

**OF THE HOLINESS
OF
CHURCH MEMBERS**

**BY
JOHN COTTON**

**Quinta Press
Weston Rhyn
2008**

Quinta Press

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

Visit our web-site: <http://www.quintapress.com>

ISBN 1 897856 ?? ?

Layout copyright © 2008

In the original book, the page numbers 57–59, 89–95 and 94 are used twice. This is indicated in this edition by adding /2 to the second appearance of the page number. The original book is thus 103 pages long, not 95.

OF THE HOLINESSE OF CHURCH-MEMBERS

By JOHN COTTON

TEACHER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN *BOSTON* IN, *New-England*.

Psalm 9:5

Holiness becometh thine house O Lord for ever.

Psalm 15:1-2

Lord who shall sojourn in thy tabernacle, who shall dwell in thy holy
hill?

He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness.

LONDON

Printed by *E N.* for *Hanna Allen*, and are to be sold at
the Crown in Popes-head Alley. 1650.

To my honoured, worshipful,

AND WORTHY FRIENDS, THE MAJOR, AND JUSTICES THE

ALDERMEN AND COMMON COUNCIL, TOGETHER WITH THE

whole Congregation and Church at *BOSTON*:

Mercy, Peace, and Truth be multiplied in Christ Jesus.

Honoured and dear Friends,

IN that twenty years Service, (or thereabouts) wherein according to the call of God and you, I fed his flock amongst you, and his, and your lambs (as *Jacob* did *Laban's* for the like space, *Genesis* 31:38). I do with thankfulness acknowledge to God, and you, you have not dealt with me (as *Laban* with him) grudgingly, and deceitfully: but rather (as the *Macedonians* dealt with *Paul*) you gave up your own selves, first to the Lord, and then to your Ministers by the will of God: 2 *Corinthians* 8:5. And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, and showed yourselves ensamples, in some first-fruits of Reformation, unto, many neighbour Congregations about you: 1 *Thessalonians* 1:6-7. And though you saw that any small measure of Reformation (which then was offensive to the State, and suffered under the name of *Non-conformity*) would expose yourselves to some suffering, unless you deserted me; yet I bear you record, you chose

rather to expose yourselves to charge and hazard for many years together, than to expose my Ministry to silence. And though at the last in that hour and power of darkness, when the late High Commission began to stretch forth their malignant Arm against us, I was forced (as *Jacob* did from *Laban*) to depart secretly from you (from some of you I say), howbeit not without the privity and consent of the chief:) yet sundry of you yielded up yourselves (of *Ittai* to *David*) to follow the Lord whithersoever he should call, and to go along with me, whether to life or death, in this (late) howling wilderness; And though after my departure you were somewhat carried aside, with the torrent of the times, yet I believe, not without some apprehension of the light of the word going before you, in your judgements, to the satisfaction of your own consciences. And even since that time wherein the strong hand of the Lord, and the malignancy of the times, had set this vast distance of place, and great great gulf of seas between us: yet still you claimed an interest in me, and have yearly ministered, some real testimony of your love: and at last when the Lord (of his rich grace) had dispelled the storm of malignant Church-governemnt, you invited me again and again to return to the place and work wherein I had walked, before the Lord and you in former times. But the estate of those of you, who came along with me

(and who thereby had most interest in me) could not bear that: nor would my relation to the Church here suffer it: Nor would my Age now Stricken in years, not infirm body ill brooking the Seas be able to undergo it, without extreme perils of becoming utterly unserviceable, either for yourselves or others, Besides, the estate of our Church, admitting more than professed Saints to the fellowship of the seals, and the government of your Church subjected to an extrinsical Ecclesiastical power would have been a perpetual scruple and torment to my conscience, which knowing the terrors of the Lord, and the conviction of my own judgement, I durst not venture upon. Not that I misjudge others, who can satisfy their consciences in a larger latitude: but because everyman is to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and I must live by my own faith, Romans 14:5,23.

Nevertheless touching the former of these (the true estate of Church members, and what is the holiness required of them)that you may see I am not pinched with groundless scruples about it; I have for the satisfaction od yourselves, and of sundry others, who have written to me about the

same, penned this ensuing Treatise, *Of the Holiness of Church-members*; wherein if the Lord should be pleased to reach forth, any satisfaction of yourselves, I hope it would tend much, if not towards this union, yet towards a mutual communion between your own Church, and other Congregational Churches which (I hear) the Lord Jesus hath planted amongst you. For if both of you could consent in that qualification of your church-members which this Treatise pleadeth for, the other scruple which concerneth the subjection of your Church to an extrinsical Church power might haply be well eased, if not wholly removed, in such a way as this. The Elders of your neighbour Churches (who were wont to be favourable to the Church at *Boston*) as they would accept your Elders into the fellowship of public consultation with them about Church affairs: so they might give your Elders counsel in matters that concern your own Church, and the members thereof: but leave the transaction and execution thereof to your own Elders, in the presence and with the consent of your own Church. And who can tell how much and how far the Lord might stretch forth the blessing of such a peacable condescendency, to more general acceptance, and accommodation? Surely the Lord hath done great things for you in your late marvellous deliverances, when an Army of Malignants passed and returned by you, and might easily have swallowed you up quick, if the Lord himself had not encamped about you. The pondering of God's goodness to you herein, brought to my mind, the former like dealing of God with his people, *Zechariah* 9:8. And wherefore hath the Lord thus saved you (as a sircion and out of the burning) but that you might live to the advancement of his kingdom, in exemplary Truth and Peace. The same good hand of the Lord still protect and direct you, in all your holy and civl administrations, in Christ Jesus. In whom saluting you all, and all your relations, I take leave and rest,

Once your unworthy Pastor, ever your faithful servant in Christ,
John Cotton

QUESTION I.

OF THE HOLINESS OF CHURCH MEMBERS.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

SECTION I

HOW FAR WE CONSENT.

IT is Consented to on both sides, That Christians truly regenerate by the word and Spirit of grace, and none but such, are the Members of Invisible Church, as it hath been commonly taken, for the society of the living members of mystical body of Christ.

2. That it is the duty of all the members of the particular visible Church, and necessary (both *necessitate præcepti, & medii*) both by Divine Commandment, and as a necessary means of their own salvioun, to be truly regenerate, and sanctified in Christ Jesus, *John 3:5; Psalm 15* throughout.

3. That it is earnestly to be wished and by all lawfull means diligently to be endeavoured both by Pastors and people, that all the members of the Church should be most holy and gracious. Mr Bailey, *Disuasive*, Chapter 7, page 156.

4. That such as are born of Christian parents, and baptised in their infancy into the fellowship of the Church, are initiated members of the same Church, though destitute of spiritual grace, until they justly deprive themselves of the privilege of that Fellowship. For even of such is the kingdom of God, *Mark 10:14*.

5. That though it be comfortable, and desirable in the admission

mission of Members into the Church, when the whole Church and all the members thereof are satisfied in the sincerity of the regeneration of such who are to be received, (especially in the first gathering and plantation of a Church:) yet neither in Judgment, nor practise do we suspend their admission, till we be convinced in our consciences, of the certain and infallible signs of their regeneration.

6. That the hypocrisy of sundry members in the Church, and the toleration of some open scandals therein, doth not forthwith take away the nature of the Church. For there must be a time to proceed orderly

against them, which if neglected, though it do defile the purity of a Church, and without repentance will in time subvert it, yet not till after some time of God's patience. Revelation 2:4-5, and Chapter 3:1-2 and Chapter 2:21.

7. That notwithstanding the discovery of hypocrisy in sundry members of the Church, and the toleration of some open scandals: yet separation is not forthwith to be made from the Church. For it may be a sin of infirmity in the Church: and we are to proceed with patience against the infirmity, of a brother, much more of a whole Church. By hasty withdrawing, Reformation is not procured, but retarded.

8. That if a man cannot continue in the fellowship of the Church where he hath lived, but shall be constrained to yield unto some sin, or shall see no hope of reformation of evils, after long waiting, and all good means used, we suppose, none will deny a man liberty in such a case to withdraw himself, so it be without condemnation of that Church, from whence he withdraweth, unless the Church fall into fundamental heresies and blasphemies, and persist therein (after conviction) out of malicious wickedness.

9. When a man is to make his choice, unto what Church to join himself, we suppose no man will deny him this liberty, to join himself to such a Church, as he findeth most pure, and watchfull, and powerfull in the administration of the ordinances of Christ.

3

SECTION II.

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION MISTAKEN BY MR BAILEY, AND APOLLONIUS.

Mr *Bailey* in his *Dissuasive from the errors of the Times*, taketh our judgement and practice to be quite contrary to what we have declared above, in the 5, 6, 7 positions, and accordingly undertaketh to dispute against our judgement and practice herein. But I know no ground he hath had from us here, either so to report us, or so to refute us; howbeit, in his Refutation, some things are delivered by him, which may justly require some further revisal.

The like mistake of us, I find in *Apollonius*, in the stating of his first Question. Nevertheless I blame neither of them, seeing (it may be) they have met with some of the Separation, who haply, have so stated the Question, though (for ought I know) none of us.

SECTION III.

THE STATING OF THE QUESTION BY MR RUTHERFORD CONSIDERED.

Mr *Rutherford* maketh way for clearing the state of the Question, by some distinctions, and some conclusions and (in the way) by answering some questions; in Chapter 9 of his *Peacable plea*.

His Distinctions (pages 93–94) are ten, whereof eight of them I should not refuse: only the eighth and tenth I cannot so readily accept, without some subdistinction. *Let it be considered* (saith he in his tenth Distinction) *if a Church not be tearmed by the Spirit of God, an whore, no Church, no Spouse, jure, & merito & quoad vocationem passivam, in respect of bad deserving, and their not Answering to the call of God on their parts: and yet that same Church remain de facto, formally, and on God's part, in regard of his active vocation and calling, the Spouse and Bride of Christ.*

This distinction I can admit, if it be understood of a Church, that hath formerly answered the call of God, and submitted to the ministry of the Gospel at least in outward profession, of the fundamentals of sound doctrine and pure worship. For such a Church, though they or their children may afterwards degenerate,

4

and go an whoring from God in doctrine and worship; yet God (in his patience and bounty) is not wont so soon to cast off them), as they cast off him. The next generation after *Joshuah* went an whoring from God, and forsook the Lord God of their fathers, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth: yet still the Lord accounted them his people, and sent them Judges and Prophets to restore, and recover them.

