, let them know, (says he) that whosoever is admitted without our consent shall be reputed but a Layman.*

I suppose the Prerogative for which he will have Basil so resolute, is a *Negative in ordinations upon the Countrey Bishops*; but this cannot be concluded from the words cited. For the Council of *Nice* gives the Metropolitan a power, as to ordinations in the same words, *καὶ διακονοῦσαν* without the judgment of the Metropolitan, the great Council will have him accounted no Bishop; and yet the Metropolitan had no Negative upon the Provincials in Ordinations, for the same Council determines, that in ordinations plurality of Votes shall prevail, which is utterly inconsistent with any ones Negative voice. What then is the import of Basil's *καὶ διακονοῦσαν*? take it in the words of a very Learned and Judicious Dr. of this Church, *it is indeed there said, that none should be ordained without the opinion of the Metropolitan,* but that doth not import a Negative voice in him, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without his knowledge, advice and suffrage, &c. 1

5. It is no proof of a *Diocesan Church,* to shew that a Town, besides the Clergy or Officers in it, had some Presbyters or Congregations in the Countrey belonging to it. The instances which signifie no more, or not so much, are produced as sufficient arguments to prove

1 *Barrow of the Popes Supremacy, Pag. 314.*
prove there were such Churches. As that of Gains Diddenis Presbyter, supposed (with what ground I examine not) to have been a Countrey Presbyter belonging to Carthage, and under Cyprian. And that of Felix said to do the Office of a Presbyter, under Decimus another Presbyter; a thing unheard of in those times, but let us take it as we find it, and upon the very slender reason alleged against Goulartins (who is of another Judgment) believe, that he was a Priest in some Village belonging to Caldonius his Diocese. And that order for the Presbyters from their Churches, to repair to their proper Bishop for Chrism in Africa, o in Spain, p and in France. q To these are added, for further evidences, the Churches (said without ground to be many) belonging to Hippo Dieritorum; Also the Church of Thyana, belonging to Alypius Bishop of Tagesta, which without reason, we must take to be a considerable City, r and the City Milevis, because Petilian says Tunca belonged to it once, though now it had a Bishop of its own; and by our Authors Art of computation, Towns, Villages and Cities must belong to Milevis, upon the sole account of Tunca, sometime appertaining to it, s and these with Fussala, (of which before) are the chief instances to prove that Africa had very large Dioceses not inferior to those of ours, in extent of Territory. t Besides in the Council of Neocesarea Countrey Presbyters are distinguished from others; u and that of Antioch provides that Countrey Presbyters shall not give Canonical Epistles, w and allows the Bishop to order his own Church, and the Countrey places depending on it. x And Epiphanius speaks of a Church belonging to his charge, which we must understand to be his Diocese, though in the passage cited, it is twice called his Province, y in fine, Jerome speaks of some baptized by Presbyters or Deacons.
cons in Hamlets, Castles, and Places remote from the Bishop.

These and such like are used as good arguments for Diocesan Churches, whereas there are diverse Towns in England, which besides the Officers in them, have many Congregations and Presbyters in Villages belonging to them, and contained within the Parish; and yet our Author and those of his persuasion would think Diocesans quite ruined, if they were reduced, and confined to the measures of those Parish Churches, and left no bigger than some of our Vicarages and Parsonages, though such as Mr. Hooker affirms to be as large as some antient Bishopricks; he might have said most, there being not one in many greater or so large. I yet see no ground in antiquity, nor can expect to have it proved, that the larger sort of ordinary Bishopricks in the fourth age, and sometime after, were of more extent than two such Vicarages would be, if united. Yet a Bishop of such a District in our times would be counted so far from having a competent Diocese, that he would scarce escape from being scorned as an Italian Episcopellus.

But his greatest argument, (in comparison of which his other Allegations, he tells us, are but accidental hints, z.) which he most insists on, and offers many times over; so that it makes a great part of his discourse on this subject. a It is drawn from the number of Bishops in Councils, by which he would evince the largeness of antient Dioceses, when it no way proves Diocesan Churches of any size. He proceeds upon this supposition that there were great numbers of Christians in all parts and Cities, b in the first age; And that the Bishops were fewer in former times than afterwards. The former part of his Hypothesis, if he understands the numbers of Christians to be any thing comparable to what they
they were after Constantine, when Bishops were much multiplied; (as he must understand it, if he expect any service from it) wants proof, and he offers none but some passages in Tertullian, strained far beyond what is agreeable to other ancient Authors, of which before. Let me add that Nazianzen comparing the numbers of Christians in former times, with those in Julian's Reign, says, they were not many in former Persecutions, (Christianity had not reached many,) no, not in that of Dioclesian, &c. (though they were at that time, far more numerous, than in Tertullian's age) but that Christianity was found only in a few bishops. The other part which needs no proof, since it is granted, (and may be without any advantage to him) he attempts to prove largely and industriously; but by such a medium as makes that which is granted to be questionable, such a one which as it is ordered may conclude backward, and prove the contrary to what he designs. That this may be manifest, let it be observed, that he will have us take an account of the number of Bishops in the Church by their appearing in Councils, more or fewer; and accordingly judge in several periods, whether they were less numerous, and consequently their Dioceses larger in former times than afterwards. And to this purpose we need view no other instances than himself produces. At Lambese in Africa there were 90 Bishops against Privatus; but not so many in any Council after (though not a few are mentioned in that Countrey) till the Donatists grew numerous. In Spain the Council of Eliberis had 19 Bishops in the beginning of the 4th Age, and the first Council of Toledo had no more in the beginning of the age after. But the following Synods, at Saragossa, Gerunda, Ilerda, Valentia, Arragon, had not so many. In France the Council at Valence had 21 Bishops in the fourth Age, but
but those following them, in that and the after ages had still fewer, viz. That of Rimz, Orange, the third of Arles, that at Angers, that at Tours, and Vannes and another at Arles. For General Councils, the first at Nice had 318 Bishops in the beginning of the fourth Age, that at Ephesus above an hundred years after, had but two hundred, that at C. P. in the latter end of the fourth Age had but one hundred and fifty Bishops.

So that if we take account how many Bishops there were of old, as he would have us, by their numbers in Councils, there will be more before the middle of the third Age, than in the beginning of the fourth; more in the beginning of the fourth than in some part of the fifth; and more in the beginning of the fifth, than in some part of the sixth; quite contrary to the Hypothesfs on which he proceeds. Whether by his argument he would lead us to think Dioceses did wax and wane so oddly, as it makes Bishops to be more or fewer, I cannot tell. However since he grants that in the fourth and fifth Ages Dioceses were very small, and crumbled into small pieces, (and so nothing like ours): there's no expectation he can find any larger, if anything near so great, in any former age: unless they can be larger when incomparably fewer Christians belonged to these Bishops; which will be no less a paradox than the former. For it cannot but be thought strange, that the Bishops Diocese should be greater when his flock was undeniably far less. And they seem not to be Christian Bishopricks, whose measures must be taken by numbers of Acres rather than of Souls; or by multitudes of Heathens rather than Christians.

He denies not, that the generality of Bishops, for a long while after the Apostles, had but one Congregation to Go-Pag. 71. vern. What then? says he, If all the Believers in and about
about a City would hardly make a Congregation, that is to be ascribed to the condition of those times. Dioceces with him, were largest in the first times; but Bishops being still multiplied, they became less and less, and so were very small and crumbled into very little pieces in the fourth and fifth Ages. This is the tendency of his discourse all along. Thus Dioceces must be largest, when a Bishop had but one Congregation; but in after ages when he had more Congregations under his inspection Dioceces were very small. If he will stand to this, our differences may be easily compromised. Let him and those of his persuasion, be content with the Dioceces in the first ages, when he counts them largest; and we shall never trouble any to reduce them to the measures of the fourth and fifth ages, when in his account they were so lamentably little, and crumbled so very small.

The particulars premised contain enough to satisfy all, that I have yet seen alleged out of Antiquity for Diocecan Churches, so that no more is needful, yet let me add another, which will shew there is a medium between Congregational and Diocecan Churches. So that if some Churches should be shewed out of the Antients exceeding the Congregational measures (as some there were in the times of the four first General Councils) yet it cannot thence be immediately inferred that they were Diocecan, since they may prove a third sort of Churches, and such as will as little please those of this Gentleman's persuasion as Congregational.

6. It's no argument for a Diocecan Church, that there were several fixed Churches, with their proper Presbyters in a City or its Territory; so long as these Churches, how many soever were governed in common by the Bishop and Presbyters in such a Precinct. For though few instances can be given of such Churches, in or
belonging to a City in the 4th. Age; yet wherever they were extant in that, or the following Age, in things of common concern to those Churches, they were ordered in common by a Presbytery, that is, the Bishop with the Presbyters of that Precinct. Jerome declares it de jure, they ought to be governed in common, in communi debere Ecclesiam regere. *h

And Felix 3 Bishop of Rome, (than whom no Bishop was higher, or more absolute in those times,) declares it de facto, when he speaks of the Presbyters of that Church, as Ἅντωνοι μετ' ἐμῖ τῶν εἰςειλικῆς ἐξουσίας, ruling that Church with him. It is the same word that the governing of Churches by other Bishops, is expressed by μετ' ἐμῖ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ τὰς ἐπικρίσεις. Jerome de- clares it de jure, they ought to be governed in common, in comrnì debere Ecclesiam regere. It imports no less than præsidere, and is ascribed to Bishops and Presbyters, jointly by Tertullian, *k Cyprian, l and Firmilian. *m Hence the Presbyters are frequently said to be συνεκτεταγμένοι with the Bishop, *n for then the Governing power of Bishops was but count- ed a Ministry, ἡ ἐπισκοπή γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ ὑποκριτῷ ὑπομαζοντικοῖς, o and the Presbyters fellow Ministers with him, and joint Administrators in the Government. They are styled συνοικοδόμοι; *p fellow Pastors, they did not then dream that a Bishop was sole Pastor of many Churches. They are also called συνεκτεταγμένοι, which is no less than συγκρίτοις, q for the Presbyters had their Thrones with the Bishop. So Nazianzen speaks of Basil when ordained Presbyter, as promoted ἰγκρίτοις ἐπισκόποις to the Sacred Thrones of the Presbyters. *r They are also called νομοδοῦται, qνομοδοῦται. They are also called νομοδοῦται, or νομοδοῦται the θρόνοι.

But further evidence is needless, though abundance may be produced, since the great Patrons of Episco-
pacy seems not to question it, that the Church was governed in common, and the Bishop was to do nothing of importance without the Presbyters, it is acknowledged by Bishop Bilson, Bishop Downham, Bishop Hall afferts it, as that which is Universally accorded by all antiquity, that all things in the antient Church were ordered and transacted by the general consent of Presbyters. 

Mr. Thorndike proves at large, that the Government of Churches passed in common; Primate Uber more succinctly but effectually. Add but Dr. St. who both afferts and proves it, there was still one Ecclesiastical Senate, which ruled all the several Congregations of those Cities in common, of which the several Presbyters of the congregations were Members, and in which the Bishop acted as the President of the Senate, for the better Governing the affairs of the Church, &c.

Let me add, when the Churches were so multiplyed in City and Territory, as that it was requisite to divide them into Parishes, and constitute several Churches; the Bishop was not the proper Ruler or Pastor of the whole Precinct, and the Churches in it, or of any Church, but one. The Parishes or Churches were divided among Presbyters and Bishop, they had their several distinct cures and charges; the Bishops peculiar charge was the Ecclesia principalis, the chief Parish or Church so called, or άναρίθμητον ὕψιστα. The Presbyters performed all Offices in their several Cures, and ordered all affairs which did particularly concern the Churches where they were incumbents; those that were of more common concern were ordered by Bishop and Presbyters together, and thus it was in the Bishops Church or Parish, he performed all Offices, administered all Ordinances of Worship himself, or by Presbyters joyned with him, as Assistants. He was to attend this particular cure constantly, he was not allowed to be absent
fent, no, not under pretence of taking care for some other Church; if he had any business there which particularly concerned him, he was to make quick dispatch, and not (χρονίζεων ἢ μάκαρίν ἢ ὀίκου ἀξίω, as Zonaras) stay there with the neglect of his proper flock; this is all evident by a Canon of the Council of Carthage a, Rursum placuit ut nemini sit facultas, reliqua principali Cathedra, ad aliquam Ecclesiam in Dioecesi constitutam se conferre, vel in re propria, diutius quam oportet constitutum, curam vel frequentationem propriae Cathedrae negligere. Of this Church or Parish he was the proper Pastor or Ruler, called there idcirco, and elsewhere b óικεὶα, óικεία, b Can. 53, in contradistinction to other parts of the Precinct, called here Dioceces; and the people of it are called óικεία, óικεία, by the ancient Canonist, his proper flock or people, his own special charge. This was the particular Church under his personal Government, but he was not Ruler of the Precinct, or any other Churches in it, save only in common, and in conjunction with the other Presbyters; who jointly took cognizance of what in his Church or theirs, was of greater or more general consequence, and concerned the whole, and gave order in it by common consent.

And while this was the form of Government, if there had been as many Churches there, thus associated, as Optatus in the fourth age says there was at Rome, or far more, they could not make a Diocesan Church, unless a Diocesan and a Presbyterian Church be all one. For this is plainly a Presbyterian Church, the antient Presbyteries differing from the modern but in a matter of smaller moment. In those their President being fixed and constant, in these commonly though not always circular. The Presbyteries in Scotland comprised some twelve, some twenty, some more Churches, their
their Moderators were at first, and for some years, circular, King James afterwards, Anno 1606 d, would have them to be constant, and so it was ordered, yet when they were fixed, no man ever counted these Presbyteries to be Diocesan Churches. The Church of Geneva consists of twenty four Parishes, governed in common by a Presbytery with a Moderator, who is sometimes changed, sometimes continued for Life. Calvin was President while he lived, yet that of Geneva is not wont to be taken for a Diocesan Church. Nor were those antient Churches such, while they were governed, not by one Bishop, but by a Senate of Presbyters where he presided; as in the Council of Constantinople all things in the Province are said, to be governed, not by the Metropolitan, but by the Provincial Synod.

Finally, the Presbyters are in the antient Church acknowledged to have had the power of the keys, both as to the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and the exercise of Government and censures. This power they exercised either jointly in conjunction with the Bishop and Senate of Presbyters; or distinctly in the particular Churches whereof they had the charge. The former power concerning the Word and Sacraments is not questioned, nor is there any ground to question, the latter, if some were not swayed more by the practice of their own times, than by the principles and declarations of the antients. Chrysostom ascribes to Presbyters, not only the power of order, but the power of Government; giving this as the reason why the Apostle gives the same rules for the ordering both of Bishops and Presbyters, there is but little difference between them, says he, for they are ordained both to the teach-
teaching (ἐκτάσεως) and ruling of the Church. Now that ὁ παπάς denotes jurisdiction or presidentiam cum potestate, and is as Hesychius renders it, xuβερνος, is plain in Chrysostome himself; he tells us the Apostle Paul had ἑξωρασίας ἀληθείας, γ γ which he elsewhere expresses by τὴν εἰκόνα ἡμῶν ἀριθμοῦ, and speaking of Μοσέως, he says, it was wonderful, that he who was to be a Ruler, ὁ δὲ θεός μέλην ἑαυτῷ, should be born at such a time. Theophilaet makes the difference as little between Bishop and Presbyters, and ascribes as much power to the later, almost in the same words k. So Theodoret declares ἐκτάσεως, jurisdiction to belong to every Presbyter l, against an Elder especially, no less than two Witnesses must be admitted, because he having ἐκκλησίας ἐκτάσεως, the Government of the Church, and in the exercise of it often grieving Delinquents, they being ill affected to him, will be apt to bring false accusations. And this is the ἴματον included in the Presbyters Office, ἐπὶ υἱο-ς τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἐπί ἴματον, ἐπί ἴματον, as Nazianzen speaks and much more to that purpose m. And besides many other passages of like import, the Title of Governours is all a long in antient Writers given to Presbyters n; and all the expressions which signifie Authority and Government, are ascribed to them. Thereby those that would curtail their power, and make it no more of old than it is now, are not a little encumbred; to extricate themselves a distinction is devised of a power internal and external, the former they will allow to Presbyters in their respective Churches, not the later.