But if a society of men should have the word of God truly caught unto them, and be thereby externally called to the fellowship of Christ, and of his Church, and yet be never wrought upon to submit themselves to the call of God, no not in outward profession, I durst not account such a society for a spouse and Church of God, notwithstanding, God's active externall calling of them. And therefore his first Conclusion hence deduced, I dare not accept. *That Saints by external calling (such a calling, whereto no Answer at all is given) are the true matter of a visible Church.*

For this Conclusion implieth within itself a contradiction: here is indeed an external calling but here be no Saints (no not in outward profession) accepting that Calling. Now look as an inward calling doth not constitute an invisible Church, without an inward answering of that call: so neither doth an external calling constitute a visible Church, without an external

answer of that call; neither are they Saints by external calling who do not externally answer the call offered to them.

With the same subdistinction (if I may to call it) I would accept his 8. Distinction. For where a people have formerly covenanted to profess, and confess the faith of Christ according to God, the Magistrate may compel them *actu imperante* on his part (*imperato*, on theirs) to stand to their profession, as *Josiah* dealt with the Israelites, 2 Chronicles 34:33. But where people never covenanted to profess the faith, I see not how a Magistrate can compel them to undertake such a profession. *David* did not compel his tributary subjects, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Syrians, Philistines, to profess the faith, or Religion of the God of Israel.

Mr *Rutherford's* Reasons to make good his first Conclusion will reach too far as hath been said, but no further.

1. *The word Ecclesia* (saith he) *the called of God proveth this: for those are a true visible Church, where God hath set up a Candlestick: and*

5

whom God calleth to repentance, to remission of sins, and life eternal in Christ: for there is a settled Ministry Calling.

Answer. Where God setteth up a Candlestick, there is indeed a true visible Church: for the Candlestick is the Church, especially if it be of gold (though mingled with much dross), *Revelation* 1:29, but not everywhere, where God setteth up a Candle, doth he also set up a Candlestick. *Paul* was set up for a Candle in Arabia, 3 years together, *Galatians* 1:17–18, but whether God settled any Candlestick, or Church there, it is not certain: certainly it is not recorded amongst the Acts of the Apostles.

Yet I should not refuse (according to the former Distinction) that where there hath been a Church before, which yielded professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ, then in case of settled Ministry be still continued there, God still continueth a true visible Church there; because he hath not called away his Embassadors from them, but still stretcheth out his hand (though it may be) to a rebellious and gainsaying people, *Romans* 10:21. And very probable it is, that where God continueth a settled Ministry of the Gospel or doctrine of grace, there though many may be rebellious, yet still some remnants are found, who gladly receive the word, and submit to it: and more, who profess it.

But if there be an universal resistance of the, Call, given by the ministry of the Word, as there was in those invited guests, (*Luke* 14:18) when they all with one accord began to make excuse, though *Ecclesia* be *Cætus*

vocatorum, yet I dare not believe, that such a *Cætus vocatorum*, is *Ecclesia*. For the Church is a company of called ones, not by men only, whose Call may be altogether rejected; but of God, who by calling making such impression upon the hearts of men, as convineeth them of the voice of God in the Word, and subdueth them to yield subjection to the Word, though not sincerely, yet at least feinedly, and in hypocrisy, *Psalm 18:44*.

But if there be no Answer at all, no not in outward profession, it is not such a Call, as denominateth the hearers to be *Cætus vocatorum*; no, not though that external call be given by a settled Ministry. For what if a religious State should provide to settle a Preaching Ministry in every Parish in *Ireland*, it is not the settled Ministry, nor the externall Call given by that Ministry to,

6

repentance, remission of sins, and life eternal in Christ, that will make the malignant refractory hearers *Cætum vocatorum*, such as may denominate them to be a Church. And therefore his

2nd: Reason will not hold, no more than the first, which is: *Because all to whom the word is preached are called the visible Church: as all within the house are the vesseli within the house visibly, though there be in the house vessels of honour, and vessels of dishonour.*

For we safely deny, that all to whom the word is preached are called the visible Church. For then might many Indians, and wild Irish be called the visible Church. All within the house are not of the house, no not in visible appearance: much less are all that hear the word within the house. For the word may be preached in the world out of the Church as well as in it: though I easily grant it, that such as bearing the word do yield professed subjection to it, are vessels within the Church, howsoever, some of them may be vessels of dishonour, as wall as others of honour.

His 3rd: Reason taken from Mr *Ainsworth's* Concession, will reach no further than the former.

The Saints (saith he) *by calling are the only matter of a visible Church: yet withall we hold, that many are called, but few chosen. So also the kingdom of heaven is a draw-net, wherein are good and bad fishes: a barn-floor, wherein are good wheat and chaff.*

All this we willingly grant. But it was never Mr *Ainsworth's* meaning, that all who are called to he Saints (In Mr *Rutherford's* sense) are true matter of a visible Church; to wit, when they are only called or exhorted to be Saints, by the external voice of the ministry of man, without any

inward power of the Spirit of God to subdue them so much as to visible profession of Saintship. When men are called to be Saints by the ministry of man, but do abhor and deride the very name and show of a Saint, it was never his meaning to account or call such, *Saints by calling*.

Yea, but Mr Ainsworth acknowledgeth, many are called, but few chosen; and we say as much, and the place alleged faith as much expressly, Matthew 20:16. But those that were so called, were not only called by the external voice of man; but by so much efficacy of the Spirit, that they all came into the vineyard, and became labourers in the vineyard, though not all, with integrity

7

of heart. I would have no man here mistaken by an equivocation of external calling. For an external calling as it is distinguished from effectual, may be put for such a calling by the voice of God's Ministers as either obtaineth no Answer at all (not so much as conviction in judgement, nor any outward reformation of life, like that of the *Athenians, Acts 17:18*) or reacheth to conviction of judgement, and some stirring of affections, and some outward reformation of life, as that of *Simon Magus*. Now all such as in Scripture phrase are termed *Saints by calling*, received a stronger calling than the former sort of these, They were either effectually called to sanctification in Christ Jesus, or, at least were wrought upon to the conviction of their judgements, and to the subduing of their outward conversation to the profession of holiness. Never doth the Scripture call them *Saints by calling*, who were only called by the external voice of man, but were never subdued to the acknowledgement, and profession of the Gospel, of Christ.

Mr *Rutherford* his 2nd. Conclusion tending to clear the state of the Question, is this;

All the members of the visible Church, de jure, by right or by moral obligation ought to be Saints effectually called.

Herein we fully consent with him; as hath been said above in the 2nd: and 3rd: Position.

His 3rd: Conclusion is:

But, de facto, as the visible Church is in the field of the world, all the members of the visible Church are not effectually called, justified, sanctified. Neither is it needful by a physical obligation, for the true nature and offence of a visible Church, that all the members of it be inwardly called and sanctified. Every professor is obliged to believe: else the wrath of God abideth on him, and he is condemned

already. But to make a man a visible professor, and so a member of the true visible Church as visible, saving faith is not essentially required, so as he should be no member of the Church visible, if he believe not.

Thus this be rightly taken, observe (saith he) that the visible Church falleth under a twofold consideration. 1. In concreto, as a Church. 2. in abstracto, as visible. The visible Church considered in concreto is a part of the universal, Catholic invisible Church: in which consideration we deny (saith he) reprobates and unbelievers to be members of the visible Church of Christ.

8

[And he giveth five Reasons for it.]

But if the Church be considered in abstracto, under the notion of visibiliy as visible, and performing all the external acts of professing, preaching, hearing, governing, &c. All the external professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous, are to be reputed members of the true visible Church.

This his 3rd: Conclusion I consent unto: though this Distinction, which he bringeth for the clearing of it, I should have understood it better if he had applied the terms contrariwise; to wit, that the Church considered *in abstracto*, as it is in its own nature, by Christ's institution, so only the regenerate professed believers, are the members of it; But considered *in concreto*, as it is existent in its visible subjects, so reprobates, and unregenerate Christians, yet professing the faith, they may be the members of it. As in like case, it is said of faith, considered *in abstracto*, in its own, nature, it is free from doubting: for doubting is not of the nature of faith, but contrary to it. But consider faith *in concreto*, in it is found in this or that subject (according to the common condition of regenerate men) so it is ever mixed with some doubting, more or less. But so long as we agree in the point, we will not vary about words.

But the Conclusions, which he inferreth from this Distinction, call for a word or two of revisal.

1. Saith he, *Separatists' arguments must be weak: for they all conclude that which we deny not, and in no other thing, to wit, that heretics, adulterers, sorcerers, blasphemers, be no part of the visible Church, as it is a Church.*

But (by his leave) their Arguments prove two things more: 1. That such scandalous persons ought not to be admitted into the visible Church: 2. That being in the visible Church, they ought to be cast out by just censure. Nor are their Arguments to prove these argued of weakness by that distinction from whence this conclusion is inferred.

It is true, when they argue, that such a Church ceaseth to be a Church, where such are tolerated, there indeed the weakness of their Arguments bewrayeth itself. But yet it may be doubted, whether Mr *Rutherford* himself do not seem to favour this arguing of theirs, when in the next page (page 97) he resolveth, *Thus*

9

in the visible Church considered under the notion of visibility, external professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous, are to be reputed members of the true visible Church.

Which if it be so, do not then the Arguments of the Separatists conclude, that heretics, adulterers, sorcerers, blasphemers, are no parts of Christ's visible Church, not only as it is a Church, but also as it is visible? *For if all external professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous are to be reputed members of the true visible Church, considered under the notion of visibility;* then surely heretics, adulterers, sorcerers, and blasphemers (who are manifestly and openly scandalous) they are no parts of the visible Church, no not as visible.

His 2nd Conclusion inferred from the former Distinction, is, *That preaching of the Gospel is a note of the Church: and profession of faith is a note of the Church: the former of Ecclesia docens, the other of Ecclesia utens.*

I have sometimes met with such, a distinction of *Dialectica*: that it is either *docens*, or *utens*: nor do I refuse the application of it to *Ecclesia*. Neither would I deny, the preaching of the Gospel to be a note of the Church, if the profession of faith according to the Gospel be joined with it. Otherwise the Ministry teaching of the Gospel, though it be *docens*, yet it is not *Ecclesia docens*, unless the auditory do profess the Gospel, and so be *utens*, and not *abutens* of what is taught.

His 3rd: Conclusion inferred from the Distinction above, touching profession, I would not wave it: let it stand; I affect not distance, but consent, so far as maybe, without prejudice to the truth. But when from these promises, he cometh to draw up the state of the Question, I cannot so freely and fully close with him there.

The Question then is (saith he), whether visible Saints, 1. forsaking all known sins: 2. doing all the known will of God: 3. growing in grace, be the only true matter of a right and lawful consistent visible Church and Congregation: so that we are to join with no company of the worshippers of God, but such visible Saints as these: And to acknowledge no other society for a true Church, whereto we are obliged to join ourselves, as members, save only such a society?

Or is this sufficient for the nature and right constitution of a true visible

10

Church, that the company we are to join ourselves unto, as visible members, have in it these true marks of a visible Church; The pure word of God purely preached; the Sacraments duly administered, with discipline according to God's word; and withall, a people externally professing the foresaid faith: Suppose they cannot give us manifest tokens and evidences, that they are effectually called, and partakers of the divine Nature, translated from death to life, elected, called, and justified? This latter (saith he) we hold as the truth of God: those of the Separation, hold the former.

But if those of the Separation hold the former, we (here) do not hold with them, but profess our Dissent from them, as appeareth in the 5,6,7, Possitions, layed down above, in the beginning of this Chapter.

And for the latter, which he saith, he (with the rest) do hold as the truth, of God, we had need to understand him a little more clearly, before we can declare either our assent, or dissent. For he may take those Marks either jointly, or severally: if jointly, we consent with him, *There is the true nature of a visible Church, where the pure word of God is purely preached, and the Sacraments duly administered with discipline also according to the word of God.* But then his words must be rightly understood, as they properly mean. For we conceive the Sacraments are not duly administered, if they be administered to undue persons, to such as are ignorant and scandalous. Nor is discipline administered according, to the word of God, if ignorant and scandalous persons be admitted into the Church.

Nevertheless, we should not deny that though all these marks should not concur jointly; yet the nature of a true Church may be found thou, defective for integrity. As (put case) if discipline be not duly administered, nor the Saraments according to the word of God as it was in *Corinth* when the incestuous person, and many other abuses both in discipline, and in the Lord's Supper were tolerated: yet the nature and essence of a true Church was preserved amongst them.

But if he intend these Marks to be taken severally then the preaching of the word alone, without some professed subjection to it, will not be a mark of a true Church. The preaching of the pure word of God purely (as by *Paul* at Athens, *Acts* 17) was no certain mark or a pure Church there: unless the Athenians

II

had yielded professed subjection to it. Nor would the circumcision of the Schemites, argue a true Church amongst them; much less Discipline, without professed subjection of the people to the word, in a way of God. Neither will it much mend the matter to say (with Mr *Rutherford*), *That it is not the preaching of the word occasionally, that is a property or a mark of a true Church: but the constant preaching of it.* For amongst us the pure word of God is preached purely, and weekly to the Indians, to two Congregations by turns, and they resort constantly to the hearing of it: And haply means maybe procured for the continuance of it (as hath been honorably began by the Lady *Armin*, and others): and ye that will not constitute a Church of *Indians*, without some more professed subjection to it, then constant attendance upon the hearing of it will reach unto. Howbeit now (through mercy) sundry of them yield subjection.

And for Discipline, though it were (as sometime it hath been) strictly administered in a cloister of *Monks*, no open scandalous vice tolerated amongst them: yea though they should enjoy both the Sacraments in both kinds, administered amongst them (as by special dispensation might have been allowed to them, as was to the *Bohemians*): yet without the preaching of the pure Word of God (yea, and some professed subjection, to it) that would not constitute them a true Church of God.

For better clearing the state of the Question, Mr *Rutherford* propoundeth, and assoyleth some Questions. *There be (saith he) many questions infolded here of divers natures: For,*

1. *The Question is, if a society have the word, and seals, and right discipline, and they profess the truth, but suppose their lives be wicked, whether they should not be answerable to that which they profess?*

I answer (saith he) No doubt, they ought to be answerable to their Light, and obey the holy calling.

Well, and good: herein we freely consent with him.

2. *Question. What if many of them lead a life contrary to what they do profess, and yet the Governors use not the rod of discipline to censure them, then whether should the members separate from that Church?*

They ought to separate (say the Separatists): They ought not to separate from the Church, and worship, say we. They are to stay with their Mother, but modestly to plead with her, and to say to Archippus, &c. And

12

we say so too. But what if the Church, and the Rulers thereof will not hear us? We say then, it were requisite to inform other neighbour Churches what is scandalous amongst us, and to solicit them to join with us in seeking the conviction and reformation of our Church. But what if such help cannot be had: or being had, do not prevail? may not a man in such a case for the comfort of his own Soul, and in way of witness-bearing against such enormities, peaceably withdraw himself from them, and join to another more pure congregation? We know no cause to doubt of it. *Jeremiah* (though a Prophet) withdrew himself from Jerusalem, *Jeremiah* 37:12. And *Calvin* giveth the Reason, *Tædebat enim ipsum urbis, quia videbat se frustra operam consumere. Tædio itaque confectus, quia videbat se nihil consequi apud homines duros & refractarios, hinc factum est ut cuperet se sutrahere à conspectu totius populi.* And this exposition is suitable to *Jeremiah's* own expression of his own desire (Chapter 9:2.) O (saith he) *that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place of wayfaring men, that I might leave my people and go from them: for they be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men.*

3. His 3rd: Question, which he assoyleth for clearing the point, is, *What if there be purity of doctrine, but extreme wickedness contrary to their doctrine, whether is that company a true Church or not?*

I answer, (saith he) it is a true visible, and a teaching, or right ministerial Church, but (so far as can be seen) not an holy, nor sanctified Church, and therefore must not be deserted, and left.

But purity of doctrine, though it may be a good testimony of a pure Ministry, and denominate it to be a true, visible, teaching, right Ministry: yet it will not argue the company, where pure doctrine is taught, to be a true visible teaching, right, ministerial Church, *in case the whole body of the people do live in extreme wickedness contrary to their doctrine.* Indeed if the doctrine be pure, and but a few names in the Church yield professed subjection to it, I should grant that Church might be accounted a true visible Church, in regard of the better part of it, as it was with *Sardis*, *Revelation* 3:1-4. But if the whole society should live it, extreme wickedness contrary to their doctrine, and yet be a Church, then a company might be a Church only for their healing sake, though they heard with scorn and blasphemy. If such a company be

13

Ecclesia, it is doubtless *Ecclesia malignantium*: and to withdraw from such a Church after due admonition, and conviction, is no schism, *Psalm* 26:5 and 55:6–11.

4. Question. *What if the guides of the Church receive in for members of the Church, those that are known to be most scandalous, and wicked; and not such Saints, as Paul writteth unto, at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse?*

The answer is, the faults of the Guides are not your faults, who are private members. You are to keep public communion in the public ordinances of Christ, but not to partake with their unfruitful works of darkness of Christ, but not to reprove them rather.

But if private members be persuaded in conscience from word of God, that themselves have due right, and interest, as well in the admission of members, as in excommunication of offenders, or in election of officers, how shall they keep themselves from partaking in the sins of their offices, if they suffer them to go on in such a manifest breach of rule, without due proceeding against them for their reformation?

Not that I would encourage them to proceed against their officers without consulting with other Churches (officers, and brethren), and without due time allowed, and due means used, for their reformation. But if no means prevail, what hindreth, but that the body of private brethren (that is, the Church without officers, who indeed are not private, but a public Society) may withdraw from the communion of such officers: (*Romans* 16:17: and from ministering to them, as well as before they admitted them to communion, and elected them to ministration? It is essential to community, to have power to admit unto communion and to withdraw from communion.

5. Question. *What if the members of the Church can give no real proofs, that they are inwardly called, sanctified, and justified, and yet, no scandalous out-breakings to be seen in them to testify the contrary?*

I answer (saith he) forasmuch as grace may be under many ashes (as a piece of gold under mountains of earth) if they profess the sound faith, they are a true visible Church, and we are to acknowledge them as such, and to join ourselves as members to such a society: or being members already, we are to remain in that society, and not to separate from it in any sort.

But I marvel here, why he putteth in this favourable answer with two such cautions, or conditions, which if they were both

14

wanting, his Answer would still be the same. The two cautions be, 1. No scandalous out-breakings to be seen amongst them: 2. If they profess the sound faith.

Now what if they profess, and protest against the sound faith delivered by their Ministers? And what if they do break out into notorious scandals, living in extreme wickedness? as he said before in Q. 3. Notwithstanding the absence of both these conditions here required, and the putting of the contrary, yet the congregation was still to be accounted, *a true, visible teaching, right ministerial Church, and therefore must not be deserted, and left.* See his Answer to Q. 3. So whether the body of the brethren (which is the Church) profess the true faith, or profess it not, whether out breakings into open scandals be found amongst them, or not: yet still we must give to such Churches the right hand of Fellowship; and not desert them.

But for our parts, we should not dissent, that such a Congregation may be a true visible Church of God, where those two conditions are found: And withal, that there may be a lawful remaining in such a Church. Nevertheless, we believe also there may be a lawful departure from it, without sinful separation: in case we neither renounce their Church-estate, nor brotherly communion with them, when we shall have occasion to come amongst them. If a man may remove from one Church to another for the greater expediency of his outward calling: why not much rather for the greater expediency of his spiritual edification? But in this I suppose there will be no dissent.

His 4th Conclusion is occasioned by Mr *Ainsworth's* complaint, that swarms of Atheists, Idolaters, Papists, and Erronius Sectaries, Witches, Thieves, Adulterers, liars, &c. are found in the Churches from which they separate, Whereupon he holdeth out this for a

4th. Conclusion. *That howsoever openly and grossly profane wicked persons (as known atheists, the mockers of Religion, Idolaters, papists, Heretics, witches, thieves, adulterers) are not to be received into the Church, as members thereof, until they give evidence of their repentance: nor to be kept in the Church, but to be excommunicated: yet there is nothing more required, as touching the essential properties, and nature of being members of a Church, as visible, but that they profess before men, the*

15

faith, and desire the seals of the Covenant, and crave fellowship with the visible Church.