But this is devised to disentangle themselves, and salve the deviations and irregularities of later times, not that there is any ground for it in Antiquity. For the highest act of that external power of jurisdiction, is Excommunication; and if this was in the Presbyters power of old, no other act of that power will, or can
in reason be denied them; but this the antients ascribe to them; So Jerome, n Mihi ante Presbyterum sedere non licet, illi si peccavero licet me tradere satane ad interrimum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit. Chrysostome threatened some of his Auditory, while he was a Presbyter, to Excommunicate them, ἐπικορδήσω λοιπὸν ὑμῖν τῶν ἵσον τῶν αἰσθάνεις ἀλάπον, o to wave all of like nature insisted on by others; Justinian in the 6th. Age signifies plainly, that not only Bishops, but Presbyters might Excommunicate Offenders, in his Constitutions he forbids Bishops and Presbyters to exclude any from Communion, till such case was declared, for which the Canons appointed it to be done, πάντα τοις ἐντύποις κτρεπτήθη τοὺς απεικόνεις, ἀφοίζειν πάντα τὰ ἐν τοῖς κοινωνίας. &c. and will have the sentence of Excommunication rescinded, which was passed by Bishops or Presbyters without cause. p In the Code both Bishops and Clergy are forbid to Excommunicate in certain cases, and then mentions the cases for which they must not, ἵνα αφοίζειν ἵνα ἀναθεματίζειν — καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἐκκαθαρ. al-though they had been accustomed to it. q

Now while Presbyters had this power there could be no Diocesan Churches, whether they exercised it in common, as was shewed before, or particularly in their several Churches, as will now be made apparent; For by virtue of these powers the Presbyters were really Bishops, though they had not always the Title, yea, they are called Bishops, as a Learned Prelatist observes, by the antientest Authors, Clemens, Ignatius, Tertullian, and have frequently the Names and Titles which some would appropriate to Bishops, and which the Fathers use to express the Office of Bishops by, εξεστάτες Prefpο-

siti, Antifites, Presidentes, &c. And so there was as many Bishops really in every Diocese, as there were particular Churches and Presbyters there; And well may
may they be said to be really the same, since they were of the very same Office; for Bishops in the antient Church, were not a superior Order to Presbyters, but had only a Precedency in the same Order. This some of the most judicious and learned Defenders of Episcopacy assert. And those who hold that Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Bishops differed not in Order, but in degree only, which is the common opinion of Episcopal Divines, and yet contend that Bishops and Presbyters were of a different order, will never be able to prove it. The difference they assign between Bishops and Metropolitans is, that these presided in Synods, and had a principal interest in Ordinations, and what more did the preeminence of antient Bishops, distinguishing them, from Presbyters amount to? It consisted in nothing material but their presidency in Presbyteries, and their power in Ordinations. This last is most insisted on, as making the difference wider, between these than the other. But with little reason all things considered.

For those to be ordained, were first to be examined and approved by the Presbyters, \(\text{μὴ ἄλλα} \chiρεστενεῖστον αλλὰ τὸ \text{ἐφοδίασθαι κληνικὸν ὄσμαζωτὸν} \), the ordaining of one to the Presbytery was to be \(\text{ὑπῆρξ} \) \(χρττει} \) \(παῦ κληρον \text{παῦ}. \) \(\) It was a crime for which the greatest Bishop in the World was censurable, to prefer any, or make Ordinations \(\text{ἀυτὰ γενόμενα} \) \(παῦ), as appears by what Chrysostome was accused of, though it is like fallly \(w\), and this is counted by some the substance of Ordination, wherein the Presbyters had no less share (to say no more) than the Bishop. And in imposing hands, which was the Rite of Ordaining, the Presbyters were to concur with the Bishop, for which there is better Authority than the Canon of an African Council, for faith a very learned Doctor \(x\), to this purpose, the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery \(y\), is no ways impertinently allledged, although \(x \text{Iren. p. 275.} \) \(y \text{1 Tim. i. 1.} \) \(\)
we suppose St. Paul to concur in the action; because if the Presbytery had nothing to do in the Ordination, to what purpose were their hands laid upon him? Was it only to be Witnesses of the fact, or to signify their consent? Both those might have been, done without their use of that Ceremony, which will scarce be instanced in, to be done by any but such, as had power to conferr what was signifyed by that Ceremony. And diverse instances are brought by the same hand to shew that Ordinations by Presbyters was valid in the antient Church.

But if the Presbyters had been quite excluded from Ordination, and this power had been entirely reserved to the Bishops, yet this would not be sufficient to constitute them a superiour Order. For the Rite of Ordaining was so far from being an act of Government or jurisdiction, that it did not inferre any superiority in the Ordainer; nothing being more ordinary in the practice of the Antient Church, than for those were of a lower Degree and Station, to Ordain their Superiours.

While there was no more distance betwixt Bishop and Presbyters but only in Degree, so that as the Bishop was but primus Presbyter, (as Hilary under the name of Ambrose, and others a; or Primicerius as Op- tatus, b defined by a Learned Civilian to be πρατέων & τῆς ἐκκλησίας b the first Presbyter, so the Presbyter was a second Bishop; or άρετας δέονος, as Nazianzen. As the Bishop was summus sacerdos, in the style of Tertullian and others, that is, cheif Presbyter, so the Presbyter was Bishop a degree lower; not that he had less pastoral power, but because he wanted that degree of dignity or preeminence, for which the other was styled chief. As the Praeter Urbanus was called Maximus, yet he had

---

a In 1 Tim. Aut. Quest. in V.
b Gothsfrid, in Cod.
had no more Power than the other, Prætorum idem erat collegium, cadem potestas c, but only some more privi-
ledge and dignity, dignitate cæteros anteibat propterea c. 6. 
maximus dicebatur d, and the δεξεων επίνυμεν at Athens d Fæ. in verb. 
was Prætor maximus, yet all the rest were pares potestas-
majors. 
et e; Bishops and Presbyters had idem ministerium as e ibid. 
Jerome, cadem Ordinatio, as Hilary f, they were of the 
fame Order and Office, had the same power, the power 
of the Keys, all that which the Scripture makes essential 
to a Bishop. While it was thus, there could be no Dio-
cesian Churches, that is, no Churches consisting of many 
Congregations which had but one Bishop only.
POST-SCRIPT.

A Late Writer presumes he has detected a notable mistake in the Author, of No Evidence for Diocesan Churches (assigned to one who owns it not) about μῆχριν, which I suppose he would have Translated Ten Thousands definitely; but there it is rendered indefinitely thousands, as we are wont to express a great many, when the precise number is not known. Those who understand the Language, and have observed the use of the Word, will be far from counting this a fault: and those who view the passage will count it intolerable, to render it as that Gentleman would have it. That of Atticus Bishop of C. P. may satisfy any concerning the import and use of the word, who sending mony for the releif of the poor at Nice to Calliopius, he thus writes,
writes, ἢ μεγάς ἐν τῷ πληθῶν παρίσταμεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὴν εὐπεπίπλωτον ἔλεον. Ἡ μεγίστη ἡ λέγει τὸ πληθῆ, ὅταν ἐκείνος ἐμήν ἔλεος
where he tells him that by μεγίστη he understands a multitude whose number he did not exactly know, thus (i. e. indefinitely) is the word most frequently used by Greek Writers, and particularly by Eusebius the Author of the passage cited. So he tells us, Nero killed his Mother, his Brothers, his Wife, οὐδὲν μεγίστη
of her Kindred: And Timotheus of Gaza, he says, indured μεγίστας ἡμέρας. Many more might be added, where the word is not rendered by the best Translators (Valesius particularly) ten thousand; but still indefinitely innumerables or infiniti, or sexcenti, &c. Nor have I met with one instance (though possibly there may be some) in him where it is used to express ten thousand precisely.

However it had been an unpardonable injury to Eusebius, to have rendered it so in this place; as if he would have deluded the World with a most palpable untruth, which both he, and all men acquainted with the state of the Church in those times, know to be so. For this make him say that ten thousand Bi-
shops
Post-script.

Bishops met in Council at Antioch in the third Age; when as he never knew a Synod of six hundred Bishops in the fourth Age, while he lived; though then Bishops were farr more numerous, and had all encouragement to meet in greatest numbers. This makes him signifie, that ten thousand Bishops assembled in the skirts of the East part of the Empire: When as their was not near so many (this Gentleman is concerned to maintain there was not one thousand) in the whole Christian World.

This is more than enough to shew that there is sufficient warrant to Translate μις ὃς, Thousands more than once; though that it is in that discourse (which he stiles a little Pamphlet) so translated more then once, is another of his mistakes. And a third (all in two lines) is that the Author grounds his Argument on it. Whereas those that view the passage, and the occasion of it, will see it had been more for his advantage to have translated it ten thousands. He that can allow himself to write at this rate, may easily be voluminous, and look too big to be despised, as a writer of little Pamphlets.
Post-script.

The Letter mentioned pag. 45. being communicated to me by M. B. that part of it which concerns Alexandria is here added, that it may appear how much it is mistaken, and how far from being answered.

For Alexandria it was the greatest City in the Empire next to Rome, *μείζων μη διώ Παμφίνη πίνης*, says Josephus de bello Judaic lib. 5. c. ult. And Epiphanius gives an account of many Churches in it assigned to several Presbyters, viz. besides Cæsarea finished by Athanasius, that of Dionysius, Theonas, Pierius, Serapion, Perseas, Dizia, Mundidius, Annianus, Baucalas, adding *καί ἄλλα*.

Hæres 69. page 728: This notwithstanding that the Christians at Alexandria which held Communion with Athanasius, might and did meet together in one Church, he himself declares expressly in his Apology to Constantius, page 531. Tom. 1. Edit. Commelin. Anno 1601. The whole passage is too large to transcribe or translate, this is the fence of it. He being accused for assembling the People in the great Church before it was dedicated (*πρὶν αὐτῷ τελευταίον*) makes this part of his defence. 'The confluence of the People at the Paschal solemnity
Post-script.

Unity was so great that if they had met in several assemblies (καὶ μετὰ τὰς διηνυσίας) the other Churches were so little and strait, that they would have been in danger of suffering by the crowd, nor would the universal harmony and concurrence of the People have been so visible and effectual, if they had met in parcels. Therefore he appeals to him, whether it was not better for the whole multitude to meet in that great Church (being a place large enough to receive them altogether ὑπὸ τῆς δυναμείας Ἱερᾶς πάντος, ἐν αὐτῷ αὐτίκως) and to have a concurrence of all the people with one voice (ἐν τῷ ἑνίω μὲν συμφωνίας ὡς ἱκάνον δίνεις τῷ φωνῇ). For if says he according to our Saviours promise, where two shall agree as touching any thing, it shall be done for them of my Father, &c. How prevalent will be the one voice of so numerous a People assembled together and saying Amen to God? Who therefore would not wonder, who would not count it a happiness, to see so great a People met together in one place? And how did the people rejoice to behold one another, whereas formerly they assembled in several places? Hereby it is evident that in the middle of the fourth Age, all the Christians at Alexandria,
Post-script.

dria which were wont at other times to meet in several assemblies, were no more than one Church might and did contain, so as they could all join at once in the Worship of God and concurre in one Amen.

He tells him also that Alexander his Predecessor, (who died An. 325) did as much as he in like circumstances, viz. assembled the whole multitude in one Church before it was dedicated, pag. 532.

This seems clear enough, but being capable of another kind of proof which may be no less satisfactory, let me add that also. This City was by Strabo his description of it, xlaunod. enis to zyma, like a Soldiers Coat, whose length at either side was almost 30 Furlongs, its breadth at either end 7 or 8 Furlongs, Geogr. lib. 17. pag. 546. so the whole compass will be less than ten Miles. A third or fourth part of this was taken up with publick Buildings, Temples, and Royal Palaces, ἠχεῖ τε ἡ πύλης περίπλον, τὸ τε καὶ τὸ καλλίτερον ἔλεύθερον, τῷ τε ταῖς τε παλαιοῖς περίπλοις μετ' ἐμ. ibid. two Miles and half or three and a quarter is thus disposed of. I take this to be that Region of the City which Epiphanius calls ἐγόμαν, (where he tells us, was the famous Library of Ptolomeus Philadelphus) and speaks of
of it in his time as destitute of Inhabitants, 

A great part of the City was assigned to the Jews, πόλεως ἀρέσκω μισα μήπω τοις θεοῖς τέκνοι. So Strabo indefinitely, as Josephus quotes him. Antiquit. Jud. l. 14. c. 12. Others tells us more punctually, their share was two of the five divisions (Ushers Annals Latin, pag. 859.) Though many of them had their habitation in the other divisions, yet they had two fifth parts entire to themselves, and this is (I suppose) the τέταρτον which Josephus faith, the Successors of Alexander set apart for them (καὶ τοῖς ἀθρόοι, bello Jud. l. 2. cap. 21. Thus we see already how 6 or 7 miles of the 10 were taken up. The greatest part of the Citizens (as at Rome and other Cities) in the beginning of the 4th. Age were Heathens. Otherwise Antonius wrong'd the City, who, in Athanasius's time, is brought in thus exclaiming by Jerom. vit. Paul. p. 243. Vae tibi Alexandria quae pro Deo portenta veneraris; vae tibi civitas meretrici in quam totius orbis daemonia confluxere, &c. a Charge thus formed, supposes the prevailing party to be guilty. But let us suppose them equal, and their proportion half of the 3 or 4 miles remaining, Let the rest be divided amongst the Orthodox, the Arrians, the
the Novatians and other Sects: And if we be just a large part will fall to the share of Heretics and Sectaries. For not to mention others, the Novatians had several Churches and a Bishop there, till Cyril's time, vid. Socrat. Hist. I. 7. c. 7. The Arians were a great part of those who professed Christianity, το ἄρθρο τὰ ἁπλὰ μόνας, (Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. 14.) and if we may judge of the followers by their leaders, no less than half. For whereas there were 19 Presbyters and Deacons in that Church (Theod. Hist. l. 4. c. 23.) (12 was the number of their Presbyters by their Ancient Constitution, as appears by Eutychius, and 7 their Deacons, as at Rome, and elsewhere) 6 Presbyters with Arians, and 5 Deacons fell off from the Catholicks. Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. 14. But let the Arians be much fewer, yet will not the proportion of the Catholick Bishops Diocese in this City, be more than that of a small Town, one of 8 or 12 Furlongs in compass. And so the numbers of the Christians upon this account, will be no more than might well meet for Worship in one place.

FINIS.
READER

THE first Epistle is now written upon the sight of Jugulum Causæ: The other with the Propositions was written about a year and half ago, upon the sight of Papa ultrajectinum, &c. and the Parænelis contra Ædificatores Imperii in Imperio: And the design of all is, to shew how little or nothing at all the sober moderate Protestants, called Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Political or Erastian are disagreed in this business, whilst I name you near a hundred Propositions in which they commonly consent: That Princes and all Magistrates may see, that they have no cause to be offended at the Christian and Protestant Doctrine, or to judge the true Religion of any of these parties, as such, to be contrary to their interest; when in very truth they are in that all one: But that among all Sects and Parties, there will be still some injudicious, intemperate and unpeaceable men; especially those whose Interest in the world is Great, and cannot be upheld, without encroaching on the rights of others: As Great Trees must have much room, and suffer nothing
nothing to prosper under them, but Weeds and Bryars. And it is to tell Politicians, that the true Pastoral Power (being a Power to labour and suffer in patient self-denial for the Church of Christ and the souls of men) is past all doubt of Christ's appointment: And to diminish that Power, is but to diminish our obligation to labour and suffer, and to gratifie our sloth and fleshly interest. But to diminish that Secular Church-power which Clergie men claim as of Divine Right, is but for Princes to be Princes, whether the Clergie will or no.