In this Conclusion of this, there be three distinct Propositions included: whereof the two first tend much towards reconciliation: the third will need some explication, and in some sense, after a sort may be admitted.

The 1. Proposition included in this his 4th Conclusion, is *That notorious scandalous persons are not to be received into the Church, as members thereof, until they give evidence of their repentance.*

2. *That such like notorious offenders are not to be kept in the Church, but to be excommunicated.*

Both these embrace with him, as the holy truths of God.

3. *That nevertheless, There is nothing more required to the essence, and nature, and being of the members, of a Church, as visible, but that they profess before men the faith, and desire the seals of the covenant, and crave fellowship with the visible church.*

But this 3rd Proposition, as it is propounded in way of an Argument *a diversis* doth imply, that both the divers parts might be found in one and the same subject that some persons may be notorious offenders (as known Atheists, mockers of Religion, Idolaters, Papists, Heretics, witches), and yet profess before men the faith.

But this seemeth to me to imply a contradiction. For Atheists, mockers of religion, and witches do not profess the faith, but renounce it. Idolaters, Papists, and Heretics do not profess the true faith, but subvert the foundations of it.

Nevertheless I deny not, but that in some sense, any such notorious offender may have the essence and being of a member of the Church, as visible, to wit, in this sense, a corrupt and rotten member, fit to be cut off. A member of the visible Church (though formerly an inoffensive professor of the faith) may afterwards fall away into any of these notorious scandals, and yet for a while still retain the essence and being of a member of the Church as visible, to wit, till the Church have orderly proceeded against him; otherwise the Church should want power to proceed to the excommunication of such a notorious delinquent. For what hath the Church to do, to judge men without? 1 *Corinthians* 5:12. But such within the Church are to be cast out: 1 *Corinthians* 5:11. And if

16

such were tolerated in a Church, a Christian man should have little comfort to join in fellowship with such a Church, or to continue long in it, if joined.

For take this 4th Conclusion (as it is here expressed by the Author, and to his intent) and apply it to a civil Society, and see if it be not deceitful and dangerous: though I believe he himself neither intend deceit, nor danger to the Church in it. Howsoever rebels and traitors, robbers and murderers, are not to be received into the civil Society of the common-wealth, until they give in security of their good behaviour: nor to be tolerated in the common-wealth, but to be cut off, and executed: yet there is nothing more required, as touching the essential properties or nature of being members of a common-wealth, but that they be born and live in it, that they profess subjection to the laws and government before men, and desire the liberties of subjects, and crave fellowship with the common-wealth. And therefore a Country consisting of such is a true visible common-wealth, and a man coming amongst them, ought to join with them; and being of them, ought not to separate from them.

But who seeth not, there is abroad difference between these two, what is essentially required, to make men members of a society (fit and ripe to be cut off): and what is necessarily required to make men such members of a society, whereunto a man ought to join himself, and unto whom, being joined he ought not to separate himself from them?

SECTION III.

REHEARSING AND AVOIDING MR RUTHERFORD'S ARGUMENTS FOR HIS 4TH CONCLUSION.

But as if this 4th Conclusion (such as it is) were the very staffe and state of the controversy, Mr *Rutherford* proveth it by six Arguments:

1. *From the manner of receiving members in the Apostolic Church, where Ananias, and Sapphira (hypocrites) and Simon Magus (not long before a sorcerer) were received into the Church.*

2. *From the estate of the visible Church planted and constituted lawfully, which is as a Draw-net (wherein are fishes of all sorts): or as an*

17

house wherein are all sorts of vessels, precious and base, or as a Barn-store, wherein is wheat and chaff.

3. *From the right constitution of such a true Church, where the man without the wedding garment came in to the marriage of the King's son, Matthew 22.*

4. *From the right constitution of the Church of Israel, who were God's holy and chosen people, and yet because of back-sliders and revolters amongst them, a perverse and crooked generation, an whorish people, an harlot city, full of murderers.*

5. *From the right constitution of the Church of the Jews, which was the Lord's vineyard, and building, of whom was salvation, who had Moses his chair amongst them, &c. and yet were blind guides, Persecuted Christ, killed the Prophets, &c.*

6. *From the right constitution of the Churches planted by the Apostles, as that of Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Thyatira, Sardis, Laodicea: where many wicked persons were found, as Demas, Hymeneus, &c.*

Answer. But all these Arguments do prove no more, than what we willingly grant, namely, these two things:

1. That hypocrites, and false brethren may creep into the Church, yea into the purest Churches.

2. That such hypocrites, and false brethren may afterwards break forth into open notorious scandals, yea and may (at least for a time) be tolerated in them, and yet not take away the nature and essence of a true visible Church.

Of these things there is no controversy. But none of all these Arguments do prove any one of these three things:

1. That these Churches did receive any open scandalous persons into their communion without profession of their repentance: or that they did tolerate them in the Church with God's allowance. It is true, *Philip* received *Simon Magus* who had been a great sorcerer: but did not *Simon* renounce his devellesh art and profession, before he was baptized; as well as those of like profession? *Acts* 19:18–20.

2. These Arguments do not prove, that a Christian man was bound in conscience to join himself unto such a Church where such notorious scandals were tolerated, in case he had opportunity and liberty to join himself to some other Church who walked more faithfully according to the order of the Gospel.

It is true indeed, whilst the Church of Israel, or of the Jews

18

stood in fellowship of covenant with God, there was no other Church under heaven, to which a faithful proselyte might join. For Israel was not only God's people, but his peculiar people by covenant: and therefore until they renounced the covenant, and Christ the surety of the covenant, God could not take any other into Church fellowship with him: and so all religious proselytes must join to them, or live out of Church fellowship. But the case is not so now: now, no one Gentile-church is a peculiar people to God; other Gentile churches are God's people, as well as they. If a Christian man see swarms of Atheists, and Epicures, Idolaters, and

adulterers tolerated in one Church, he may lawfully forbear his joining with them, and join to another more pure.

3. Neither do those Arguments prove, that a member of such a Church, where such notorious scandals are tolerated, may not after all good means of reformation used in vain, withdraw himself from such a Church, and join to another more purely administered, if such another may be found, and fellowship with it orderly obtained. When the golden calves were erected in Israel, and the true Priests were cast out of their office, the godly Priests left their possessions, and employments in the synagogues, and went up to Jerusalem; and such as set their hearts to seek the Lord, came up after them out of all the tribes of Israel, unto Jerusalem to worship the Lord God of their fathers, *2 Chronicles* 11:13–16. And may not Christians now go and do likewise, in the like case?

SECTION V.

DECLARING THE STATE OF THE QUESTION ACCORDING TO OUR APPREHENSION.

When I seek the true state of the Question in our brethren of the Presbyterian way, I do not satisfy myself in the clear apprehension of their judgments. For when they speak, what ought to be (*de jure*) the qualification of Church-members, they speak safely and holily, that the members of the Church ought to be *Saints by calling*, yea and sincerely also to answer their calling.

But when they speak *de facto*, what members are found to be even in the purest Churches, they say, they are often found to be

19

hypocrites, and some notoriously scandalous, both in judgement and practise: and yet the essence of a true Church preserved.

Neither do we dissent from them in both these Propositions, although they are pleased to dispute against us in defence of this latter, which we never denied.

Nor would I father, of fasten any tenents upon them, which themselves might not own. I shall therefore content myself, to declare our own judgement about this point, in 2. Propositions: wherein also if they concur with us, we are then agreed in that which Mr *Bayly counteth the weightieth point of difference between us*, and shall bless the Lord for such harmony. But if they dissent in either, then there lieth the pinch of the state of the Question.

1. The first Proposition is this; Such persons, and such only, are lawfully received as members into the fellowship of the visible Church, who do before the Lord, and his people, profess their repentance, and faith in Christ and subjection to him in his ordinances: and do not scandalize their profession, with an unchristian conversation.

2. The 2nd. Proposition is this; That such as are born and baptized members of the Church, are not orderly continued, and confirmed members of the Church, unless when they grow up to years, they do before the Lord and his people, profess their repentance, and faith in Christ Jesus, and subjection to him in his ordinances: and do not scandalize their profession with an unchristian conversation.

When I say they may not be confirmed, I mean they may not be admitted to the seal of the Lord's Supper (which is a sacrament of communion), and so are not to be admitted to all other rights of a Church-member, as the election of officers, admission of members, censure of offenders.

From both these, Propositions, three others follow as necessity.

1. That ignorant persons (grossly ignorant) of the first principles, and foundations of Religion, are not to be received members into the Church: or if born in the Church, yet so continuing in ignorance to their ripe age, they are not to be continued Members.

For such cannot make profession of their faith, which they

20

know not. Hence *Paul* counted it a shame to the Church of *Corinth*, that some of their members had not the knowledge of God, 1 *Corinthians* 15:34.

2. Atheists, Witches, Papists, and a Heretics, who either deny the faith, or profess a false faith against the foundation of Christian Religion, they are not to be received members into the fellowship of the Church, without repentance and reformation.

For such profess not the faith of Christ, but either no faith, or a false faith.

3. Persons notoriously scandalous for any gross crime (as Idolatry, adultery, fornication, drunkenness, oppression, perjury, profaness, lying), are not to be received into the Church, nor continued in it.

For such though they profess the faith of Christ, and subjection to him: yet in their works, they deny him, and scandalize their profession with an unchristian conversation. And therefore much less are they to

be compelled by any Ecclesiastical or Civil censures either to join themselves to the Church, or to continue in the Church, or to be confirmed in Church-estate by partaking in the communion of the Lord's Supper.

CHAPTER II.

PROPUNDING THE REASONS AND GROUNDS OF OUR JUDGEMENT AND PRACTICE.

SECTION I.

I. Our first reaction may be given from the pattern of the Church of the Old testament. The Church of Israel was at first planted visibly and eminently in *Abraham's* family: he and his seed being received into covenant with God, and called to the fellowship of the seal thereof, in circumcision. But when *Ishmael*, though a member of this Church, and circumcised, grew up to a profane mocking of the seed of the promise (in mocking *Isaac*) he was cast out of the Church, as unworthy to continue in that holy fellowship, *genesis* 21:9–10.