And as to the Learned Author, Dr. Lud. Molinaeus, my meaning is to second him in awakening Magistrates to reassume their proper power, and to leave it in no Clergie mens hands, of what party soever: But as to his reflections on the Protestants Discipline, lovingly to chide him for making the difference seem wider than it is, and to RECONCILE the four Parties, while I distinctly open the common Doctrine of them all, excepting the rigid Opinions of some interested or intemperate individuals.
My Learned, Sincere and Worthy Friend,

When I had hastily set down my judgement of the Cause which I found-handled in your Papa Ultrajctcinus and other Writings which you sent me, I cast by that Script (which I intended at the writing of it, for your view) that I might surely keep it from the notice of others, in this Age wherein the prevalency of Interest, Faction, Passion and Injudiciousness, doth make it so great a difficulty, to say any thing for the cure of any mens errors, enormities or impieties, which shall not be charged with the same crime (or greater) which it would cure, and be taken for a disturber of the Church and Peace, which it would save or heal. But now seeing that you renew your endeavours in the same Cause, and finding your Jugur- lum Cause directed to so many hands, by seventy particular Epistles, and that you have honoured me with a place among those great and worthy persons, I take my self obliged to render you some account of my judgement of your Writings, and especially of the whole Cause, by bringing into the open light, those hundred Propositions which I had purposed to conceal: And withal to tell you,

1. That (though you have much overvalued me in your recitation of their report, who would have joyned me with so Great, so Wise and Good a man as A Bishop Utber, and that in so great a work; and experience may tell you, that other men have other thoughts of me, as one unmeet to preach the Gospel in the Land of my Nativity, much more unmeet
unmeet to be a decider of the Churches Controversies;) yet you have truly described my judgement of your self and your undertaking. I confess I hope not that ever you should make the Roman Usurpation, more palpable, than the falsity of their Doctrine of Transubstantiation; where they maintain (not only the Corporal Presence, which is not it that I now mean, but) that Bread is not Bread, and Wine is not Wine, when all men see, taste, smell and feel them: And if the Princes, Doctors, and great men of the world, can thus obstinately deny (or take on them to deny) the judgement which is made of sensible objects, by all mens senses, you may gather what fruit you may expect of your labours, or of any Cause how plain soever, where prejudice and seeming interest are against you? Can all the Writings or Reasonings in the world, bring any thing to a more clear and sure decision, than that of all the senses of all men in the world, about the proper objects of sense? If flesh so far conquer flesh itself, and the interest of sensuality can cause such men, and such multitudes to renounce the apprehension of all their senses, what have we to do more for the cure of mankind?

You have made it plain enough, that it is really a part of the Secular Government of Kings and States, which is now commonly called Ecclesiastical among the Papists, and as such is challenged and usurped by the Pope, and that Princes that subject their Kingdoms to his Usurpation, do take in a joint Ruler with them, and divide their Kingdoms or Power between themselves and him. But so they have done, and so they will do, till the Time of the Churches fuller Reformation, and of the Coalition of the Christian world is come.

I know you may think that as Interest blindeth them, so this great detection of the Invasion of their Interest is the way to bring them to the truth. For who will have a Co-partner with him in his Kingdom, that may choose? Who had not rather Rule alone, than divide his Kingdom with the Pope? Undoubtedly they give away more of their own Interest hereby, than you have opened? When they deliver part of their Power to one, who by an approved
prove General Council of their own, which is the Religion of their Party, Later. sub Innoc. 3.

Can. 2. 3. may depose Temporal Lords, (though no Protestants themselves) that will not exterminate those that deny Transubstantiation out of their Dominions, and may absolve their subjects from their fidelity, and may give their Countries unto others. When their most Learned, Renowned, applauded Doctors teach, that the Pope may excommunicate Kings, and that an excommunicated King is no King, and he that killeth him, killeth not a King. When the Roman Council under Greg. 7. decreeth, that the Pope may depose Emperours: And the same Greg. 7. li. 4. Ep. 7. conspireth in the like Doctrine. The Oration of Card. Peron is well known: If so great a Kingdom as France, that glorieth of its Church-liberties, can bear so much, what will not those bear, that are less able to deliver themselves? The words of this Great and prettily Moderate Cardinal in a Moderate Kingdom, in a publick Writing against a Protestant Learned King (King James) pag. 453. (as cited by A. Bishop Usher of Babylon, pag. 163. is fit to be written on the Doors of all Princes, and of the Pope himself, in Capital Letters; viz. "By this Article (that Kings may not be deposed by the Pope) We are cast headlong into a manifest Heresie, as binding us to confess, that for many Ages past the Catholic Church has been banished out of the whole World: For if the Champions of the Doctrine contrary to this Article do hold an impossi and detestable opinion contrary to God's Word, then doubtless the Pope for so many hundred years expired, has not been the Head of the Church, but a HERETICK and the ANTICHRIST.)"

What would you have more to satisfy Kings, than their own
own profession that, *Either the Pope may depose Kings, or else he is not the Head of the Church*, but an Heretick and Antichrist, and hath been so for many hundred years. Can you shew their Interest plainlier than all this?

And last any say, that this is but the Doctor of the Jesuits, remember that Perron was another kind of man, and the famous Perverter of King Henry the fourth. And I will cite here the words of one more of a multitude, even one that wrote so long ago, as to be numbred with the Fathers in Biblioth. Patr. To. 4. p. 913. and a Roman Cardinal Bertrand Card. & Epif. Eduens. de Orig. & utrius juris. Q. 4. [Respondendo & dico: quod Potius Spiritualis debet dominari omni humana Creatura per rationes Hostenfis—Item quia Jesus Christus filius Dei dum fuit in hoc mundo, & etiam ab aeterno naturalis dominus fuit, & de jure naturali in Imperatores & quoscumque alios depositionis sententias ferre potuisse, & damnationis, & quoscumque alius: Utpote in personis quas creaverat, & donis naturalibus & gratuito donaverat, & etiam conservabat. Et eadem ratione etiam ejus Vicarius potest. Nam non videtur discretus Dominus fuije (ut cum reverentia ejus loquar) nisi unicum post se talem Vicarium reliquisset, qui hac omnia poffet. Fuit autem iste Vicarius ejus Petrus apud Matheum: Et idem descendit de successoribus Petri, cum eadem absurditas sequeretur, si post mortem Petri humanam naturam ad creatam sine regimine unius personae reliquisset.]

I will English it left the unlearned believe not what Fathers, what a Biblioth. Patrum, what Cardinals, and what Doctorines the Roman Clergy obtrude upon the Christian world.

[ I answer and say, that the Spiritual Power ought to have domination over every humane creature, by Hostiensis reasons—Also because Jesus Christ the Son of God while he was in this world, and also from Eternity, was the Natural Lord: and by Natural Right, could pass the sentence of Deposition and of Damnation, and any other, upon Emperours and upon any others; as being persons that he had created and endowed with Natural Gifts, and freely, and also preserved: And by the same reason his Vicar can do it: For the Lord seemeth not
not to have been discreet (that I may speak with reverence to him) unless he had left behind him one such Vicar, who could do all these things. And in Matthew this his Vicar was Peter: And the same must be said of the successors of Peter, seeing the same absurdity would follow, if after the death of Peter he had left humane nature created by himself, without the Regiment of One person.

Do you think this is not plain dealing enough, if men are willing to understand?

I know that there were Emperours and Princes that struggled hard, before they suffered themselves to be thus subject; And these Emperours had Lawyers, State-men and Divines that took their parts; as all the Treatises in Goldastus his three Volumes de Monarch. and his Imp. Constít. shew. But still those that sided with the Pope spake contrary, as the argumentations of those Books besides the Authors whom they oppose, do shew. And, alas, Oeccham, and Marsilius Patavinus, and Widdrington and Barclay came all too late. For all that Secular Power which was cloaked with the name of Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, was before so deeply rooted in the Papacy, that they durst plead for no more, than that Princes are not subject to the Pope in Temporals: But as you truly note, abundance of Temporals, and of the Magistrates proper work about things Ecclesiastical, was still vailed under the name of Spiritual: And at last, even the Temporal Power again claimed more subtilly, and indirectly, as in ordine ad spiritualia.

But you'll say, that All men are naturally so regardful of their own Interest, and especially Princes, that it is not possible they should be so servile, tame and self-abasing, as to give away
away so great a part of their Kingdoms to a Forreigner, yea, to one that claimeth all, (by himself, or by his most famous Writers) and by his Councils claimeth a power to depose them; They that with their own Nobles and other Subjects, are so jealous of their Prerogatives, would never so far depose themselves, if they did but know what they do: And therefore when Popish Princes understand the matter, they will shake off the yoke, and reassert their right.

Answ. It's true, that Protestant Princes and States have done so; And the true meaning of our Oath of Supremacy is the same with your main desig: And though some have stumbled at those words, that the King is Supream Governor in all Causes Ecclesiastical, the meaning is only (as hath been oft publickly declared) that he is the Supream Civil or Coactive Governor by the Sword, in all Causes Ecclesiastical, so far as they fall under that Coactive or Coercive Government. And hereby the King doth but reassert the Royal Power over the Clergy and the affairs of Religion, which the Pope had usurped under the name of Ecclesiastical. For its well known, what was called Ecclesiastical Power in England in the times of Popery: so that this much of the Vail is removed long ago among all Protestants. And if you peruse but Bishop Bilsions excellent Tract of Christian Subjection, and Bishop Andrews his Tortura Torti (to pass by all others) you will see that this Case is better opened, than I for my part am able to open it. And it is seldom heard of (for all the industry and subtilty of Rome) that any Prince or State doth Voluntarily turn Papist, that is once delivered from the Yoke, and that ever again parteth with his power when he hath recovered it.

But yet that even this Argument from Notorious Interest, doth not recover the Liberty of Countreys subject to the Pope, you will the less wonder, if you consider these three things.

1. That the Papal Interest hath got such rooting in their Subjects minds, that it is not in their power to reassert their right. The Clergy are so numerous, subtile, ubiquitaiy and potent, and the people so commonly deceived, and so tenacious of ancient Customs, that to make this Change,
Change, might cast all into a flame: And they think it better to lose part, than all. And no doubt but the examples of Henry the third, and Henry the fourth of France, make some think, that if they displease the Pope and his Confederates, they have not sufficient security for their lives.

2. And Princes stand usually on such terms of danger or jealousy from one another, that they are fain to keep such a Peace at home, lest they expose themselves to a greater mischief from abroad. And they are broken by the Papal subtlety, especially in Germany and Italy, into such Fractions, and petty Principalities, that few of them are strong enough to defend themselves against the Confederates of the Pope (when potent Emperours heretofore could not do it.) And many of them, especially the House of Austria, do take this Copartnership of the Pope, to be a great part of their strength: And as anciently many Emperours were forced to choose their Gesars and Copartners, when the defence of the Empire was too hard for themselves alone; so divers Princes are glad to make use of the Papal interest and power for their own security; though upon terms that else would never be submitted to.

And in some Countreys the Rebellious disposition of the Subjects driveth them to accept of this dear remedy; and they choose rather to strengthen themselves by a Copartner, than to stoop to the wills of their inferiors.

For here you must take notice, that the pretence of a Jus divinum and of Spirituality, and the Interest of Christ, and of the safety of their souls, doth make this kind of servitude much less dishonourable, than it is to be overtopped by a neighbour Prince, or to be curbed by their subjects. For what dishonour is it for a man to be subject to his Maker and Redeemer? Nay, what greater honour can there be? And the Roman Clergy have used themselves to Canonize those Princes that have been most zealous for their Grandure, and to raise the fame and praisies of such, as have raised that which they call the Church, that the very ambition of the Cargies Praisies, doth do much to tempt some to a tame acceptance of a Copartner, who pretendeth to be the Vicar of Christ: When this servitude goeth for
lanctity, and carrieth not with it the reproach of other sorts of servitude.

3. And it greatly furthereth their success, that the Popes Agents are commonly bred up in Learning, and so are made able to over-wit the Laity; And that it is their great design, to gratifie the Lusts of Princes, by indulging their voluptuous sensual lives, that so they may spend their days in such things, as will never advance their understandings to an ability to discern the cheats of their Copartners: And they detestably cherish the Ignorance of the Common Laity, that they may be the fitter to be led and mastered by them; even as men keep women from Learning and great attainments, lest they should be the more incapable of subjection. And thus as Satan leadeth men to Hell, so the Papal Usurper bringeth the Laity into their power, by their own consent, by such pleasing baits, as make their servitude easie to them. And it is not your telling them of their interest, that will prevail against all these temptations. They that will lose Heaven, and their salvation by such cheats, may lose half of their earthly Dominions by them, as long as the other half sufficeth to satisfy their concupiscence, and to maintain their honour and pleasure in the world.

The Roman Usurpation consisteth of two parts. 1. The Usurpation of such a Pastoral Power as they have no right to. 2. The Usurpation of a great part of the Magistrates power, sometime directly, and sometimes indirectly in ordine ad spiritualia; and constantly by the cheat of the false name of Church power, put upon the Magistrates part of Church Government, as if it were the Clergies part.

1. The Usurpation of a Pastoral power which belongeth not to them, is the chief part of their Iniquity. And it consisteth in these, among other particulars.

1. In the impious, and arrogant claim of an Universal Pastorship over all the world. The Roman Prelate must be the Teacher of all the world, the High Priest of all the world, and the Spiritual Ruler of all the world; which because he cannot do by himself, he must do by others, as far as he can to uphold his usurpation. He must be the Law-
giver and the Judge of all the world, even at the Anti-
podes, and where he hath no acquaintance nor access.

2. By this he undertaketh to be a Bishop in other mens
Diocesies, and to rule in all matters, where he hath no
more power, than any Pastor hath in another Pastoral
Charge.

3. And by this he undertaketh to be the Spiritual Father
and Governour of all the Kings and Rulers of the Christiian
world, and so to have the power of excommunicating
them when he thinketh there is cause, and to brand them
as uncapable of Christiian communion with their own Sub-
jects; or with any other Christiians.

4. By this he usurpeth authority of imposing what Pa-
stors he please (even such as will carry on his interest) up-
on all the Churches in the world, and depriving both Princes
and people of their just liberty of choice.

5. By this also he usurpeth the power of deposing what
Bishops or Pastors he please, and depriving the people of
their necessary helps, and faithfuller Teachers. Yea, of
putting whole Nations under Interdicts of serving and ho-
nouring God in Church-assemblys; commanding all Pa-
stors to shut up the Church-doors, and forbidding them to
perform their office, and to preach Christ's Gospel, or admi-
nister his holy Sacraments.

6. By this he sendeth forth his Missiories, and setteth
up Societies of Jefuits and Fryers to do his work, and com-
mmandeth all Princes and people to receive and counte-
nance them.

7. By this he layeth claim to a right of maintenance for
Himself and his Missiories in all parts of the world, in the
name of Christ, whom hath said, that the labourer is worthy
of his hire.

8. By this he granteth Dispensations, Pardons, Indul-
gences, commandeth praying to Saints and Angels, and
praying for the Dead, as being in Purgatory, and by this
he setteth up his whole new frame of self-devised Worship
and Religion. Now I call not all this an Usurpation of
Magistracy, so far as he useth no Corporal force, and
threatneth no penalty but excommunication and damna-
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tion. For every true Pastor with his own flock hath the Power of Guiding them by delivering Christ's Doctrine and Precepts, and commanding obedience as his Servant or Embassador in his Name, and of denouncing his judgements, and of judging obligingly who are fit to be taken in to the Church by Baptism, and who to be cast out as Impenitent by excommunication in his own particular Charge or Society. And if the Pope usurp a power of doing all this and more, as an Universal Pastor only, this is an Usurpation of a Church Power, and not of a Magistracy. And indeed if you will acquit him from the guilt of the Mysterie of Iniquity any further than he invadeth Magistracy itself, you will do him a great deal of wrong: For he is the Vicarius Christi, and the Vice-Chrift more notably by his Spiritual Usurpation of a power proper to Christ himself, or at least of a power that Christ never gave him.

II. His setting up a KINGDOM, and invading the MAGISTRACY is done I. Directly, II. Indirectly and Consequentially.

I. Directly; 1. By holding a Secular Jurisdiction, as the King of Rome, where he exerciseth the Supream Civil Power, acknowledging no Superior Civil Governour; either as to the Legislation or Execution, in all the parts of his own Dominions.

2. By his laying claim to many Kingdoms as his own (among which England is one, as pretended to be delivered to him by King John) and supposing that the Kings do hold them as under him, and by his Grant.

3. By laying claim to the Temporal or Corporal Government of all the world (say some) or of all the Christian world (say others): Of which you may see a multitude of Volumes written in the defence of his pretensions: In particular all those aforesaid were of this subject, which all Goldfasus his Collected Treatises, for the Right of Princes do confute. I gave you Cardinal Bertrands words before.