The like might justly have been the censure of *Esau* for, his profanness, and fornication; *Hebrews* 12:16. And therefore

21

through his father was indulgent to him: yet God's hand cut him off from the inheritance both of the birth-right, and of the blessing, *Hebrews* 12:16–17. Whence it was that himself was deprived of Church-fellowship, and his posterity deprived both of Church-fellowship, and of the seal of the Covenant, and blessing, which was circumcision. And so *Jeremiah* reckoneth up *Edom* amongst the nations uncircumcised, *Jeremiah* 9:26.

In Jacob's family, although his blessing reached beyond the blessing of his ancestors, (*Genesis* 49:26), to all his Children, so as that they and their posterity were all of them admitted into the fellowship of the Church: and though they had expiatory sacrifices amongst them even for known scandalous offences, which being offered might keep sundry of them in the Church, who otherwise might justly deserve cutting off from the congregation: yet even in the Church of *Israel*, there was order taken for the excommunication of scandalous offenders, as is proved at large by a judicious and learned Minister of Edinburgh, Mr *Gillespi*, in *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, book I. *Ca.* 6. & *ca.* 12. Whatsoever therefore is alledged from the pattern of the Church of *Israel*, for the lawful constitution of a Church, where many notorious scandalous persons are found, it only argueth the sinful neglect of Church-discipline in the toleration of such public scandals

in the Church: and it may also argue the continuance, of their Church-estate notwithstanding such toleration; but it, doth not argue the lawful constitution of the Church of such persons, nor the lawful toleration of such offenders in it.

Besides, that such as were members of the Church of *Israel* (even born members) were to profess their faith and obedience before the Lord, and his people, may appear from the order of confession appointed by God himself, *Deuteronomy 26*, throughout, where every Israelite when he brought his first-fruits and tithes, he was to make confession before the Lord, and the Priest, at the tabernacle of the Congregation, of the low and perishing estate of his father, *Jacob*, of their affliction in *Ægypt*, of their redemption out of it by the mighty hand of God, and of the faithfulness and goodness of God in giving them that land; And withal, they were to make profession of their obedience to the Commandments of God (verse 14), and in thus doing, they professed

22

and avouched the Lord to be their God: and the Lord avouched them to be his People, verses 17–18.

And that the like or greater care was had of the profession and conversation of such proselytes, as were admitted into the Church of *Israel*, I will not go about to show out of the Jewish writers; were not eye-witnesses thereof, as living after those times. But the Prophecy of *Isaiah* may abundantly suffice to show, what manner of persons were rightly accepted to be proselytes both in the old and new Testament; such they were, at joined themselves to the Lord, to serve him, to love his Name, to be his servants, keeping his Sabbaths, and taking hold of his Covenant, *Isaiah 56:6–7*.

SECTION II. ARGUMENT II.

2. A 2nd Argument tending to clear what manner of persons are to be received members of the Church, may be taken from *John's* Baptism, for he received none to his Baptism, but such as confessed their sins, and therewith professed their repentance, and faith in Christ, who was to come after him, whence also his Baptism was called, *The baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins, Matthew 3:6, Acts 19:4. Luke 3:3*. Whence the Argument ariseth thus.

Such whom a Gospel-ministry would refuse, and withhold, from Baptism, such ought not to be received into Church fellowship.

But the ministry of the Gospel would refuse, and withhold scandalous persons from Baptism, and receive none but such as professed faith and repentance.

Therefore scandalous persons, are not to be received to Church-fellowship, but such as profess faith and repentance.

The former Proposition (the major) is granted on all hands. For such as may not partake in any seal of Church-fellowship, may not partake in Church-fellowship. The latter is proved by the instance of *John Baptist*, who baptized all that came to him, confessing their sins, and professing repentance, whether Publicans, soldiers, or other people. But when he saw many of the

23

Pharisees and Sadducees come to his Baptism, he refused them with a reproof, *O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to fly from the wrath to come? Matthew 3:7.*

Objection. But John did receive these Pharisees and Sadducees to his Baptism, though he did entertain them with such a sharp reproof.

Answer. It seemeth to me incredible, contradictory to the very style of *John's* baptism, that he should administer the baptism of repentance, and yet baptise impenitent persons, a generation of vipers; unless baptism were given not to seal up our initiation into Christ, but to beget it, which orthodox Divinity doth reject, it is not credible that *John* would cast holy things to dogs, or pearls to swine: or that he would make the Temple of God, a den not only of thieves, but (which is worse) of vipers. It is far more credible, that the speech of the Evangelist (*Luke 7:29-30*): reached to these Pharisees as well as others, that all the people and the Publicans, who heard *John*, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of *John*: but the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, and were not baptized of him. Holy *Augustine* is most clear in this point, that neither *John Baptist* admitted any open scandalous persons to his baptism, nor that in the Church of Christ any should be received unto baptism who live in any sinful course, till they possess repentance and reformation. And for that purpose wrote a whole book, entitled, *De Fide & operibus* extant in his 4th Tome.

SECTION III. ARGUMENT III.

3. A 3rd Argument (Or rather, a 3rd head of Arguments) may be taken from the estate and condition of the members of the Apostolic Churches,

which because they are expressed more at large in the way of the Churches (*Chapter 3, Section 3.*) I shall here briefly rehearse them, and clear them from such exceptions, as have been made against them by our brethren of the Presbyterial way.

The 1 Reason there, was taken from the near relation, between the church, and the Lord Jesus, with the other persons of the Trinity. The Lord Jesus is the head of the Church, even of ther visible Church: and the

24

visible Church is the body of Christ Jesus 1 Corinthians 12:27. The visible Church is said to be the habitation of God by the Spirit, Ephesians 2:22. To be the temple of the holy Ghost, and the Spirit of God to dwell in them, 1 Corinthians 3:16–17. to be espoused to Christ, as a chaste virgin, 2 Corinthians 11:2. The members of the visible Church are said to be sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty: 2 Corinthians 6:18, and are exhorted to be followers of God, as dear children: Ephesians 5:1. Now how can the visible Church be called the members of the body of Christ, or the spouse of Christ, or the temple of the holy Ghost, or the sons and daughters of the heavenly Father, except the members in charitable discretion be (as indeed the holy Ghost describeth them to be) Saints by calling? 1 Corinthians 1:2, and faithful brethren, Colossians 1:2, and that not only by external profession (for these are too high styles for hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

This Reason cast into form runneth thus; if particular (or visible) Churches stand in so near relation unto Christ, as members to their head, spouses to their husband; unto the holy Ghost as his temples: to the Father, as his sons and daughters: then we cannot lawfully receive any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion may be esteemed Saints by calling, and faithful brethren.

But the former is true: therefore the latter. The connexion of the major Proposition Mr *Rutherford* would grant, if Christ were the head of the visible Church as visible. And so I intend it that Christ is the head of the Church, not only as invisible, but visible also. But this he denieth; *For, saith he, that Christ is the head of the visible Church, as visible, is not in all the word of God.*

I would not here strain at words. There may be a fallacy, in affirming Christ to be head of the visible Church, as visible. For then it would follow, that he is not only the head of every visible Church (which may well pass): but also that he is the head only of the visible Church, and so not of the invisible. But that is far from my meaning: and I hope, far from

his intention to fasten it upon us. But this I say, that Christ is the head of the Church, as the Church, whether it be considered as invisible, or visible. For even the Church considered as visible is the kingdom of Christ; for so the Church is called the kingdom of heaven, when it is compared to a field, wherein are tares, and wheat, to a draw-net, wherein are good fish, and bad: virgins wise and foolish

servants profitable and slothfull: *Matthew* 13:24 and 47 and 25:1-2,14. And who is the head and King of this kingdom, but Christ? The Laws of this Kingdom, are his statutes: the officers of his Kingdom are his servants: the people of this kingdom, are his subjects by professed subjection: the ordinances administered in this kingdom are his Institutions: the censures are the judgements of his mouth, which maketh me to marvel, how Mr *Rutherford* could allow himself liberty to deny *Christ to be head of the Church, as visible, and that his leadership thereto is not in all the word of God*. But therefore in a few words after he qualifyeth his speech; *In a large sense (saith he) Christ may be called the head of the Church visible, a visible in regard of the influence of common graces for the ministry, government, and use of the keys.*

Lut this maketh me still the more to marvel, that so judicious and learned a man should advisedly and deliberately, *make Christ the head of the visible Church (as visible) only in regard of the influence of common graces*. For are there not in the visible Church, as visible, as well visible Saints, as visible Hypocrites? And is Christ an head in the visible Church to visible Saints, only in regard of the influence of common graces? Where then must they seek the influence of Christ in saving graces, if not in the visible Ministry, and keys of the Church? Is not this to evacuate the saving benefit of living in visible Church-fellowship under visible Ministry, visible Sacraments, and censures? Where did all the Saints of God receive their saving graces of conversion, faith, repentance, sanctification, but in attendance upon Christ the head, in the visible use of visible Church-ordinances? Is not this to send the Saints of God to visible Churches only for influence of common graces: but for saving grace, they must resort to deserts and secret chambers? *Matthew* 24:26. I believe the pious heart of Mr *Rutherford* abhorreth such horrid, and enthusiastical inferences. But let him therefore disclaim such Anti-evangelical Positions, on which these inferences (for ought I see) do unavoidably follow. No marvel, if deluded Sectaries sleight ordained Ministers, and all public-visible Church-

ordinances, when no greater benefit can be expected from them (in the judgements of the greatest Divines of this Age), but the influence of common graces.

But from hence, that Christ is the head of the Church visible as visible, in respect of the influence of common graces; it followeth (saith he) that

26

to be admitted members of the Church under Christ the head, there is not required a union with Christ the head, according to the influence of the life of Christ, but only an union with Christ as head according to the influence of common gifts. In which respect, Christ may be called the head of Judas the traitor, and of some other hypocritical professors. And also though the promiscuous multitude, that is, a multitude of profane Atheists, and scandalous mockers be not members of Christ, nor are to be acknowledged as his members, but to be excommunicated: yet the promiscuous multitude of professors, whereof there be prostrate and elect, good and bad, are to be received, and acknowledged as members of Christ's visible body, whereof he is the head in this latter sense.