And though some of their Clergy who live under Princes that are not willing to resign their Crowns, do disclaim the
the Popes direct Title to the Universal Civil Sovereignty, yet he himself disclaimeth it not, nor condemneth the Books as such, that have been written to defend it.

In the Jesuits Morals the last Chapter hath this Title [That the Jesuits teach, that the Church cannot command spiritual and internal actions; That its Laws and guidance are humane, and that it is its only a Political Body] Where the Jansenist chargeth them with destroying the Church from its foundation, and making it altogether external, humane and Politick; and that which needeth only Politick Virtues for its Government, and the exercise of its principal offices, and that they make its Laws but humane and politick, which oblige only to things external: and chargeth them as Cyprian did the Novatians, Quod Ecclesiam humanam faciant] So that if he accuse them justly, here is no room for any subterfuge: It is not the Spiritual and Temporal power that he makes them claim, but the Temporal or External only: But what doth the Jansenist himself therefore disclaim all Temporal Power in the Church, or is he just to Kings? Judge but by pag. 388. where he boasteth of Layman's Confession of the Truth, that [Ecclesiastic power is instituted immediately from God, and the Civil power comes immediately from men: And that Civil power regards properly and directly wealth and peace temporal only:] And he adds [For the Civil power regards the outward order and Civil tranquility alone; and prescribes none but outward and humane means to attain this end.] Which is all false, and most injurious to Kings; whom this moderate Jansenist would hereby set as far below every Priest, in real dignity and amiableness to the Subjects as a Humane Creature is below a Divine, and the interest of the body is below that of the soul. Whereas indeed God is the im-
mediate Original of Civil and Church power, though in both the Persons are designed by the means of men. And both have God himself for their ultimate end, and the Common Good of the Society for their Common End; which ever consisteth most in spiritual felicity, referring to Eternal. Though the Magistrates weapon be the Sword, and the Pastors only the Word, by which all this is brought to pass.

Indeed
Indeed it is not possible that the Papacy in its present State can be defended by any man how moderate soever, without Injury to Princes and States, whose Power the Pope hath so notoriously invaded and usurped: For how can they defend him, that usurpeth the Power of Kings, or usurpeth a false Power over Kings, and not be injurious to them that the Usurper injureth?

But it is most wonderful to me, that when W. Barclay defendeth the right of Monarchs in such a Kingdom as France that hath power and will to hold fast its own, he should complain as if he undertook a Cause which most were against him in, and in which he expected to be wondered at for his singularity.

4. By their Inquisition, and by their Decreeing Corporal Penalties in their Councils, and Decreeing the deposition of Princes, and the giving away their Dominions to others, as in the two fore-cited Councils, Roman. sub. Greg. 7. & Lateran. sub Innoc. 3. In a word, by all that they do in their Usurped Legislation, Judgement and Execution, by the Sword, or a forcing Power as in themselves.

II. But the more successful Usurpation of the Power and Rights of Princes is Indirectly, and as Bellarmin defendeth it, in ordine ad spiritualia; By using their Ecclesiastical Usurped power upon mens Consciences, in such a way as shall overtop the Magistrates power of the Sword: when they decree that all are Hereticks that believe their senses, and deny Transubstantiation, and that all such Hereticks shall be banished or burnt; the Clergy is not to do this themselves, but to deliver them over to the Secular Power: The Pope and Clergy do but charge it on their Consciences in the name of Christ. And if Princes obey them not, or Temporal Lords will not burn or banish all such Hereticks for believing sense, the Pope is not to touch their bodies, but to excommunicate them. And if they will not yet obey the Pope, when they are excommunicate, the Pope, Good man, will not draw a Sword against them, but only use the Spiritual Sword, by giving their Dominions to others, which is but by word of mouth; he doth but declare such a Temporal Lord to be dispossess of his Title, and require another
another to take his Lands, and let his great Divines publish that an Excommunicate King is no King, and that to kill him, is not to kill a King: And if Princes will defend themselves by Arms, the Pope will not send his Clergy in Arms against them, but only by the Spiritual Sword, or Word, command other Princes, States and people to arm themselves against their Emperours, Kings and Governours, and to defend those to whom he hath given their Dominions. How oft these Games have been seriously acted, the German Histories lamentably tell us: and Guicciardines Italian, and the English, French and others are not wholly silent.

So if the Clergy be exempt from paying Taxes, from Secular Judgements, if their Lands and Estates be not under the Power of Kings, if they set up Courts of Judicature with Offices like a Civil Court, if they assume to themselves the sole judgement of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and Apostates, and also of Testaments of the dead, and of Causes of Adultery and Fornication, of lawful or unlawful degrees of Marriage, and of Divorce, if the Pope lay Taxes on the Clergy that are Subjects in all Princes Dominions, if he dispose of Buildings, Tythes, Glebes, Monasteries, Lands, Almshouses, Colledges, and abundance such like; all this is not by the Sword, but by perswading Kings and States that they are bound in Conscience to promote all this, and obey the Pope as their Ghostly Father herein: And that if they be stricken with the Thunderbolt of Excommunication, they are in a state of damnation, and if they so dye, are undone for ever: And by perswading other Princes and people, that the Arms taken up against such Princes at the Popes Command (according to the foresaid Councils) are meritorious, and shall procure their salvation.

And if Princes and people will believe all this, and will be deceived, and will voluntarily subject themselves to such an Usurper, who can help it? Though it excuse not the Pope, yet they have little reason to complain, that they lose that power which they voluntarily give away, and that the Pope shall exercise that power which they give
give him. And so much to your Cause against the Pa-
pacy.

II. But in your Epistle to Mr. Areskin and several others, you lay much of the like charge upon the Reformed Churches, and you take our great Reforming Divines, to have kept up the Mysterie or Iniquity in their Discipline. Concerning which give me leave to deal freely with you, and to tell you, that I am perswaded that your meaning is sincere and good, and that it is an usurpation or devised imitation of Secular Government by the Clergy which you condemn; and that too great a part of the Protestant Clergy have given you some occasion for these complaints: But that really you deal not accurately in the Controversie, and Accurateness is the thing you want. You do not here exactly describe the true difference between the several powers where you seem to describe them; you leave out much that should be said. It is a more distinct way of handling this point, that must decide the Controversie. To which end I have laid you down an hundred Propositions, on occasion of your former Writings sent me.

And as you say in Epist. ad D. Russellum, p. 248. that in this you would believe one Physicion, one Code, Goddard, Lower, Ridgley, &c. (Though I have reason to think that the first and last of these are more of my mind about Church Government than of yours) before a thousand Augustines, Hieroms, Gregories, yea, Jewells, Davenant, Uphers, Daleses; so my opinion is, that usually all men are wiser in their own Profession. And though I am naturally somewhat unapt to take more than needs I must upon trust from any (since I have had great experience of humane ignorance and vanity,) yet I had rather take a Physicians judgement in Physick, and a Lawyers in points of Law, and a Souldiers in Military matters, and a Divines in Theology, than any of their judgements about the matters of an aliene Profession. Not but that now and then a man may arise, that shall know more on the by, than others that make it the study of their lives: But that is not usual. And that one man would have been yet wiser, in those things if he had been of that Profession. For
For surely ceteris paribus, he that bestoweth twenty years, or thirty, or forty, or three score in the Study of Divinity alone, with its subservient helps, is liker to understand it, than he that alloweth it, but now and then a spare hour, in the midst of other diverting Studies. For my part, if I follow not one thing only when I am upon it, but divide my thoughts among things heterogeneal, I cannot pierce deep into any great difficulties, nor make any thing of distracted Studies; neque quicquam recte fit, quod fit praoccupato animo. God doth not use to give wisdom now by the way of Miracles; but they that seek most, are likeliest to find. And therefore pardon me for telling you, that though I am deservedly a great honourer of the Physicions you name, yet I see more by the Judgement of one Usher, one Davenant, one Jewell, one Dalleus, one Blondel, one Camero, one Le Blank, one Petrus Molineus in matters of Theology, than of abundance of Lawyers and Physicions. And of one Lawyer and Physicon in matters of their Profession, than of many Divines. Being still of Pembles mind, that one clear eye can see further than a Council of purblind ones.

And as to the matter of Partiality of which you suspect Divines, it is not without cause as to all that party who seek for Riches, Ease and Honours, or Domination and Preferments and Prebeminency in the world: But such as that St. Martin whom you mention out of Severus, who so vehemently opposed the Ithacian Violence, * and Maximus his using the Sword against the Priscillianists are as impartial as you. Certainly if Christianity be what we all profess to take it for, it will make that man best who is most a Christian: And he that is best will be most impartially and self-denyingly faithful to Christ, and will prefer Christ's honour incomparably before his own. And he is like to be most a Christian, who doth sincerely give up himself to the closest study of it all his days. Deny this, and your suspicions will fall upon Christianity itself.

But yet I will allow you to be moderately suspicious.
where you see that there is any great bait of carnal interest to tempt men: A Popedome, a Cardinalship, (I must name no more) may make the Roman Heathen say, I will turn Christian, if you will make me Bishop of Rome, &c. But will you suspect that a good man, yea, and all such good men, should be partial where they put themselves on the greatest self-denial? Where they have no profit, no preferment, no man-pleasing, no worldly honour to invite them? Yea, where it is like to diminish their gain, to hinder them from preferment, to make them hated by most on whom their discipline is exercised? If a few out of a pang of Factions or Phanatick zeal, may cast themselves on such a self-denying life, it is not like that this will be the ordinary case, of learned, sober, godly men. If it be, with whom shall the ignorant trust the conduct of their souls, that will not make merchandize of them? Would you be partial and false to the Truth of Christ your self, if you were the Pastor of a Church? Is the Office so malignant to infect all that undertake it? If it be, how can our Religion be good? If not, why should you think that others will not be as just and impartial as you would be? Do you consider what excellent persons in all respects for Wisdom, and Piety, and Integrity, were Melancthon, Bucholtzer, Sobnius, Kimedontius, Olevian, Ursinus, Zanchius, Parens, and those English men you named, and many hundreds more; who more unlikely through Ignorance or partiality to betray the truth?

But they say, that Interest will not lye. Do you not know that an able Preacher, may better by many degrees consult his own Ease, his Profit, and his worldly honours by Preaching only, than by this troublesome ungrateful work of Discipline? I am confident that you and I do take one another for true plain dealing honest men, and therefore can believe each other. And if you will believe me, I did, in my Pastoral Charge (in those times when I was thought tolerable in the Sacred Office) for about ten years (of the twenty that I had leave to preach) exercise some Discipline upon some particular offenders, according to the common judgement of Protestant Divines; And it was
was so much to my labour, to my expence of time, to the grievous displeasure of those that fell under it, and required so much self-denial, that when I consulted with flesh and blood, if I might but have forbore it, and only preached, and given the Sacraments to all that came, I should have thought my self so greatly disburdened, as would have made my life to be sensually pleasanter: so that, though I had not any maintenance of my own, I think I could gladly have given up all that I received for my Ministry, and made what other shift I could for food and raiment, so I might but have been freed from the trouble of this particular Discipline: I speak only what it was to flesh and blood, and not what it was to faith, which faith God cannot be served too dearly. Till I speak this to one that hath tried the thing I talk of, I shall take it for granted, that my words are not half understood.

If you say, Why then did you not forbear a work so ungrateful? I now only answer, Why doth not the Judge and Sheriff forbear hanging Murderers and Thieves: The rest of my Answer you shall have anon.

Though my following Propositions seem full enough in opening the difference between the two Powers; yet I will here also briefly tell you, 1. Somewhat of the nature of Church Power: 2. Somewhat of the certain Truth that Jesus Christ did institute it: 3. Somewhat of the Necessity of it sub ratione medii ad finem.

1. For the first, take these few things together, and you may clearly see what power we claim.

1. Our Office for the Original of it, is as immediately from Christ as that of Magistrates, and is not made by Kings or any Monarchs. Therefore we hold it as immediately from Christ.

2. For the Matter of it, it is only to expound and apply the Word of God, both commonly in Sermons, and particularly to each man's several Case, as Physicians look to the Cure of individuals: And also to exercise the Keys of the Church or Kingdom of Christ; that is, 1. To be the ordinary Judges who is to be taken in by Baptism; 2. And also who is to be publickly admonished as scanda-
lous, in our particular Charge: 3. And also who is to be absolved as penitent: 4. And who is to be declared unmeet for Church-communion, as obstinately penitent, and to be forbidden Communion with the Church, and the Church with him, and consequently denied the privileges of the Church, and signs of Communion in the Lords Supper, which it belongeth to the Pastor to deliver only to the capable, and by the peoples familiarity and brotherly Society, which they are obliged to deny them. And this Sentence of the Pastor, if it should proceed on mistake, doth not make the mans Case the worse before God; but yet (till the Church have sought its due remedy against mistaking Pastors) it remaineth so far valid, as that none against it may obtrude himself on the Communion of that Church. For, I pray you tell me, if Plato, or Zeno mistake in their judgement of a Disciple whom they refuse, or any Free Schoolmaster in judging of the incapacity of a Scholar, shall others so misjudged intrude into their Schools, and make themselves their Scholars against their wills? Or shall he whom by mis-information you refuse or reject from your family or service, become your household servant in despight of you?

3. And as to the Instruments and manner of exercising our Office, we professedly disclaim all pretensions to any power of the Sword, or of corporal penalty, that is coactive or coercive. You confess this once your self. We claim no power but by the Word, either generally preached, or particularly applied to the case of those that are of our charge. No other power of Excommunication do we claim: If men will despise our Ministerial instructions, reproofs and censures, we have done with them. Shall they force themselves into our familiarity or communion in spight of us? Your Epist. 54. ad Mettagerium openeth the matter so fairly, that we little differ from it. If you say that Presbyterians and Episcopal set up Courts, Judicatures, with Officers like Civil Courts: I answer, 1. The more pomp and likeness to the Magistrates coercive way, the worse I like it. 2. But how shall men be heard, if they be not cited? How shall such things be Justly and Regularly,
Jarlv tran faded, if there be not a known Time and Place, and if Accusers and Witnesses be not summoned? Are not such regular proceedings necessary even in Cases of meer arbitration? If this be all, here is no more Sword, no more force, than in a Pulpit. And how doth Excommunication (that is, declaring an Impenitent person unfit for Church Communion by Christ's Laws, and binding him over to the great day) I say how doth this touch mens bodies or estates, or work any otherwise than a Pulpit-Sermon on the conscientious Volunteers? 3. And if horning, or Writs de Excommunizato Capiendo, or imprisonment, or burning men as Hereticks follow this, all this is the Magistrates own doing? If it be well, praise him for it. If it be ill, blame him for it. If Rulers will make such Laws, and if they will so far be Executioners of the Clergies Decrees, who can hinder them? If it be against their right, it is their own act, who give so much of their right away. If you say, that Clergy men are too blame that urge them to it; you shall not easily think worse of their so doing, than I do: It is greatly against our wills that the Sword so closely followeth Excommunication. I think it is the effect of Carnal Clergy mens base conceit of their own Sacred Office, as if it were a Leadenn unpowerful Sword which Christ hath put into their hands, and Excommunication were invalid, when the Sword forceth not the impenitent to dissemble Repentance and Submission. When great worldly baits have enticed worldly men into the Sacred Office, as to a worldly preferment and Trade, they will judge accordingly and manage it like themselves (which is and hath been the Churches Pelt) We would beg on our knees of Kings and Magistrates, if it would prevail, to leave Church Censures to our Lords intended use; and valeanti quantum valere possint; and to keep their Sword out of Church-mens hands, and to punish men in their own Courts for every crime that deserveth it; but not quatenus excommunicate, or meerly because the Clergy hath judged them unmeet for Church Communion. He that taketh Excommunication alone for no punishment, is not fit to be in the Communion of the Church, and therefore
therefore should not be driven for fear of a Prison to that which he hath no right to. So that you must not charge the acts of Princes, nor of ambitious Cardinals, &c. neither on Calvin, Beza, or any such as them.

And as to Lay-Elders, or Lay-Chancellors, I am no more for them than you are; that is, as the Magistrates Officers, or as the Churches Sub-Officers *circa sacra & non in sacris*: But sure those of them who are introduced on a mistaken conceit of *Divine right*, and do no more than the Pastors do, are no Usurpers of Coercive power.

You see by the late Acts of King and Parliament in *Scotland*, that all External Church power is declared to be in the King: And what would you have more? No doubt the meaning is not, *All power about external things*: For the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lords Supper, and the persons baptized, &c. are external objects: Nor can it be all power that is exercised by the external parts of the body. For the Tongue of the Preacher, and the Hand of the Baptizer, as well as the Ear of the Hearer is an external part. But in these two senses it is true, and commonly consented to, by all that I remember of my acquaintance that are Christians. 1. That all the power of the *Sword*, or of forcing by Mails or bodily punishments, as distinct from the power of the Word, that worketh directly upon the Soul alone (by the senses) is in the King, and not in any of the Clergy, though it be about the matters of Religion. 2. And that all power in Church matters and Religion, *Extrinseca to the Pastoral Office* as instituted by Christ, is of right the Kings, and his inferior Magistrates. And what would you or any man have more?

4. And as to the exercise of our Office, we all confess (except the Papists) that we are responsible to the King and Magistrates, for our faults, yea, for our injurious mal-administration. And that though the King be not the Chief Pastor, nor hath the power of the Keys which Christ gave to his Ministers, yet he is the Ruler of all Churches and Pastors by the Sword, as well as of all Physicians. And is not all this enough to satisfy you, that we claim no part of the Magistrates Office?
As you say, our power is but Persuasive. It is but, by the Word; it is but on the Conscience; it is under the Magistrates coercive Government: and so it is like a Physicians or a Tutors in a Colledge. But that I pray you leave not out 1. That it is not under the Magistrates, as to the derivation of the office or power, that is, it is no office which the Magistrate made or may unmake: 2. That it is as immediately of Divine Institution as the Magistrates. And therefore in your similitude you must suppose your Physician and Tutor to have a Commission from God. 3. That God hath described our office, and limited the Magistrates office, so that he hath no power from God to hinder the Ministry. 4. But if he do it injuriously we must not resist, but patiently suffer for obeying God. So much of the nature of the office.

II. Now that it is certain that God hath committed to Pastors, such a Government of his Church by the Word, as to stated commissioned Officers, because I have past by the proofs in my following Propositions, I will add some here. Supposing what Dr. Hammond hath said of the Power of the Keyes, and that no man with common sense can take the Power of the Keyes, for any thing less than a power of Church Government, or Authoritative Guidance, and so a Power of receiving in and putting out as there is cause; it is plain in that Christ first reciteth his own Commission and Power, Matth. 28. 18, 19, 20. and thence dateth the Commission of his Apostles, as it was to endure to the end of the age or world.


And nothing less can be meant by 1 Tim. 5. 17. The Elders that Rule well are worthy of double honour, &c. Heb. 13. 17. 24. Obey them that have the Rule over you, for they watch, &c. 1 Thess. 5. 12, 13. Know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, 1 Tim. 5. 1, 4, 5. If a man desire the office of a Bishop, let him desireth
a good work——One that Ruleth well his own house, hav-
ing his children in subjection——For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God. So Tit. 1. 7, &c. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. Many other I pass by.

And for the act of excommunication, or excluding un-
meet persons from Christian Church Communion, it would
be tedious to stand to vindicate all those plain Texts from
any mens exceptions, 1 Cor. 5. per totum. Titus 3. 10. 2 John
10, 11. 2 Thess. 3. 6, 14. Rev. 2. 14, 15, 20.

But while I am writing this, I remember that I have long
ago written a small Book called Universal Concord, in which
I have described all the Pastoral Office and Work: If you can
prove it less than I have there named in any one point,
you will so far ease us, and take nothing from us at all
that gratifieth our flesh: If you can deny none of that, we
are agreed. And in the Preface to the same Book I have
given you twelve Reasons of the great use of Church Dis-
cipline; which shall save me the labour of the third point
which I intended next to speak to; save only that I will
briefly ask you,

III. Would you have any difference made between the
Christian Church and the Pagan and Infidel world? If not
——If you would, it must be such a difference as Christ
hath appointed us to make? And doth our Baptismal Coven-
ant contain no promise and profession of godliness and
obedience, as well as of Belief; and so of Repentance and
a better life?

2. Who would you have to be Judge in this matter?
Shall every one be Judge himself? Then all Pagans, Murde-
rers, Blasphemers may come in and turn Religion and the
Church into a scorn. If any must judge, you would not
sure set the Magistrates or people such a task (on pain of
damnation) to leave their Calling, to try and judge of the
qualifications of expectants or Church-members.

3. Whom do you think Christ committed this business to?
Who were the Judges of the Capacity of persons to be bap-
tized, or the desert of persons to be rejected? Diotrophes
could not have rejected Christians injuriously, if he had not
4. Hath not all Christ's Church exercised such a Discipline as I have described since the Apostles days till now? (saving the corruption of it by ill additions, or carnal negleets) And hath all this Church been from the beginning under a false Government in the main? Or is not Reformation a righter way than extirpation, of Discipline as well as of Doctrine and Worship?

5. Is it not the wickedness of Christians that is the chief hardening of Turks and other Infidels against Christianity? And would they not encrease this pollution that would have the most vicious to be equally receiv'd with the best?

6. Is not Faith for Holiness, and did not Christ come to purifie a peculiar people, and restore us to the Image of God? And if for want of Discipline Saints and Swine be equally Church-members, and partakers of holy things, is that agreeable to this design of our Redeemer?

7. If Economical Government and School Government and Colledge Government be no wrong to Kings, neither is the Church Government which Christ hath instituted.

I do not say all this to intimate that you say the contrary. But because your Charge on Luther, Calvin and other Protestants sheweth that you do sure mistake them: And to tell you that I joyn with you in disowning the KINGDOM and Magistracy of the Mock-Church of Rome; and of all that will imitate them; But that I take the Enmity to and grosse negleet of true Church-Discipline, to be one of Satans principal services that is done him upon earth, against true Godliness.
The Churches and the Magistrates
Power stated in matters of Religion; In
an hundred Propositions, which almost all sober Protestant Teachers are agreed in.

A Reconciliation of the sober Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independents and Erastians.

To my very Learned, sincere and worthy Friend Ludovicus Molinaeus Dr. of Physick (The Author of many Treatises on this subject.)

Dear Sir,

Upon the perusal of your Writings which you sent me, the love of the Church, and of Truth and Peace and you, doth command me to tell you as followeth;

1. That I make no question, but that the Pride of the Clergy (with their Covetousness) hath for above twelve hundred years been a greater plague to the Churches throughout the Christian world, than all the cruelties of the Laity: And that the senseless forgetting the matter and manner of Christ's decision of his Apostles Controversie, Which of them should be the greatest, hath divided the East and West, and corrupted and kept down Religion; whilst that the lives of the Prelates have persuaded the observers, that they still took it for a more
more important Question, Which of them should be the greatest? than, Whether they or their people should be saved. And it hath ever been a matter of eafe remarque, that there have been seldom any dangerous Schisms on one side, or any cruel Persecutions on the other side, which the Clergy have not been the principal causes of: And that the Laity would be more quiet, if the Clergy did not delude them, or exasperate them; And that even the more mistaken and violent sort of Magistrates, would have some moderation in their Persecutions, if the Clergy did not make them believe, that a burning killing Zeal is the mark of a good Christian, and is the same that in Tit. 2. 14. is called a zeal of good works; and that to destroy the bodies of men truly fearing God, is the way to save their own souls, or their Dominions at last; when indeed, the zeal of Christ's commanding, is a zealous Love to one another, and a zealous doing good to others, and the Devil's zeal (as St. James distinguishes it, James 2. 15, 16, 17.) is an envious, hating, hurting zeal.

2. That in all this the Laity are not innocent, but must thank themselves for the evil that befalleth them; and that on two notable accounts: 1. Because they have ordinarily the choosing of the dignified and beneficed Churchmen, and they have but such as they choose themselves: They think it is their wisdom as well as piety, to make the Honour and Profit so great, as shall be a very strong bait to Pride and Covetousness: And when they have so done, the Proudest and most Covetous will certainly be the Seekers; and that with as much craft and diligence, as an ambitious mind can use their parts to: And he that seeketh (by himself and friends) is likeliest to find: And the more humble and heavenly any one is, and consequently most honest, and fit to be a Pastor of the Church, the further he will be from the Seekers way! So that except it be where the world hath Rulers so wise and strangely pious, as to seek out the worthy who seek not for themselves, its easy to prognosticate what kind of Pastors the Church will have: And verily they that choose them, are the unfittest to complain of them. Whereas if the Churches maintenance were such,
as might but prevent the discouragements of such as seek the Ministry for the work's sake and for the love of souls, that Students might not make it a Trade for wealth, but a self-denying dedication of themselves to God, the Churches would be accordingly provided; And they that intend the saving of souls, would be the Candidates, (by their own and their Parents dedication) as now they that intend a Trade to live and serve the flesh by (in an honourable way) are too great a part of them. Or men might be further rewarded ex post facto for their Merits, without being tempted to study principally for that reward. And if we will needs have carnal men, let us not wonder if they live carnally. And if the carnal mind be enmity to God, and neither is nor can be subject to his Law, Rom. 8. 6. 7. we may easily prognosticate how Christ's enemies will do his work, and guide his Church, and whether their wills and ways will be such as the conscienceable can conform to.

3. And the Laity are unexcusable, because it is they (in all those Countreys where Popery and Church-tyranny prevaileth) who put their Sword into the Clergies hands, and give away their own authority, and set up men to vie with them, and to overtop them: of which more anon.

3. I grant you also, that in all such Countreys as aforesaid (where Popery and Church-tyranny prevaileth) the name of Ecclesiastical Courts and Discipline, is applied to that mungrel power, which is neither Flesh nor Flesh; and that the true Spiritual Power set up by Christ, is corrupted and turned into a secular thing, or by confusion, a third sort arisen out of both. And that Popish Princes are wofully abused by this deceit: while that the reverence of the name of the Church and Church-Government, doth persuade them to ruine the Church indeed, and to set up their Subjects to be the Governours of themselves, and to give away their own power to their servants, and then to stoop to the power which they have given.

4. And I grant you, that all this mischief would much be cured, if Magistrates would keep the Sword to themselves, and use it only according to the judgement of their proper Courts; and would leave the Power of the Church Keyes
Keys to the Pastors, & valeant quantum valore possunt, and let it be thought penalty enough for an excommunicate person qua talis to be excommunicate: And not to take him to be a penitent, or worthy of the Communion of the Church, that had rather be there than in a Gaol. There be wiser ways of bringing men to Repentance and to the Communion of the Church, than by saying [Choose this or the Goal: You are worthy to be in the Church, if you had but rather be in it than in a Prison.] Christ said, [Forsake all, or ye cannot be my Disciples;] And some say, [Be Christ's Disciples, or for sake all: The Church will receive you, if you will but accept her communion rather than imprisonment or beggary.] A kind Church indeed! of which more anon.

5. But notwithstanding all these concessions, I must further tell you, that it is the Pastors of the Churches that must keep up the interest of Christianity in the world; and that as the bad ones are the greatest plagues, so the good ones are the greatest blessings of the earth: even the fair and lights of the world: And none but the enemies of Christ are their enemies, (as such.) And as the Ministry hath grown better or worse, so hath Christianity either risen or fallen, in all times and places of the Church on earth. (Of which see Two Sheets which I have written for the Ministry, against the Seekers and Malignants long ago.)

6. And though the Carnal Clergy afore described, deserve all the invectives in your Books, and their Usurpations, and turning Church Discipline into a secular thing, do call aloud for a just detection and rebuke, and it would be the happiness of the world, if the eyes of all Christian Princes and Rulers, were opened in this point; yet I must tell you, that I believe most sober, pious Protestant Divines are really agreed in the main things that you desire and intend; And that both you and some of your adversaries both do amiss, to make the difference seem wider than indeed it is: And that making Verbal differences seem real, and small ones seem great, is an ill employment; when a few definitions and clearer explications, would make both sides
sides see, that they are almost of one mind.

Therefore all that I shall do in this business is, to lay down my own judgement, and I think the judgement of all the pious and sober part, of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independents and Eratians (or Politicians) in certain brief Propositions, which shall carry their own evidence past all contradiction of Learned and Considerate Christians.

**Prop. 1.**


3. It was instituted for great and necessary ends, that the Ministry might be Christ's Agents, Messengers, Stewards, &c. for the furthering the affairs of his Spiritual Kingdom, and mens salvation in the world, *1 Cor.* 4. 1, 2. *1 Tim.* 3. 1, 2, 3, &c. *Acts* 20. 28. *1 Thess.* 5. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 17.

4. It was first put into the hands of Apostles chosen by Christ himself; who were to be the Gatherers, Edifiers and Guides of his Church, and to be its foundation built on Christ, and the transmitters of the Gospel, and a stated Ministry to the following Ages.

5. Though the extraordinary part of their work ceased with them, the ordinary part continueth after them, with a Ministry which is to continue to the end of the world *Eph.* 4. 11, &c.

6. This Office was in time before a Christian Magistrate, and must be the same where there is any such, and where there is none, *Matt.* 28. 20. *Eph.* 4. 12, 14, 16, &c.

7. It consisteth in an Authority conjunct with an Obligation to do their proper work.


9. It
9. It is essential to the Office to have all these in Divine Authority, but not in Exercise; nor in the Civil Liberty of exercising them (which may be hindered) Acts 5. 18, &c.

10. The Office is to be judged of by God's Institution, and not by the Ordainers wills intention, or contrary expressions; if the essence of the Office be delivered in general words.

11. Christ made these Officers the Key-bearers of his Churches, that is, the Rulers or Guides, who have authority under him over Church communion, to judge what members shall be taken in, and who shall be put out, Matt. 16. 19. Heb. 13. 17, 24. 1 Thess. 5. 12, 13.

12. The first and great act of this Key-bearing power (never denied them from Christ's time to this day) is the power of Baptizing and of judging who shall be admitted by Baptism into the Church or number of visible Christians, Matt. 28. 19, 20. Acts 2. 41. & 8. 12, 13, 38.

13. This power is not arbitrary but Ministerial, regulated by Christ's universal Laws; which describeth every man's Title to admittance; which is [his own (or Parents if an Infants) understanding, voluntary, serious Profession of Consent to the Baptistmal Covenant.] Acts 2. 38. & 8. 12. & 10. 47, 48. Mark 16. 16. Matt. 28. 20.

14. If one Minister refuse such Consenters, others must admit him: And if many should agree utterly to tyrannize, both Magistrates by just Laws may correct them, and the people desert them, for better Guides: 1 Kings 2. 27. 2 John 10, 11. Matt. 7. 15. & 16. 6.

15. The Churches Communion and Sacraments are not to be common to all the world. Otherwise the Church were no Church, as consisting of Heathens, Infidels and all, that would come even purposely to pollute and scorn the holy Mysteries, 1 Cor. 10. 16. 2 Cor. 6. 14. Acts 2. 47, &c.

16. It is necessary therefore that some men be the Judges who are fit, and who shall be admitted. Else there can be no difference. Of this see my Treatise of Confirmation.

17. Every man is not to be the sole publick Judge for himself: For then there would be still no difference, nor the Mysteries kept from common scorns.
18. The Magistrate is not made the first and proper Judge: For then he must make a Calling of it, and attend upon this very thing, to try the baptized and the admitted; which is no small work. For he that judgeth, must first try the Case, and that with the diligence which the weight of it requireth, Acts 8. 37.

19. The People are not to be the ordinary Judges: for else they must all leave their Callings to attend baptizings, and such works as these; and must do that which most of them are unfit to do: And Christ hath put all out of doubt, by putting the Keys into the Pastors hands, and commanding their study and attending to this work, and calling them the Rulers, Guides, Pastors, Fathers, Stewards, Overseers, &c. and commanding the people to obey them with submission; and telling (not the people or Magistrates) but the Pastors of the great and dreadful account that they must give, Heb. 13. 17. Matt. 24. 45, 46, 47. 1 Cor. 4. 1, 2. 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2. & 1 Tim. 4. 15, 16.

20. He that will lay this work upon people or Magistrates, is their cruel enemy; and brings on them a most heavy burden, and consequently makes it their duty to prepare and study for it, and to avoid all other business that hindereth it; and would lay them under the terrors of a most tremendous reckoning unto God.