Reply 1. It hath been proved already, that Christ is the head of the visible Church, as visible, not only according to the influences of common graces, but according to the influence of the life of Christ. And therefore it will unavoidably follow, that howsoever some plea may be made for hypocrites: yet profane Atheists, and scandalous mockers (and I may add also, gross ignorant persons) are not to be received, as members of Christ's visible body. For they have no spiritual communion with Christ as head, neither according to the influence of saving life, nor according to the influence of common graces. The Argument runneth plain.

They that have no spiritual communion with Christ, they should not be received as members of the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

But profane Atheists, and scandalous mockers, and grossly ignorant persons have no spiritual communion with Christ (neither according to the influence of saving graces, nor of common gifts): and therefore such persons as are not to be received members of that body the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

And Mr *Rutherford* himself expressly acknowledgeth, that such grossly scandalous are to be excommunicated. Whence it will also unavoidably follow, that if they appear to be such before they be received, they ought not to be received. The Argument is plain:

Such as being members ought to be excommunicated, or cast out of Church-communion, they being out of the Church ought not to be received into Church-communion.

But profane Atheists, and scandalous mockers, being members,

27

ought to be excommunicate, and cast out of Church-communion.

Therefore they ought not to be received into Church-communion.

Reply 2. As for hypocrites, the case is otherwise. They may be received members into the Church, not because they have fellowship with Christ the head, only according to the influence of common gifts, but because having received some spiritual gifts (though common) they are able to profess before men the exercise of saving gifts also, and so cannot easily be discerned from mere hypocrisy, but may pass in the judgement of charitable discretion for sincere professors. But if their hypocrisy were openly known, by any such evidence as might convince them to lie in an estate of hypocrisy, then I conceive, they ought not to be received into the Church. The hypocrisy of *Simon* was not at first discerned by *Philip*: and therefore he believing (though with a temporary faith) and professing his faith, as did others, he was received, and baptized. But when his hypocrisy was afterwards discerned by *Peter*, to be a reigning sin in him (for he went about to turn grace itself into merchandise) then *Peter* accursed him from God and renounced him from just interest in Church-fellowship; *Thy money (saith he) perish with thee: thou hast neither part, nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God, Acts 8:20-21.*

And that hypocrites if they be known to be such, should not be received into the fellowship of the Church; it may appear from hence, that hypocrites are called false brethren, and said to come in privily into the fellowship of the Saints, *Galatians 2:4*. Whereas if they had lawful right to enter in, they should not be called false brethren: nor need they to creep in, the gates of the Church would be set wide open to them with one accord. So *Jude* also describeth the like hypocrites, as creeping in unawares, *Jude 4*. Which could not have been said of them, if open access into the Church were granted freely to hypocrites, as well as to others.

Whereupon it was, that in shutting up this Argument, touching the gracious qualifications of Church-members taken from the high styles given them in in regard of their near relation, to Christ, to the holy Ghost, to the Father, *I said such titles were too*

28

high stiles for hypocrites, as being peculiar to Saints and faithful brethren, not only in some extrrnal profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Not but that Saints by external profession (who often prove no better then hypocrites) may be admitted: nor because hypocrites, when they declare themselves to be hypocrites, do forthwith *ipso facto*, cease to be Church-members. but because *de jure*, all Church-members ought to be Saints, and faithful brethren: And those that have the keys of the Church, should not open the door to any, but such as in charitable discretion, they conceive to be better than hypocrites, even Saints by calling, and faithful brethren; and yet not with such rigid examination, as to discourage broken-hearted Christians, for as I there said, better 99 hypocrites should perish by presumption, then one humble soul should sink under discouragement, or despair.

If it be said, But why way not hypocrites (even known hypocrites) be received as members into the body of the Church, Whereof Christ is the head, *seeing they have union with Christ the head, according to the influence of common gifts.*

Answer. It is not union with Christ according to the influence of common gifts, that maketh a man fit for the fellowship of the body of Christ in his visible Church. For such members are but dead members: and dead members in the body, like dead branches in the vine, God will cut off, and not engraft, or purge: *John 15:2,6.* And such as have a name to live, but are dead, Christ will come on them, not as an head to guide them, but as a thief to destroy them: *Revelation 2:2-3*, yea and to destroy the Church with them, when they grow numerous, *Isaiah 9:17.*

Hitherto I have only returned a Reply to Mr *Rutherford's* first Answer to the Argument taken from the high stiles given to Church-members, in regard of their near relation to Christ, they being to him, as members to an head; wherein I have been the more large, that I might be the more plain in so weighty a cause, And there be who do tax some of us for reservedness and obscurity, which I therefore do studiously decline.

2. His 2nd Answer is, *That our Argument proceedeth upon a false ground, before observed and discovered, that Christ is the head of the Church, the Spouse, redeemer, and Saviour of the visible Churchas it is*

29

visible: which is the Arminian doctrine of universal grace.

Reply. Where he hath before observed and discovered that false ground, that Christ is the head, and husband of the Church as visible; it hath been there declared, that he is the head and husband of the Church as well visible, as invisible. Visible or invisible is not attended as the formal object of Christ's headship, or espousage, or redemption, or salvation. Christ is tht Redeemer and Saviour of his elect, whether the fruits of their election be visible or not. And he is the head and Spouse of his Church, and of the true and sincere members of it, though they do make visible profession of their covenant with him, and of their relation to him in the sight of all men.

As for those (whom Mr *Rutherford* speaketh of) *profane Atheists, scandalous mockers, dissembling hypocrites*, we are so far from the Arminian Doctrine to extend universal grace to them, that we would not extend to them the common grace of external fellowship in the visible Church, if we discerned them evidently to be such.

3. His 3rd Answer to our Argument is this, *If those who are conceived sound believers, members of Christ the head, are to be admitted members into the Church, why do you not admit men of such approved piety, as members into your Churches, except they swear to your Church-government, which you cannot make good from the word of God? New to refuse communion to these, who are known to be members of Christ's body, and to separate from them is all one. And therefore in this, you separate yourselves from Christ's body.*

Reply. Mr *Rutherford* is very wrongfully informed, that we refute communion, or admission of any sound believer, or member of Christ, or any of approved Piety into our Churches, especially upon any such ground, because they will not swear to our Church-government,

For 1. we require no man to swear to our Church-government at all: nor ever did that I know. Neither do we so much as require, that they should profess their approbation of our Government: but only that they profess their subjection to Christs government in his Church, according to the order of the Gospel.

2. We refuse to admit no man of approved piety into the

30

fellowship of our Churches, if he be willing to accept it: yea we rather encourage him, and persuade him to it. Only it is true, we do not compel any man to join with us, against his will, as knowing Christ accepteth a willing people, *Psalms* 110:3. It is not we therefore that separate from such, but they from us.

Whether or no we can make good our Church- government from God's word though he be pleased to deny it, and ourselves see no cause of presuming on our own strength: Yet we believe on the Lord Jesus Christ (who is the head and King of true Church-government) that himself will bear witness from heaven to that government, which his Gospel hath, taught us; and will also in due time give us strength, and opportunity, to make good from his word, what we practice according to it; or else we live not by faith in Church order, but by fancy. Meanwhile, as we believe, we speak, we never yet read, or heard, any such exceptions against our Church-government, as might give us just ground to scruple it.

Mr *Rutherford* proceedeth (in pages 257, 258, 259. of his *Due Right of Presbyteries*) to give some further Answers to other branches of the Argument which we took from the high style given to Church-members in regard of their near relation, to Christ, to the holy Ghost, and to the Father, which were all mentioned above, in the propounding of our 3rd Argument; where the visible Church is said to be *the habitation of God by the Spirit*, Ephesians 2:22. *To be the temple of the holy Ghost, and the Spirit of God to dwell in them:* 1 Corinthians 3:16-17. *To be espoused to Christ as a chaste virgin*, 2 Corinthians 11:2. *To be the sons and daughters of the Lord God almighty:* 2 Corinthians 6:18, &c. *Now how can the visible Church be the habitation of the Spirit, the Spouse of Christ, &c. unless they be in charitable discerning (as indeed the holy Ghost describeth them to be) Saints by calling:* 1 Corinthians 1:2, and faithful brethren: Colossians 1:2, and that not only in external profession (for these are too high styles for hypocrites), but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

This argument we cast into form in the propounding of it above. But Mr Rutherford here casteth it into another form for us, thus.

Those only we are to admit members of the visible Church, who in the judgment of charity are conceived to be such, as were the members of the visible Church of Corinth and Ephesus.

31

But only such as were the habitation of God by his Spirit (not only in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth) were the members of the visible Church of Corinth and Ephesus.

Therefore such only are we to admit to be members of the visible Church.

This form of Argument is different from what I intended and propounded above, which runs thus:

In particular (or visible) Churches stand in so near relation to Christ, as members to their head, and spouses to their husband: unto the holy Ghost, as his temples, and habitation: to the Father, as his sons and daughters: then we cannot lawfully receive any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion may be esteemed, Saints by calling, and faithfull brethren.

But the former is true: therefore the latter.

But if a categorical Form may seem more acceptable, take it thus:

Such members, and such only are we to admit into our Churches, as in charitable discretion we judge suitable to the pattern of the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles.

But the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles, were such as they in charitable discretion judged, to be Saints by calling, faithful brethren (and particularly to be the temples of the holy Ghost, the members, and spouses of Christ, the sons and daughters of God Almighty). Therefore such members, and such only are we to admit into our Churches, and we do in charitable discretion judge to be Saints, by calling, faithful brethren, temples of the holy Ghost, &c.

To the Argument Mr *Rutherford* returneth four Answers.

Answer 1. This Argument (saith he) concludeth not the Question: for it proceedeth only upon our conception, that we are to admit members only of the visible Church, as we judge or conceive to be the spouse of Christ, and truly regenerate.

Now if our conception be erroneous (as it cannot be infallible), then we may admit those that are not regenerate, if we conceive them to be regenerate.

Very true, we readily grant it.