21. Seeing it is a trust that must be committed to some or other, common reason tells us, that it is better in their hands that Christ hath put it in by Office, and who spend their lives in preparation for it, than in theirs that neither have the preparations nor the Office, 1 Cor. 9. 16. & 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. 1 Cor. 4. 1, 2.

22. It is the great end of Christ's coming into the world to destroy the works of the Devil, and to purifie to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, and to save his people from their sins, and to vindicate the Holiness of God: And the world is so apt to judge of Christ's doctrine by his followers, that the Holiness and Concord of Christians is one of Christ's great appointed means, for his own and his Fathers glory in the world: That as God's greatness thineth forth in the frame of nature, so might his Holiness in the Church:
Church: And the Enemies of Holiness are condemned by
their Creed, when they profess to believe the Holy Catholic Church, and the Communion of Saints. And Rome it self
dothing own the name and pretence of Holiness.

23. Travellers well know, that the great hinderance of
the Conversion of Infidels and Heathens, Turks, Persians,
Indians, Tartarians, &c. is the wicked lives of the professed Christians that are next them; when they see that
Christians are more false, and cruel, and drunken, and beastly, and divided, &c. than themselves.

24. Those therefore that would have the Church ly common (without Christ's Discipline) to all the most
prophane and wicked that will come in, and have communion with it, are indeed Antichristian, even open enemies
to the Church, to holiness, and to the saving of the Infidel
and Heathen world, 1 Cor. 5. 6, 11, 12, 13. 1 Pet. 2. 9,
Tit. 2. 14.

25. The Devil hath fought in all Ages as subtilly and diligently against the holy Discipline of Christ, as against the
Christian Doctrine.

26. True Discipline doth so wonderfully displease the
guilty, and lose men's love, and especially the Richer sort,
and all men's carnal interest and nature inclineth them so much to man-pleasing and flattery, that Ministers have
abundance more need to be driven to the exercize of Disci
pline, than restrained from it; except it be the corrupt
and carnal Discipline which the Popish and tyrannizing
Clergy do exercise, where the Magistrate himself upholdeth
them in Grandure, and lendeth them his Sword. Let Disci
pline be but such as Christ appointed, and stand of it self,
and then it is but few that will have any more cause, to be
restrained from it, than from too much preaching: Though
still I yield, that there must be limits for the wilful and
the indistreet, 1 Cor. 5. 3 John 9.

27. The true Discipline of Christ hath been acknowledged
to be his Ordinance, in all the Churches almost in the
world, since the Apostles dayes till now; save that (as you
open it) since Constantines time it hath been much cor
rupted by the mixture of the secular force, and the Em

perours
persuaded lending his Church-power to the Bishops and Councils.

28. Government hath two parts: Antecedent to mens facts, which is Legislation; and Consequent, which is Judgement and Execution. Christ is the only Lawgiver of Universal Laws to the universal Church; and the Author of his own Doctrine, and the Substantials of his Worship: But yet there are many undetermined circumstances, which may and must be antecedently determined, some by each Pastor; some by a consent of Pastors, and some by Magistrates (if they please). I will name you twenty lately named elsewhere; 1. What day (besides the Lords day) and what hour, the Church shall meet. 2. How long the Prayers, Reading and Sermons shall be. 3. When and how often publick Fasts and Thanksgivings be. 4. What place the Church shall meet in. 5. Of the Form, Ornaments, Seats, &c. of the Temples. 6. The place and form of the Pulpit. 7. The subject of the present Sermon, and the Chapter to be read. 8. The Method of the Sermon. 9. The Words of Sermons and Prayers. 10. Of using or not using Books and Sermon Notes for memory. 11. What Translation of Scripture to use. 12. And what Version and Measure of the Psalms. 13. And what Tune to sing in. 14. What form of Catechism to use. 15. Of decent Habits, especially in publick Worship. 16. By what professing sign to testify our consent to the Churches Confession of faith: Whether by speaking, or lifting up the hand, or standing up. 17. Of decent Gestures in the acts of publick Worship. 18. Of Font, Table, Cups, Cloathes, and other Utensils. 19. Making new Officers for these actions circa sacra, as Door-keepers, Clarks, Churchwardens, &c. 20. Judging when any private man shall speak in the Church, and when he shall be silent, and such other Orders necessary to peace and Edification, 1 Cor. 14. 28, 29. 33. 26, 40.

29. Most of these should be left to every Pastor's judgement; some may be determined by the Magistrate; but yet some are fittest for the Concordant determination of Consoiated Churches, in a Synod, or by consent. But none of them by any neighbour Pastor (that like the Pope) usurps...
eth authority over other Churches. Nor should any standing Laws at all, be made of such things where there is no need; especially where the case is mutable, and it belongeth to the Pastors function to determine it, as occasion serveth. 2 Tim. 2. 15. Mat. 24. 45.

30. Whether these Antecedent Determinations of Concordant Pastors in a Synod, shall be called Laws, or Canons, or Decrees, is but lis de nomine: And also whether this power be called Legislative, or Jurisdiction. And who will trouble the Church unnecessarily about words and names? But yet I think they may be best called Canons or Agreements: And I wish that high Titles be laid aside, left it encourage the usurping Spirit, that aspireth after too high things.

31. Grotius de Imperio summari um potestatum circa sacra hath said so much and so well of all this Controversie, that it is a shame to us all that we need any more, and a shame to me to trouble the world after him, with Writings on that subject, so far less useful, and to any one, to cloud that which he hath clearly and judiciously stated; were it not that renewed occasions require it.

32. Pastors have not only the charge of right ordering the Assemblies, but also of helping and overseeing all the individuals of their charge; And to help them in the personal application of the Scriptures to themselves, and to resolve their particular Doubts and Cases of Conscience; and to reprove, admonish and comfort the individuals as there is need. As a Physicion is not only to read a Physick Lecture to his Hospital, but to Govern each Patient in order to his Cure.

33. Ordination is & rei & ordinis gratia an act of Office, by which the Ministerial Office and Power is Ministerially delivered by way of Investiture and Solemnization, as a house is delivered by a Key, and a parcel of Land by a Turf and Twig, by the hand of a Servant appointed thereunto. Or as our Church state is delivered to us by Baptism by the like investiture. Though yet it is God directly, who giveth the Power, and that secondarily by his servant thus investeth us in it; though not without the previous Call which is necessary thereunto.
Ordination is not an idle Ceremony which the Ordainer must perform upon the judgement of others (Prince or people) without his own cognizance of the person, or against his Conscience: But he that must ordain, must first judge the person fit to be ordained; and therefore must also try his fitness, 1 Tim. 5. 22.

35. So much of the Antecedent power of the Ministry; in which it is to be noted, that Ordination and Baptism are efficient acts, like Generation in nature, under God the first efficient, as ex quo omnia, and as they are ordinis gratia, are the beginning of Government also. And Government is an Ordering act, as under God the supream Governor, ut per quem omnia. And Sacramental entertainment with Christ's body and blood in Church Communion, is Actus Amoris, a final act, of friendship, under God as the final Cause, ad quem omnis.

36. The subsequent part of the Pastoral Government, is by uniting the members of the Church in the exercise of the Pastoral Office, according to their several deserts: which is by a General, and particular application of the Word of God to their Consciences, and guiding them in circumstances, and judging of actions and persons according to that Word, in order to the good of souls, and the preservation of the Church and truth, Acts 20. 28. Heb. 13. 17.

37. When the whole Church falleth into notorious sin, the Pastors must reprove them, and call them to repentance: And if they apostatize forfake them, as ceasing to be a Church.

38. When a single member falleth into notorious scandal, the Pastor must admonish him, and call him to repentance: and if he remain impenitent and obstinate after due admonition, and publick exhortation and patience, he must [as Christ's Steward of his Word and Family, pronounce him a person unfit for Church communion, and require or command him in the name of Christ to forbear it, and the Church to forbear his communion, declaring him also unpardoned by Christ till he repent, and binding him over to his judgement.] So that Excommunication is a Sentence of the person as incapable of Church communion according
according to Christ's Laws, and a fore-judging him as unpardoned and condemnable by Christ's judgement, unless he repent, and a command to the sinner to forbear the communion and privileges of the Church, and to the Church to avoid him, 1 Cor. 5. Titus 3. 10, &c.

39. If the sinner repent, the Pastor is Christ's Officer, in his name to pronounce him pardoned, if his repentance be sincere; and the Guide of the Church to require them to receive him again into their communion, 2 Cor. 2. 7, 10, 11. Gal. 6 1, 2, 3.

40. Because Magistrates and people (as aforesaid) cannot attend so great a work as this, without the neglect of their particular Callings, and are not to be supposed so fit as the Pastor, and because God hath made it the work of his Office, the people are to rest in his judgement about the fitness and Title of those that have the publick Church communion with them, (though they are the Judges and Choosers of their Domestick and private familiars:) And they must not separate from them that are thus regularly admitted.

41. Yet when the Pastors by mal-administration, give them just cause, the flock may seek their due remedy: of which more anon.

42. This power is essentially in the Ministerial Office; and therefore is in every single Pastor, and not only in some few, or in the abler sort, or only in a Synod, Mat. 16. 19.

43. When a Church hath but one Pastor he must exercise it alone (with due consideration and advice.) But when a Church hath many Pastors, they must exercise it (and all Church guidance) in a way of Concord, and avoid all dissentions among themselves, Ephes. 4. 3, 4, 5. 1 Cor. 1. 10. John 17. 21, 22.

44. Therefore in such a case a particular Pastor may be obliged oft to suspend some such acts, because the Major Vote of his Syn-Presbyters are against it; Not that they are his Governours for the Majority of Vote, but because the Laws of Concord require the Minor part to submit to the Major.

45. The same is the reason why in Elections, Consents and
and other acts belonging to the flock, the Major Vote should carry it in things lawful; not because the people have any true Church Government; but because they are obliged to Unity and Concord; And in that case, the Law of Nature calleth the Minor part to submit to the Major, left there never should be any Concord had.

46. And the same is the reason why in Synods and Councils, the Major Vote of the Bishops must prevail, in lawful things not forbidden of God.

47. If any Pastor in the world pragmatically thrust himself into another man's charge, and pretend himself to be the Ruler of his neighbour Churches and Pastors, and attempt to exercise authority over them, he is to be flighted as an Usurper, and a disturber of the order and peace of the Churches of Christ, 3 John 9, 10.

48. Yet every Pastor is an Officer and Minister of Christ (as to the unconverted world to call them, so) to the universal Church to exercise his Office in it where ever he hath an orderly call! And if he teach, or administer Sacraments or Discipline, upon such a particular call, in a neighbour Church pro tempore, he doth it as an Officer of Christ (and their Pastor pro tempore) and not as a Lay-man: As a licensed Phylicion medicateth another Phylicion, or another's Hospital, when called to it, not only as a neighbour that is unlicensed, but as a licensed Phylicion. So Timothy, Apollo, Silas, and others did.

49. Therefore neighbour Pastors must have so much care of other Churches as to admonish them against the infection of any Heretic or Scandal, which they see them in apparent danger of; whether by heretical wicked Pastors, or others.

50. All neighbour Churches capable of correspondence, are bound to hold a special concord among themselves, for the advantage of the Gospel by their Unity, or for the conversion of the Infidel world, and for the preservation of the several Churches from danger, by Heresie or discord, Acts 15. John 17. 21, 22. Eph. 4. 3, 6.

51. He that is excommunicated justly in one Church should not be received by the rest till he repent: Therefore the neighbour Churches may do well, to acquaint each other whom
whom they have excommunicated, when there is cause.

52. This correspondence is to be kept by Messengers, Letters, or Synods.

53. Whether such Synods be stated, or occasional, and whether the President shall be still the same or changed, with such other circumstances, are things not determined in Scripture, but left to the determination of humane prudence, as the case shall require, for the end intended.

54. Though the Major part in these Synods, be not the proper Governours of the Minor, yet the Pastors there assembled are still the Governours of the flocks, and they are also bound to Concord in things lawful among themselves. Therefore their Decrees about such things, are Obligatory to the People ratione authoritatius, and they are obligatory to one another (I mean the Pastors) ratione concordiae: And this is the true state of the binding power of Synods.

55. Though the usual phrase of [binding the Conscience] be unapt, (Conscience being an act of science; and it is not to know that by the obligation now in question we are bound to primarily) yet as to the sense intended, it is certain, that the Commands of Parents, Magistrates and Pastors, in their proper places, do all truly bind the soul, or will, or man, or as they say, the Conscience; But it is only by a secondary obligation, from a derived power; as God bindeth it by a primary obligation by the primitive power. He that hath no power of obliging, hath no power of Governing. And he that obligeth not the soul and will, obligeth not the man at all, by any Moral obligation: The body alone or immediately is bound by Cords and Chains, but not by Commands and Laws: He that may not bind the soul by a Command, hath no commanding authority, Col. 3. 20, 22. Eph. 6. 1. Tit. 3. 1. Heb. 13 17, 24. & 11. 8.

56. Therefore the distinction of Internal and External Government, and of the forum interius & exterius, needeth better explication, than is used by most; or else it will be worse than useless. The true difference of the Government Civil and Ecclesiastical is to be fetched, ab objecito, & fine proximo & modo regendi. But as it meaneth that which
is Intrinseca or Extrinsic to the Pastoral Office, it is of great use. And as it differenceth Government by the Sword, from that which worketh only on the mind.

57. The same God who instituted the Office of the Magistrate, did also immediately institute the Office of the Ministry: And therefore as to the Foundation they are coordinate; and neither of them derived from the possessors of the other.

58. As to the Work and End, the Magistrates work and the Ministers have each a preheminency in their own kinds.

59. Magistrates, Ministers and Parents may all command the same thing, and all their Commands be obligatory; As to learn a Catechism, to observe the Lords Day, &c.

60. It is not lawful for Pastors to Excommunicate either Kings, or their chief Magistrates, or their own Parents (unless perhaps in some rare case) by any publick formal or dishonouring Excommunication. Because the great Command in Nature [Honour thy Father and Mother; Honour the King] lyeth lower than the positive Command of Excommunication; and is antecedent to it: And as affirmatives bind not semper & ad semper, so also they give place to Natural Laws, and not Naturals (ordinarily) to them. And the Rulers Honour is of more publick use and necessity, than excommunication in that particular act is. But an Usurping Tyrant, who may be deposed, and dishonoured, may be excommunicated.

61. Much less may a strange Pastor, to whom the Magistrate never committed the care of his soul, presume to excommunicate him who is none of his charge: And therefore the Pope and his Prelates excommunicating Kings and Rulers, seemeth to me, to be nothing but a proclaiming open Hostility against them.

62. Pastors have no Power over any but Consenters: Nor can they use the Sword, or have any Coactive power at all; that is, any power to touch a man's body or estate: but only to work upon his Conscience, and his Church-reputation. The forcing power belongeth only to Parents, and Magi-
Magistrates, and not to Ministers as such at all, *Luke* 22: 25, 26, 27. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4.

63. The samility of a *Physicians* power, (if you will but suppose him to have a *Hospital of Volunteers*, and his office to be of *Divine institution*); or of a Philosophers or Tutors (on the like supposition) over adult Disciples, may much explicate the Church power. No wise Physician will take any into his Hospital and Cure, upon unsafe destructive terms, which the *Patient* or *Magistrate* shall impose; but will say, [It is my function to Rule you, as to Medicine for your *Cure*; Take what I give you, and use your self upon it as I advise you, or else take your course; you are no Patient for me; nor shall be in my Hospital: I will not strike you, nor fine and imprison you; but I will be none of your Physician, (or faith the Tutor, I will be none of your Teacher;) nor shall you be any part of my Hospital, (School) or charge.] Only still remember here the *Divine institution* of the Ministry and Discipline, and the regulation of it by Gods Laws, that it be not arbitrarily used.

64. The undoing of the Church of Christ (in those Countreys where Popery and Church-tyranny prevail) hath long been by the Magistrates annexing their executions to the sentence of the Church (as it is called) and becoming the meer Executioners of the judgement of other men. No Magistrate should be debased, so as to be made the Churches Executioner. If the Magistrate will punish a man, it must not be meerly quatenus *excommunicate*, that is, as punished already; but for the *fault* for which he was excommunicate. And if so, then he must *try and judge* him for that fault at his own *barr*, and not punish him unheard; because the Church hath sentenced him. And if Rulers would more leave the Church to the exercise of its proper power, and let excommunication do what it can of itself, (unless the nature of the crime require a distinct Secular judgement and punishment;) it would do much to heal all the divisions and perturbations in the Christian world. For which course I have these Reasons following to urge.
1. It is a great contempt and reproach to Christ's institution of discipline, to tell the world, that it is a powerless uneffectual thing of it self, unless the Secular Sword do enforce it. Such Pastors vilifie their own power also, which is so useless.