But the (saith he) our brethren say falsly, that the members admitted

32

must be Saints, and faithful, not only in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Reply. We say not falsly in either of these: for both are true; the members of the Churches must be Saints, that is, *de jure*, ought to be Saints, not only in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth. Therefore we may not lawfully admit any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion we judge to be Saints, and faithful in some measure of sincerity and truth. It is true, that he saith the Church may be deceived, and the Apostolic Churches were themselves deceived, yea and the Apostles themselves also in the discerning of the spiritual estate of *Ananias*, and *Sapphira*, *Simon Magus*, and such like, at their first admission. Neither

doth God require either of the Apostles, or Churches, either then, or now, that we should be able to know the hearts of men (which is God's own peculiar attribute). But yet in judgement of charity, they conceived them all to be Saints, and faithful, whom they admitted, whom they did admit them. If those whom they admitted declined afterwards, from their holy profession, and declared themselves by their fruits to be scandalous hypocrites, the Apostles did accordingly proceed against them either by ordinary or extraordinary censures.

2. His 2nd Answer is, the assumption is false, for the Apostles admitted to be members of the Church visible at Corinth, and Ephesus, not only Saints by true profession, but also carnal men, deniers of the resurrection, partakers of the tables of devils: and in Ephesus, false apostles, and liars: Revelation 2:3.

Reply. It is true, the Assumption is false, to wit, the Assumption which he miscollected: but not the Assumption which our Argument rightly framed, holdeth forth, which was this, before expressed:

That the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles, were such as they in charitable discretion judged to be Saints, and faithful brethren (and particularly, the temples of the holy Ghost) &c.

And for such the Apostle doth expressly acknowledge them: 1 *Corinthians* 1:2, *Ephesians* 2:22.

That some of them fell away afterwards into the denial of

33

the resurrection, or into fellowship of Idolaters, at the Table of Devils, it doth no more argue, that they were such, and so carnal, when they were first admitted into the Church, than it doth argue, that the incestuous *Corinthians* lived in incest with his Mother in *Law*, when he was first received into the Church: or if he so lived that it was publicly known.

It doth not appear in the Text, that *Paul* admitted into the Church of *Ephesus*, false Apostles and Liars, the Text alledged, (*revelation* 2:2-3) saith no such thing: but only, that the Angel (that is, the Eldership) of the Church of *Ephesus*, tried them, which said they were Apostles, and were not, and found them liars.

But whether they tried them before their entrance into the Church, or after, it doth not appear.

If they tried them before, and found them Liars, and so rejected them, it is that which we readily approve. If after, it must be proved they were false Apostles in their first entrance, and that *Paul* was more remiss in

trying them, and admitting them into their first entrance, than the Elders were, who tried and discovered them afterwards.

But in case these false Apostles were Members of the Church, when the Elders tried them, and found them such (to give the Apostle the honour due to his vigilance and faithfulness) I dare be bold to say, they did not appear to the Apostle to be false Brethren, much less false Apostles, when he received them into the Church (if they were received by him at all) but to him they appeared as *Demas* did, when at first he accounted him, his fellow-helper, *Philemon* 24, though afterwards, he proved a deserter, 2 *Timothy* 4:10. Sure I am, *paul* doth foretell to the Elders of *Ephesus*, that after his departure, grievous wolves should enter in amongst them, not sparing the Flock. Also (saith he) of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw Disciples after them, *Acts* 20:29–30.

If after his departure Wolves entered in amongst them, then he did not himself admit them.

And if out of themselves, some were to arise speaking perverse things, then they were not risen amongst them before his departure: at least none were discerned to be so risen.

34

Objection. But when Paul giveth the Church and members of Corinth such spiritual Styles, he speaketh of them according to the best part. For the epistle and Doctrine of the Covenant is written and preached for the elect's sake, and for believers, &c. nor do the Promises of the Covenant indeed, and in God's intention belong to the visible Church, though the word be preached to carnal men for their conviction.

Reply. I trust will not deny that the word is preached to carnal men for their conversion also, as well as for their conviction: unless they be not only carnal, but reprobate. And surely sundry parts of his Epistle are directed to the Instruction and reformation of the partakers at Idol's Tables, and of the Deniers of the resurrection: of whom to say, that they were all Reprobates, or carnal men destitute of all Spiritual life, or that the word was written only for their conviction, and not for their unfeigned repentance, it is more than can be justified. Godly men may fall far and foul, both in judgement and practice. I know no reason, but that the true Saints in *Corinth*, lately converted from *Paganry*, might as easily fall to deny the resurrection, as *Peter* to deny the death & resurrection of Christ Jesus, *Matthew* 16:21–22. Nor do I see why the like Saints at *Corinth*, might not as well fall to partake with Idolaters, at the Table of Devils, as

Solomon converse in conjugal communion, with his Idolatrous wives, yea and erect Temples to their Idols and Devils, and to maintain their Tables at an excessive charge, and yet he still retain his Saint-ship, and they theirs?

3. *His third answer is by affirming this Proposition to be false, those only we are to admit to the visible Church, whom we conceive to be Saints, and so are persuaded of them in the judgement of Charity.*

For the Apostles did admit all Professors, even 3,000 at one Sermon in one day, Acts 2. And they could not be persuaded in the judgement of Charity, that they were all Saints.

Reply. If Mr *Rutherford* can as well prove that the Proposition to be false, as he doth affirm it to be false, we must without tergiversation or evasion, yield the cause. But the reason he giveth of the falsehood of it, is only his bare assertion upon a weak foundation.

That the Apostles did admit all Professors, because they admitted even 3,000 at one sermon in one day. Acts 2, of whom they could not be persuaded in the judgement of charity, that they were all Saints.

35

Reply 1. If they did admit all Professors, then it doth not appear, that they did admit all opposers, and oppugners, any scandalous, or grossly ignorant persons, nor Atheists, nor any profane mockers, whose admittance was too far excused above by himself.

Reply 2. It is too broad an affection, that the Apostles did admit all Professors, if it be extended to such as profess Christ with their mouths, but in their works do deny him; or if profession be extended to all such, as do ordinarily hear the word, and crave Fellowship with the Church in the Sacraments. There is no ground of any such latitude of admission in all the New-Testament.

As for those 3,000 which the Apostles admitted after one Sermon, in one day: There is no ground of any such latitude of admission in all the New-Testament.

As for those 3,000 which the Apostles admitted after our Sermon, in our day: they were not such as only heard that Sermon, but were pricked in their hearts at the hearing of it: and so pricked not as *Stephen's* hearers, to kick at it (*Acts 7:54*) but lovingly and reverently to submit themselves to the instruction and direction of them that wounded them, saying to *Peter*, & other the Apostles, Men and Brethren, what shall we do? *Acts 2:37*. And when they were instructed, and exhorted to repent, and be

baptized into the name of Christ, and to save themselves from that froward generation, they gladly received his word, verse 41. And that in a time, when the receiving of the Word was perillous. And these are said to have continued steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and Fellowship, verse 42, to part with their possessions, for the maintenance of the Church, verses 44–45, and to eat their meat together with gladness and singleness of heart, verse 46, yea of the same persons, and of others joined to them it is soon after said, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and were all of one heart, and one Soul, *Acts* 4:31–32. These are not the Characters of all Professors, but of Saints: nor can it be argued from the Apostles admission of such, that they admitted all Professors: but such only of whom they were well persuaded in the judgment of charity, that they were all Saints. What though *Ananias* and *Sapphira*

36

Sapphira proved afterwards, not sincere Saints, but Hypocrites? yet there is no colour from the Text, but in judgement of charity, they were conceived to be Saints when they were admitted as well as others. *Judas* a long time was as well thought of, amongst the Disciples, as his fellow-Apostles. *Demos* was as well accounted *Paul's* fellow-labourer, as *Marcus*, or *Aristarchus*, or *Lucas*, *Philemon* 19.

Nor is it any just impeachment of their Saint-ship, that so many of them (even 3,000) were wrought upon in one Sermon, in one day (as Mr *Rutherford* intimateth), for Christ being newly ascended into Heaven, and sitting at the right hand of his Father, it was meet he should put forth more power in his Ordinances, in their first administration, than afterwards.

Kings newly crowned do Spargere ///// & ?????, more abundantly, than in the folloowing course of their reign.

I conceive the words of *David* in *Psalms* 110:3, do most fitly and plainly foretell this large increase of the Church, by the first Ministers, when he said, that the Dew (or fruit) of Christ's youth, was more than the dew brought forth by the womb of the morning.

For the place is an evident prophecy of the power of Christ put forth in the Ministry of his word (the Rod of his power) when he sat down first at his Father's right hand, and brought forth the fruits of his youth, as the Dew of the morning; it has been no great power to breed Hypocrites.

4. *His* 4th answer taketh exception against the Argument, for saying that all the visible Church of *Ephesus* (or *Corinth*) was a Spouse betrothed to Christ,

and Saints of calling, &c. which the word of God saith not: much less that they were all such, not only in profession, but also in some measure of sincerity and truth. It is true (saith he) the styles are too high for Hypocrites: but they are not given to the Church precisely, as visible, but as invisible, and true Church of believers. As when he calleth them Temples of the holy Ghost, Saints by calling, &c. He wrote to the incestuous Corinth amongst the rest, whom he commandeth to be cast out of the Church.

Reply. The Argument doth not say, that all the visible Church of *Ephesus* or *Corinth* were Spouses to Christ, or Saints by calling, or sons to God Almighty, not only in profession,

37

but in some measure of sincerity and truth: but that the Apostle in the judgement of charity, conceived them to be such: or else he would never have given them such high styles, as are not compatible to Hypocrites. Those (whom he instanceth in) who called themselves Apostles in *Ephesus*, and were found liars, (*Revelation 2:2-3*) they did not arrogate any such high place to themselves, when *Paul* wrote his Epistle the the *Ephesians*. Else the Holy-Ghost would as well have taxed that arrogance in them by his Pen, as Christ did afterwards by the conviction of the elders of *Ephesus*: yea the very proceeding of the Church of *Ephesus*, against those false Apostles, doth argue the Body of the Church, to be a sincere Spouse of Christ, and a Temple of the Holy-Ghost.

Reply 2. There is no crime taxed, by the Apostle, either in the Church of *Ephesus*, or *Corinth*, that doth convince any of the Members of either Church, to be no Saints, but Hypocrites.