2. It is a corrupting of Christ's discipline, and destroying the use of it: For it cannot be known now, what the Keyes do of themselves, when the Sword goeth with them: No man knoweth when Repentance professed is credibly real and moved by divine Motives; and when it is dissembled for avoiding of the Secular punishment.

3. It must leave the Pastors conscience unsatisfied in his administrations; and bind him to abuse Christ; when he must say to men, [If you had but rather say that you repent, than lye in a Gaol, I absolve you, and give you the Sacraments, and pronounce you pardoned by Christ.] Who can administer on these terms?

4. It is a dangerous deluding of the sinners soul, that seemeth intimated by this way.

5. It is a wilful corrupting and confounding of the Church; when men shall be forced to be its members, though they be Infidels, Heathens, or most impious, if they had but rather say they are Christians than lye in Gaol. And by this means it is, that no man can know, who are really of the Church of Rome, or of any tyrannical Church, but only who had rather say they are of the Church, than be undone: which any Infidel and Atheist will soon do. Therefore let not Rome boast of the number of her members which are unknown.

6. It is a changing of Christ's terms of Covenant, Christianity, Communion and Absolution: when Christ faith, [He that from his heart believeth and repenteth, and forsaiketh the flesh and the world for me, shall be my Disciple and be pardoned; and he that credibly professeth thus much, shall be taken into the Church (which are truly Christ's terms) now cometh the Church-tyrant and faith [He that will say, that he believeth and repenteth rather than he will forsaie the flesh and the world, and will choose the Church before a Gaol; shall be pardoned, and have communion with the Church,
Church, or at least have the seals of pardon to delude him.

7. By this means the Church is mostly constituted, in such Countreys, of the grosseft wicked hypocrites: And it is made a scorn to Infidels and Heathens, and their conversion hindered thereby, when they see that Christians are worse than they.

8. And by this means these hypocrites ruine the Church it self (as an enemies Souldiers in an Army): And nominal Christians and Pastors, that are heartily enemies to Christ, do him more wrong, and cause more divisions and ruines in the Church, than they could have done, if they had staid without.

9. It destroyeth most of the hopes of the sucess of those Pastors, as to the converting and saving of mens souls: Because when the Magistrate is made but their executioner, the people take all their sufferings as from them: And they will bear that from a Magistrate, which they will not bear from a Minister, whose Office is to Rule them by Reason and by Love: And so such Pastors are usually feared and hated by the people, whereby they are disabled to do them that saying good, which can be done on none against his will, 1 Cor. 8. 13. & 9. 22. 1 Tim. 4. 16.

10. And hereby a Church-tyranny is set and kept up in the world, by which perfections and divisions have been maintained for many hundred years; and the Ministers of Christ have been forbidden to preach his Gospel, to the unspeakable injury of souls; and the lives of many hundred thousands, have been a Sacrifice, to the Pride, and Avarice, and Cruelty of the Clergy; to the great dishonour of the Christian Name.

11. And hereby Princes have had a power set over them, to the diminution of their proper power, and part of their dominion subjugated to others, under the false name of Ecclesiastical Authority; yea, and their own standing made troublesome and unsafe, and multitudes dethroned, and Wars raised against them by the Clergies pretended power, or instigation; of which all the Wars between the
German Emperours and the Papalles are full proof, recorded in all the Histories collected by Freberus, Ruberus, and Pi- storius, in Subbellicus, Nauclerus, and multitudes of other Historians; and our English Histories, by Ingulphus, Mathew Paris, Hoveden, &c. And the Italian by Guicciardine and many others: Nay, what Countrey is there, where the Papal and Tyrannical Clergy have not overtopt or troubled the State.

12. And when all this is done, they would deceive the Princes themselves into a Consent, and so into the guilt of their own disturbance, and their peoples misery: And cast all the odium upon them, and say, we do but deliver you into the hands of the Secular Power, it is they that do the execution on you: when yet a General Council (the Rule of their Religion) Later. sub Innoc. 3. Can. 2, 3. deposeth such Temporal Lords that will not do such execution.

65. He that desires the Communion of the Church, doth take it for a grievous punishment to be cast out of it. And he that doth not desire it, is unfit for it. Therefore he that cannot feel the penalty of an Excommunication alone (but only of a Mule or Prison) may be fit enough for further punishment, but is unfit for the Communion of the Church.

66. Yet is the Magistrate the Protector of the Church, a Keeper of her Peace and Priviledges and of both Tables; and must use his power to promote Religion.

67. To which end he may prudently by moderate means contrain some that neglect their own salvation to hear God's Word, and confer with such as can instruct them, and use those means, which God hath made universally necessary, to bring the ignorant to knowledge; and may restrain them from actual open sin, and from scorn and opposition of the means that should convert them, and from hindering others from the means of salvation, and from open seducing them from God, or Christianity, or from a godly, righteous, or sober life: In all this, moderate penalties may be used; and men may be thus far constrained, and restrained: But not constrained to profess that which
which they do not believe, nor to take the privileges which God forbiddeth them to take. So that there are fitter means left, for the Magistrate to help the Church by.

68. The King and Magistrates have *cum animarum*, though not in the same sense as the Pastors have: They have the charge of Government, not only in order to the *corporeal* case, and peace and prosperity of their subjects, but also in order to mens holy, sober and righteous living, and to the saving of mens souls. And their *calling* must be *sanctified*, by doing all in it to these high and holy ends, Rev. 11. 15. Rom. 13. 3, 4, 5. Isa. 49. 23, &c.

69. They are Gods subordinate Officers, and have their power from him, and therefore for him, who is the beginning and the end of all, Rom. 13. 2, 4, 5, 6.

70. Because their power is from him and for him, they have none against him.

71. Yet have they a power which we must submit to as from God, even when it is used by accident against him, in some points of his will and interest; so be it that we obey it not in doing any sin our selves.

72. They that make Kings and Magistrates to have no charge of Religion, but only as the Clergies judgement leads them, but only to preserve mens bodily power; and say that the Church hath the care of mens souls and Religion, and the King only of the Body and our *outward* wealth, do degrade the Magistrate as far below the Minister, as the body is below the soul; and teach the people to esteem, love and honour the Minister as much above the Magistrate, as the soul and Heaven are better than the flesh and earth: And they make the difference so great, as that the holier any of the people are, the more they must prefer their Minister before their King: which is a Popish and most unsufferable debasing of the highest Officers of God.

73. The same points of Religion, the same sin and duties, come under the judgement of the Magistrate and the Pastors; though to several ends. The Magistrate is the Judge of Heretie, and the Pastors are the Judges of Heretie: The Magistrate is the Judge of Murder, Adultery and Theft,
Theft, and so is the Pastor: That is, the Magistrate is Judge, who is to be corporally punished for Heresie and Murder, and Adultery, &c. And the Pastors are Judges, who is to be excommunicated as Impenitent in such guilt, 1 Cor. 5. 3, 4, 5, &c.

74. Yet there are some faults, and some sorts of inquisition into faults, which the Magistrates may prudently restrain the Pastors from medling with, for the safety of the publick peace; especially when they would indirectly make themselves Judges of mens Titles and Estates; or in controverted cases, where the Magistrate must first decide, and the Pastors only follow, if the Pastors will be the first deciders, and prevent the Magistrate and assume his work, or otherwise wrong the publick peace, or private right, they are to be restrained.

75. The Magistrate hath all the Coactive Government, over Ministers as well as over any others of his Subjects: And to exempt the Clergy from his subjection without his consent, as traiterous. (And if he will consent, he may thank himself.)

76. Magistrates may (by moderate penalties) drive on negligent Pastors to their duty, and restrain them from mischieving the Church, and punish them for notorious pernicious mal-administration: As Solomon deposed Abiather, &c.

77. But they must not on this pretence invade any part of the Pastors Office; as to ordain, degrade, baptize, excommunicate ecclesiastically, nor impose on the Pastors any of the circumstantialis, which it is their own Office to determine of.

78. Pastors must obey the Magistrates in all Lawful things, which belong to his Office to command.

79. Many things are sinfully commanded (because without necessity or cause, or because of ill ends, or with ill circumstances in the Commander,) which yet it is the Subjects duty to obey in: Because one Law may be for a Ruler, and another for a Subject, and their duties various.

80. Where it is not lawful to obey, it is yet unlawful for Subjects to resist the higher powers, as being the authorized
authorized Officers of God, for our good, Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6.

81. Though usually it is very unfit that Pastors be alfo Magistrates (both because of some dissonancy in their necessary deportment and work, and because one of the Offices alone is enough for any man faithfully to perform.) Yet if the King make Magistrates of Pastors, as Magistrates their coactive power must be obeyed.

82. Magistrates may make Laws for the Church in circumstances circa sacra, which belong to their proper determination: And also to enforce obedience to the Commands of God, as far as prudence shall justly direct them: of this see Grotius de Imp. sum. pot.

83. Magistrates may call Synods and Councils: And the Pastors may also voluntarily assemble, for mutual advice, either in cases of great necessity for the safety of the Church, or in lesser cases, when the Magistrate forbideth it not.

84. In a time when Blasphemy, or Heresies, or Sedition prevaleth, the Magistrate may name certain Blasphemies, Heresies, &c. which he may forbid his Subjects to preach up.

85. And he may restrain all utterly unable persons, or heretical false Teachers, or any that notoriously do more harm than good, from the liberty of preaching in his Dominions, till they are proved fitter; that is, from abusing the Gospel and men's souls.

86. But if on this pretence he should forbid Christ's faithful able Ministers, to preach the Christian faith, and call men to repentance, and save men's souls, (when there are not enow more, especially to do that work, as proportioned to the number and necessity of souls;) it would be a sin so heinous against Christ, and against the souls of men, as I think it not meet now to aggravate or express, 1 Thes. 2. 15, 16.

87. If faithful Ministers break good Laws, they must be punished as other Subjects, in Purse, or Body, or Name, so as may least hinder them in the work of Christ.

88. They that silence faithful able Pastors, for such faults as may be otherwise punished, do grievously punish the faultless people (even in their souls) for the fault of another.
As if a man that hath a family of an hundred persons, were forbidden to give them bread to save their lives, because he was drunk, or swore an Oath, which might be punished on himself alone.

89. The Magistrate may excommunicate in his way, as well as the Pastors do in theirs. That is, the Magistrate may as a penalty for a crime, lay Subjects under a note of infamy, and Outlaw them, and command all men to avoid familiarity with them; (And this as bad Subjects, whether they be Church-members or not.) And he may as a Keeper of the Churches Priviledges and Peace (till forfeited) restrain all excommunicate persons from forcing themselves into the Communion of the Church which did excommunicate them.

90. So contentious are Pastors oft times, and so necessary is the Magistrates Office to the publick peace, that every Church should be under the eye of some Justices of the Peace, or Censors appointed by force to silence intruding Bawlers and Railers, and to restrain Ministers from making it their publick work, unpeaceably to traduce and revile their Brethren, and represent dissenters as odious to the flock. And if such Magistrates had kept the Churches Order and Peace according to their Office, it had prevented abundance of the Papal Usurpations, which were the fruit of Magistrates neglects.

91. Lay Chancellors exercising the Spiritual Power of the Keys (though they should pro forma use the Stale of an Ordinaries pronunciatio) is such a sort of Church Government, as I will never swear that in my place and Calling I will not at any time endeavour to alter by lawful means.

92. The Parents are put in the fourth Commandment, rather than the Magistrate or Pastor, because their authority is the most plenary Image of the Divine Authority in these respects. 1. Their Authority is not by Contract, but by Nature. 2. It is the primary radical power. 3. It is most universally necessary to mankind. 4. And it represteth Gods Government. 1. In that it is founded in Generation, as Gods in Creation. 2. Because thence ariseth 1. The fullest Image of his Dominion, in the Parents fullest Propriety in his Child. 2. Of his sapiential Rule, in the Parents Go-
vernmen (as in presence) 3. Of his Love which Parents are allowed to exceed all other Rulers in: Therefore God calls himself Our Father.

93. Q. What if the Magistrate, Minister, and Parents have opposite Commands? Which of them is to be obeyed? e.g. The Magistrate bids you meet in one place for publick Worship; the Bishop in another; and the Parent in a third? The Magistrate bids you Learn one Catechism and no other; the Bishop another, and not that; and the Parents a third. The Magistrate bids you stand, the Pastor bids you kneel, the Parents bid you sit. The Magistrate bids you pray by one form, the Bishop by another, and the Parents by a third or none. The Magistrate commandeth one translation of the Scripture, and the Bishop another. The Bishop commandeth you to use a Ceremony, or to keep a holy day, and your Parents forbid it you? In such cases which must you conform to and obey? Answer. When I am desired, and promised by those concerned in it, that it will be well taken, I will answer such kind of questions as these. But till then I will hold my tongue, that I may hold my peace.

94. No contrary commands of Church-men (as they are called); nor any of our own Vows or Covenants, can excuse us from obedience to the Higher Powers, in lawful things, which God hath authorized them to command; that is, which are belonging to their place of Government to regulate. Though if the question be but, e.g. What Medicine and Dole shall be given to a Patient, or by what Medium a Philosopher shall demonstrate; or what Subject and what Method and Words a Pastor shall use for the present edification of his flock; or how a Surgeon shall open a Vein, or a Pilot guide his Ship, &c. the Artist may be obeyed before an Emperour, (by him that careth for his life, or his understanding). But yet as all these are under the Government of the King, so he may give them general Laws; especially to restrain them from notorious hurtfulness.

Sir, If all these Propositions be known for the Concord of sober Christians in these matters, I hope neither you, nor I, nor any lover of the Church and Peace, shall need to use much
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sharpness against the Opinions of such dissenters. But if they be not, I know not when we shall have concord. And yet that you may see that I am not over solicitous of my Peace, I will make up the number with these less pleasing Propositions.

95. Because Corruptio optimi, est peccata, Magistrates and Ministers are of all men (usually) either the greatest Blessings or the greatest Burdens of mankind on earth. Saith Campanella, (Metaph.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Potentia} & \quad \text{Tyrannis} \\
\text{Sapiens} & \quad \text{Heresis} \\
\text{Amoris} & \quad \text{Hypocrisie.}
\end{align*}
\]

(though indeed he might as well have named more,) As Tyranny is in the greatest part of the whole world, (which is Heathen, Infidel and Popish) the principal sin, which hindereth the Gospel and Kingdom of Christ, forbiddeth the preaching of the Word of life for men's salvation (And therefore a sin which no Christian Magistrate or Preacher, should think of, but with great abhorrence, and none by any palliation should befriend it); so Prudent and Good Princes are under God the Pillars of the world; For they are the Chief Officers of God, to shew forth his Power, Wisdom and Goodness, Truth and Holiness, Justice and Mercy, in their Government; And by their Laws to promote the obedience of his Laws; And to encourage the Preachers and Practisers of Godliness, Sobriety and Righteousness; And to defend them against the Malignity of those that would silence, oppress and persecute them on earth; And by their examples and punishments, to bring all ungodliness, intemperance and injustice unto shame. None therefore that possess so great a mercy, should undervalue it, or be unthankful.

96. Wise Rulers will watch the Plots of such enemies, as would use them as the Devil would have used Christ, who carried him to the Pinnacle of the Temple, in hope to have seen his fall the greater: who would have them with Herod arrogate the praise of God unto themselves, or with Pharaoh or Nebuchadnezzar to disdain to be under the Sovereignty of their Maker? and ascribe to them the Divine Prerogatives;
Prerogatives; And would make it seem their honour to have Power to do the greatest mischief, that the pretence and claim may make them odious, and so may debilitate and undermine them. That like a draught of cold water to one in a Pleurisie, they may kill them by pleasing them.

97. It is an unchristian carnal craft for the Protestant Clergy of several Opinions, to lay false charges on one another, as being enemies to the Civil Government, when really their principles therein are all the same; Or to make the differences of Statesmen and Lawyers, to be taken for differences in Religion: purposely to make one another (and their Religion) odious, and to strengthen themselves by the errors and passions of Princes; till at last they have tempted the world to think as bad of all and of Religion itself, as they have said of one another, and by undermining others fall themselves.

98. But yet that Party who really make a Religion of the Doctrine of Rebellion, are to be disowned by all that will be true to God and to his Officers. In my Sermon to the Parliament the day before they Voted the Restoration of the King, I said somewhat of the difference of the Protestant and Popish Religion, in this point. And a Papist Gentleman first wrote an Invective against me, as if I had given no proof of what I said; And several persons of unknown names wrote Letters to me to urge and challenge me to prove it: Blindly or wilfully overlooking the undeniable proof which I had there laid down, from one of their General Councils, viz.

The Decrees of approved General Councils are the Papists Religion: The Decrees of approved General Councils are for the Popes deposing Temporal Lords, if they exterminate not such as deny Transubstantiation, and giving their Dominions to others: Ergo, The Popish Religion is for the Popes deposing Temporal Lords in that case, and giving their Dominions to others.

The Major is not questioned. The Minor, (besides the Concil. Rom. sub Greg. 7. which determineth that the Pope may depose Emperours;) I there proved from the express words of Concil. Lateran. sub Innoc. 3. Can. 3. which ut-
tereth it at large. And if any Protestant do (with Dr. Tailor, Dr. Gunning, and Dr. Pearson) doubt of the authority of those Canons, that's nothing to the Papists who justify it as an approved Council, and vindicate it, as you may find with copiousness and confidence, in the printed Answer to the last named Doctors. What impudence then is it in these men to challenge me to prove, and yet overlook my proof?

99. CHRISTIANITY according to the Scripture and primitive simplicity, in Doctrine, Worship, Government and Life, doth constitute a CHRISTIAN, and a Christian Church. The making of humane additions and mutable adjuncts to seem things necessary, doth constitute a SECT. (And alas how small a part of the Christian world, is not entangled in some such Sect.) To be united to all Christians, in the bond of Christianity, is to be a Catholic: To trouble the Churches peace by striving to set up one Sect or Faction, and suppress the rest, is to be a Schismatick and Sectary.

So then if some will by a superstitious unscriptural rigour of Discipline, make every Pastor's power arbitrary (or the peoples, which is worse) in judging of mens inward holiness, and will lay by the Scripture Title, which is (a sober Profession of the Baptismal Covenant) and think by this strictness to advance the honour of their party, as to purity, They will but endlessly run into divisions: And by setting themselves at a greater distance, from common Christians, than God alloweth them, provoke him to cast on them some greater shame.

And if any others will make their unnecessary forms of Synods, and other adjuncts, to seem so necessary, as to enter into Leagues and Covenants to make them the terms of the Churches Unity, God will not own such terms nor ways; nor will they be durable, while the ground is mutable.

And if in the Countries where Popery and Church-tyranny prevail, any other more lofty faction, shall perswade the people that there must be no King any longer than their domination is upheld; and shall seek to twist the corruptions, grandure or mutable adjuncts of their function, by Oaths, into the very Constitution of the State; Like the Trent Oath, swearing
swearing the Subjects to obey the Church, yea, putting the Church before the State, and swearing them, not at any time (though commanded by the King) to endeavour any alteration in that Church-Government; no nor to consent to any; that so the subjects may be as fast bound to them, as they are by the Oath of fidelity to their Kings; It is time in such a case to pray [God save the King] and, to write on our doors [Lord have mercy on us.] And a true subject in such cases, when it comes to swearing, must learn Seneca's Lesson, [No man more esteemeth virtue, than he that for the love of it can let go the reputation of it; ] And must be content to be called Disloyal, disobedient, factious, that he may not be so, nor betray his Soul, his Prince, and his posterity.

100. But to put my self out of the reach of any rational suspicion, besides what is said, I profess, that I ascribe all that Power to Kings, which is given them by any Text of Scripture, or acknowledged by any Council General or Provincial, or by any publick authentick Confession of any Christian Church, either Protestant, Greek or Popish, that ever I yet saw. And if this be not enough as to matter of Religion, (leaving the Cases of Law to Lawyers) I can give you no more.

---

Object. Ecclef. I. 18. In much wisdom is much grief, and be that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow. 7. 16. Be not righteous over much; neither make thy self over wise: why shouldst thou destroy thy self? 9. 2. As is the good, so is the sinner; be that sweareth, as he that feareth an Oath. 2. 59. 15. Truth faileth; and be that departeth from evil, maketh himself a prey. 1 Kings 22. 13. Let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak good.

Answ. V. 14. As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that I will speak. Luke 12. 4. I say to you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But, &c. 1 Thess. 2. 15, 16. They please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.

Acts
Acts 20: 24. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto my self, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the Ministry which I have received, &c. 1 Cor. 4. 17, 18. For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding eternal weight of glory: While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen, are eternal.

Sept. 21. 1669.

Addition:
Addition: Of the Power of Kings and Bishops out of Bishop Bilson and Andrews.

Left you should wrong the sober Episcopal Divines, so as to think that they claim as jure Divino, and as Pastoral, any Coercive forcing power, but only an authoritative persuading power, and that of the Keyes of the Church, I will transcribe some of the words of that Learned, Judicious Bishop Bilson in his Tract. of Christian Subjection; By which you will see, that all forcing power claimed by them, is only Magistratical, as they are the Kings Officers, and not from Christ.

Note also that constantly he distinguisheth the Magistrates power from the Pastors, by the \textit{Sword} as the instrument of execution, which even about Ecclesiastical matters is proper to the Magistrate; As the power of the \textit{Word} and \textit{Sacraments}, or Keyes of the Church, is the Pastors: And these are the shortest, plainest, and least ambiguous terms; and more clear than \textit{Internal, Ecclesiastical and Civil} which have all much obscurity and ambiguity.

Pag. 238. Princes only be Governours in things and Causes Ecclesiastical, that is, with the Sword——Bishops be no Governours in those things with the Sword. Pag. 240. We confess Princes to be Supream Governours,——Supream bearers of the Sword——We give Princes no power to devise or invent new Religions, to alter or change Sacraments, to decide or debate doubts of faith, to disturb or infringe the Canons of the Church.

But of these two last I must tell you, what we Puritans (as they call us) hold. 1. That the King may and must decide doubts of faith, in order to execution by the Sword (as, who shall be banished or imprisoned as a Teacher of Heresie). 2. And that Canons \textit{circa sacra} not taking the Pastors proper work out of his hand may be made by the Magistrate even if he please without the Prelates.

H And
And, if Pastors make Canons, they are but in order to their proper way of execution.

Pag. 252. And if Princes shall not bear the Sword, in things and Causes Ecclesiastical, you must tell us who shall—Since by Gods Law the Priest may not meddle with the Sword, the consequent is invincible, that Princes alone are Gods Ministers, bearing the Sword, to reward and revenge good and evil in all things and causes, be they Temporal, Spiritual or Ecclesiastical: unless you think that disorders and abuses Ecclesiastical should be freely permitted—Page 256. This then is the Suprem power of Princes, which we teach—That they be Gods Ministers in their own Dominions, bearing the Sword, freely to permit and publickly defend that which God commandeth—So may they with just force remove whatsoever is erroneous, vicious, and superstitious within their Lands, and with external losses and corporal pains repress the broachers and abettors of Heresies and all impieties—From which subjection to Princes, no man within their Realms, Monk, Priest, Preacher or Prelate is exempt: And without their Realms no mortal man hath any power from Christ judicially to depose them; much less to invade them in open field, least of all to warrant their Subjects to rebel against them. These be the things which we contend for; and not whether Princes be Christ's Masters, or the functions to preach, baptize, impose bands, and forgive sins, must be derived from the Princes power and Laws; or the Apostles might enter to convert Countreys, without Caesar's delegations; These be jests and shifts of yours.

Pag. 261. To Bishops speaking the Word of God, Princes as well as others must yield obedience: But if Bishops pass their Commission, and speak besides the Word of God, what they lift, both Prince and people may despise them.

Pag. 258. His Word is Truth: and therefore your Bishops cannot be Judges of the Word of Christ, but they must be Judges of Christ himself that speaksiby his Word, which is no small presumption.—My Sheep hear my voice—They be no Judges of his voice.—

Pag. 259. If you take judging for discerning, the People must be discerners and Judges of that which is taught—
Page 271. Ph. If General Councils might err, the Church might err—Th. As though none were of or in the Church, but only Bishops! Or all the Bishops of Christendom without exception, were ever present at any Council? Or the greater part of those that are present might not strike the stroke without the rest—

See pag. 350, 351, 352. Et seq. That only Magistrates may touch body or goods.

Page 358. The Watchmen and Shepheards that serve Christ in his Church, have their kind of Regiments distinct from the temporal Power and State: But that Regiment of theirs is by Counsel and persuasion, not by terror or Compulsion; and reacheth neither to the goods, nor to the bodies of any men—

Page 366. As for your Episcopal Power over Princes, if that be it you seek for, and not to take their Kingdoms from them, I told you, If they break the Law of God, you may reprove them: If they hear you not, you may leave them in their sins, and shut Heaven against them. If they fall to open Heresie or wilful impiety, you may refuse to communicate with them in prayers and other divine duties; yea, you must rather yield your lives with submission into their hands, than deliver them the Word and Sacraments, otherwise than God hath appointed.]

(Say you so; I promise you Sir, if Kings must be dealt so strictly with, though it cost you your lives, I will be a Non-conformist a little longer, though it cost me my livelihood, rather than give Baptism, the Lords Supper, Absolution, and the justifying assertions at Burials, as commonly as I must do, if I conform.)

P. 525. Pastors have their kind of Correction even over Princes: but such as by God's Law, may stand with the Pastors Vocation; and tend to the Princes salvation: and that exceedeth not the Word and Sacraments: Other Correction over any private man Pastors have none; much less over Princes—Princes may force their Subjects by the Temporal Sword. Bishops may not force their flock with any corporal or external violence. Pag. 526. Chrysostom faith—For of all men Christian (Bishops), may least correct the faults of men by force: Judges that are without the Church—may compell—But here
here (in the Church) we may not offer any violence, but only persuade. We have not so great authority given us by the Laws as to repress offenders: And if it were lawful for us to do, we have no use of any such violent power; for that Christ crowneth them which abstain from sin, not of a forced, but of a willing mind—Hilary teacheth the same Lesson; If this violence were used for the true faith, the doctrine of Bishops would be against it. God needeth no forced service: He requireth no constrained confession: I cannot receipt any man but him that is willing — I cannot give ear, but to him that intreateth. I cannot sign, (that is, baptize any but) him that (gladly) professeth.—So Origen—For all the crimes which God would have revenged, he would have them revenged not by the Bishops and Rulers of the Church, but by the Judges of the world—Bishops by virtue of their Callings cannot command others, or authorize violence or arms.—

Pag. 541. Parliaments have been kept by the King and his Barons, the Clergy wholly excluded; and yet their Acts and Statutes good. And when the Bishops were present, their Voices from the Conquest to this day, were never Negative. By Gods Law you have nothing to do with making Laws for Kingdoms and Commonwealths: You may teach, you may not command. Perswasion is your part: Compulsion is the Princes.

Page 245. Far better St. Ambrose faith [If the Emperour ask for Tribute, we deny it not: The Lands of the Church pay Tribute: If he affect the Lands themselves, he hath power to take them: no man among us is any let to him. The alms of the people is enough for the poor. Let them never procure us envy for our Lands: let them take them if they please: I do not give them to the Emperour, but I do not deny them.

So far Bifon.

All this we allow: And if all this be the concurrent judgement of all sorts of sober Protestants, called Episcopal or Presbyterians, what reason hath any Erastian upon the account of the Magistrates interest to quarrel with them. If any prætice not according to these principles, let them hear of it.

Indeed
Indeed in point of convenience we greatly differ from some men: That is, 1. Whether it be convenient for the King to make Church-men Magistrates, or not? 2. And whether it be convenient immediately to back their Excommunications, with the Sword; And for the Magistrate to be the Clergies Executioner, or to imprison men eo nomine, because excommunicate and not repenting. 3. And whether it be convenient to make the same Court called Ecclesiastical, so mixt of Pastoral and Secular Power united, in one Chancellor (who is no Pastor, but a Lay than) or in a Bishop, as that in and by it, the Magistrates, and the Spiritual Government shall be either confounded, or so twisted as to be undiscernable, or become one tertium.

But for this, as we love not to be too forward in teaching Magistrates what is convenient, (though many of the ancient Fathers have done it plainly, and spoken against the Magistracy of Priests; and Cyril of Alexandria is branded by Socrates and others with some infamy, as the first Bishop that used Coercive power); so you have more cause to say what you have to say in this, to the Magistrate himself, than to the Bishops or Presbyteries: For if the Magistrate will needs make Priests his Officers, and put his Sword into such hands, as have enough to do in their proper work, Or if he will punish men with the Sword, because they are punished already by excommunication, or because they repent not, left excommunication alone should prove uneffectual; quarrel not for his actions with other men: It is his own doing; and it is himself that you blame, when you blame these things: Say not that Prelates or Presbyteries take the Magistrates power from him; but say the truth, that the Magistrate giveth it them, and will have it so to be. (Though I excuse none that urge him to it, or voluntarily assume his Power.)

Bishop Andrews also faith Tortur Torti p. 383. [Cobi- beat Regem Diaconus, si cum indignus sit, idq; palam con- stet, accedat samen ad Sacramentum: Cobi- beat & medicus, si ad noxium quid vel insalubre manum admoveat: Cobi- beat & Equito, si inter equitandum adigat Equum per locum praeruptum, vel salebrosum, cui subit periculum. Eti-
Here you see what Church Government is in Bishop Andrews sense, and how far the Bishops hold the King himself to be refrainable even by a Deacon; and yet but (I think) according to your own sense, I pray you judge then whether the Bishops and you differ as far as you imagine; and whether the Courts and Church power which offendeth you, be not set up by Kings themselves, who make the Bishops their Officers therein. To which add what Bilson proveth that Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Archbishops Dignities are the gift of Princes, and not the institution of Christ, and then you will see more, that it is the Princes own doing.

I add to the like purpose more out of Bilson pag. 313. [We grant, they must rather hazard their lives, than baptize Princes which believe not, or distribute the Lords mysteries to them that repent not, but give wilful and open signification of iniquity, &c.] This is Church Government, which none can contradict.

This is it that Chrysostom so often professeth also, as that he would rather let his own blood be shed, than give the blood of Christ to the unworthy.

And Beda Hist. Eccles. 1. 2. cap. 5. telleth us, that Melitus Bishop of London (with Justus) was banished by the heirs of King Sabareth, because he would not give them the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which they would needs have before they were baptized.

(And by the way, if Bishops say that Kings must be used thus, the Non-conformists are not such intolerable Schismatics, as some now represent them, for desiring, that every Presbyter may not be compelled against his Conscience to give the Sacrament to the basest of the people that are ignorant what Christ or Christianity is, and to them that are not willing to receive it, but are forced to take it against their wills for fear of a Prison; nor to baptize the Children of such Parents as know not what baptism is, or as are professed Infidels, having not so much as
as Christian Adopters, but only Ceremonious persons called God-fathers and God-mothers.

Papirius Maffonus in vita Leonis i. reciteth his words of the Magistrates banishing the Manichees, and addeth [Ex hac rei geste narratione perspicionum est Romanus Episcopos relegare tunc non potuisse, nec in exilium eos mittere, ut bo-
die faciant; sed eos tantum censura coercere, & paenae ecclesiastica multa re-at.

I add no more, supposing that almost all sober Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Erastians are agreed in all the first ninety four Propositions, (if not all) that are here asserted; and that all those may suffice to signify their Concord, and promote their Reconciliation, if Interest (mistaken) and Passion (mis-guided) did not much more than difference of judgement in those matters, to cause their alienation.

And as I have written this to vindicate both the Power of Kings, and the Office of Pastors from any mens unjust suspensions or accusations, who look only on one side; and to shew that these Offices are no more contrary than Head and Heart, than Light and Heat: so I do require the Reader to put no sense upon any thing here written, which is injurious to the Government of Magistrates or Pastors, or contrary to the Laws: For all such senses I do hereby dis-
claim.

FINIS.