It hath been shown above in the Agitation of this Argument, That Saints by calling have denied the resurrection, and have, been partakers of the Tables of Devils. And for the incestuous *Corinthian*: though the Apostle command him to be cast out of the Church: yet neither his crime nor his censure doth convince him to be an Hypocrite. He might be nevertheless a Saint by calling, and sincere in heart too, though in that Act, wicked, and scandalous in life. In the second Epistle, when *Paul* exhorteth the Church to restore him to former communion, he doth not speak of his censure, as the means of his first conversion to Christ, but only as the means of his humiliation, and repentance.

The incest which *Lot* committed with both his Daughters, was as Odious, and foul a sin, as that of the incestuous *Corinthian*, in dealing

his Mother-in-Law: yet the Scripture doth not brand him for an Hypocrite, but acknowledgeth him for a righteous soul, 2 *Peter* 2:8.

Reply 3. I cannot assent to that which Mr *Rutherford* saith, *That Paul writing to the visible Church of Corinth, doth not speak to them as a visible, but as an invisible Church, when he calleth them the Temples of the holy Ghost.* For *Paul* useth it as an Argument to the visible Church, and to all the Members of it (as well as to the invisible)

38

that they should renounce Fellowship with Idol's Temples, even from this style, for ye are (saith he) the Temple of the living God: and what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, 2 *Corinthians* 6:16. *Paul* when he writeth to *Timothy* about the Election and ordination of Elders and Deacons in the Church of *Ephesus*, and such other things pertaining to Church-Order, he therein looketh at *Ephesus* as a visible Church.

And yet when he summeth up the scope of his Epistle, these things (saith he) have I written to thee, That thou mightest know how to behave thyself in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of Truth, 1 *Timothy* 3:15. If the visible Church of *Ephesus*, as administered by Elders and Deacons was the House of God, it was also the Temple of the Holy Ghost. In the former place of the *Corinthians* (2 *Corinthians* 6:16) The Apostle argueth the Church of *Corinth* to be the Temple of the holy Ghost because the Lord said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them. And that very Act of Christ's walking in them, the Lord himself vouchsafeth to the seven visible Churches of *Asia*, *Revelation* 2:1, and the very truth is, if the visible Church of *Christ* as visible, were not the Temple of the Holy Ghost (even as it is a ministerial and governing Church) whence cometh all the spiritual efficacy and power, that is found in the Administration of the Word, and Sacraments, and Censures of the Church?

SECTION 4.

Having thus cleared our first Argument from the exceptions of Mr *Rutherford*, it will be requisite to clear it also from the exceptions of Mr *Baily*, in his dissuasive from the errors of the time, Chapter 7, page 163, to page 167. But yet I shall not need to repeat, what hath been already answered to Mr *Rutherford*: which would fulfil this Treatise with needless Tautologies.

The form which he casteth mine Argument into (which yet as he saith, is the best he can set upon it) he thus layeth down.

If every Member of each Church, is not only in profession, but in sincerity

39

and truth to be a Saint and faithful: then the body of each Church must make Trial, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every Person, before they receive him into the Church.

But every Member of each Church, is not only in Profession, but in sincerity and truth, to be a Saint and faithful.

Ergo, the Officers and Body of each Church, must make Trial, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every person, before they receive him into the Church.

Reply. This Syllogism is none but mine (but Mr *Bailyes*), nor can it be gathered from any words of mine, in the place whence he fetcheth it.

My words be these,

In the way of our Churches, Chapter 3, Section 3, page 56. *We receive none as Members into the Church, but such, (as according to the judgement of Charitable Christians) may be conceived to be received of God, into Fellowship with Christ, the head of the Church.*

Then follow our Reasons, from the near relation between Christ Jesus, and the Church, and the High styles which thereupon the Apostles give to visible Churches, and to their Members (*as Temples of the Holy Ghost, Spouses and Members of Christ, children of God Almighty*) which could not be given to them, except the Members in charitable discretion were such as the Holy Ghost describeth them) *Saints by calling (1 Corinthians 1:2) and faithful Brethren, Colossians 1:1-2) and that not only by external profession (for these are too high styles for Hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.*

When judgement of charity, and charitable discretion, are twice repeated, both in the laying down our position and in the conclusion of our Argument, methinks, if Christian candour, did not, yet logical reason should have enforced the expression of it, in the conclusion of his Syllogism: which had he done, he had wanted colour of just exception, at least, a great part of it.

For the argument then run thus (besides the true form which I intended and expressed above, page 52).

If the Church, and Members of the Church, ought to be Saints and faithful, not only in external profession but in Some measure of sincerity and truth: then the Elders and Brethren,

are not to receive any as Members into the church, but such as judgment and charity they conceive to be Saints and faithful.

But the Church and Members of the Church ought to be Saints and faithful, not only in external Profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Therefore the Elders and Brethren are not to receive any, as Members into the Church, but such as in judgment of charity, they conceive to be Saints, and faithful.

Let me now consider Mr *Bailyes* answer.

We answer (saith he) *no part of this argument is found: the Major, and Minor, and conclusion are vitious.*

The conclusion is two ways vitious,

1. *It commeth not near the question, which should infer a necessity to separate from a Church, which neglecteth the due Trial of their Members, and satisfaction of themselves in the true faith, and sanctification of their Members.*

If this be not concluded, this Arrow misseth the mark.

Reply. Mr *Baily* taketh his aim amiss if he think, we shoot our arguments (as Arrows) as such a mark.

The Question of Separation, is a distinct Question from this in hand: every delinquency in a Church (whether Offices, or members, or both) doth not forthwith put upon us a necessity of Separation, *Omnia prius tendanda*: necessity of Separation is the last remedy of gross and notorious scandals, after all good means, still remaining incurable. Nevertheless there may be a lawful expediency of removing from a more impure Church, to a more pure, without the necessity of separation, as hath been opened above, in clearing the state of the Question in hand with Mr *Rutherford*.

2. *The 2nd fault which Mr Baily findeth in the conclusion, is, That it concerneth not the Estate of reformed Churches, but the gathering of new Churches, or admission of Members into them. In which there may seem (saith he) to be some reason for the trial of their members before admission: but the reformed Churches, who take themselves to be so farre true, that they need no dissolution, or new erection, they are not concerned in this case of admission. For their members were born in the Church, and had the Covenant sealed to them in Baptism. What*

trial they take of their children, when they admit them to the Lord's Table, is no ways for their admission to be members.

Reply 1. If our conclusion do not concern the estate of reformed Churches, then I hope, it doth not reach the disturbance of them. What reason then had Mr *Baily* to say, *That our way of admission of members tendeth to dissolve, and unchurch all the reformed Churches?* But it seemeth, men transported with heat and disputation, will be put upon it by a wise hand of God, as well to oppose themselves, as their adversaries.

2. Though we acknowledge the children of the faithful, born and baptized in the Church to be members of th Church: yet we do believe, they ought not to be received as confirmed members of the Church, nor to be admitted to the Lord's Supper (which is a Sacrament of Confirmation) till they have professed their faith, and repentance, and subjection to the Gospel of Christ before the Church. Which doth not tend to the dissolving, or unchurching of all reformed Churches, but rather to their purifying, and reformation according to the primitive pattern, as *Bucer* wisely adviseth in his *Scripta Anglicana, censurâ de Confirmatione*. But of that we have spoken before, and may (God willing) more hereafter.

This practice is a pillar of purity, and piety, not any pillar, much less main pillar of Anabaptism (as Mr *Baily* calleth it) nor any ground of our sympathy or symbolizing with that Sect, as he saith. He is not ignorant (I suppose) that we are taxed for the contrary extreme, as being too rigid, and over-harsh to that Sect.

The major also (saith Mr Baily) is vitious: for suppose the antecedent were true (that every member of the Church is to be a Saint, and faithful, not only in profession, but in sincerity), yet it will not infer the consequent, that the offices and body of the Church must take trial, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every person, before they receive him into the Church.

Such a power in the people would make any one of them a Church-governor, &c.

Reply. It is Mr *Bailyes* inference, and not ours; that because the members of the Church ought to be Saints, and faithful, therefore the body of the people must take trial, and be satisfied in the true faith, and factification of those whom they receive

42

into Church-fellowship with them. No, this is neither our judgement, nor practise. For though in the first gathering of a Church, the people do meet together, and do perform some duties of prayer and spiritual conference together, till they be well satisfied in the spiritual good estate one of another: yet this satisfaction reacheth no further then charitable

discretion, which often falleth short of certainty and sincerity of sanctification. And after a Church is furnished with Elders, it is the Elders office to try the knowledge, and profession of such as offer themselves to the Church. And if in their judgement of charity, they conceive them to be Saints, and faithful, they present them before the body of the Church. And if the body have no just exception against their profession, or conversation, they are with common consent admitted as members of the Church, though it may be many of them in strictness, and exactness of judgement are not fully satisfied in the truth and sincerity of their sanctification. But it is one thing to be satisfied in judgement of charity: another, in truth of sincerity.

Nor will this make everyone of the people a Church-governor, to cast in any rational exception against the profession, or conversation of any that offer themselves to their communion (which is all that the people do in this case): no more than it made the Disciples, Church-governors, who when *Saul* assayed, to join himself to them, they were afraid of him at first, as not believing that he was a Disciple: *Acts* 9:26. There is a judgement of spiritual discerning, that belongeth to every-spiritual Christian (1 *Corinthians* 2:15) and the same is joined with some Ecclesiastical liberty, and power in every Church-member (1 *Corinthians* 5:12), as well as there is a judgement of Rule or Government peculiar to Elders.

But against the satisfaction of the Elders or officers, Mr Baily pleadeth, *If there be any truth in it, that the officers should be satisfied in the true and sincere grace of their Members at their first admission, why not as well afterwards when those who at first were taken for truly regenerate have thereafter fallen into such error in judgement, and such practices of life, as have given just ground to conclude the irregeneration of some, and to doubt the regeneration of others? Now if the uncertainty of regeneration be a just cause to hold a man out of all Churches, is it not a just*

 43

cause to cast a man out of the Church, when by doctrine or life this uncertainty appeareth, which at first was covered? Yet none of our Brethren affirm, that the uncertainty of regeneration, nor the certainty of irregeneration a just ground to cast any man out of the Church, who once is come in. Yea this consequent runnethwilde of the rigid Separatists: for the holiness they require is expressly external, which may stand with the internal wickedness of hypocrites: but the consequent speaketh of inward sincerity, contradistinguished from all outward professions.

Reply. This whole Argumentation proceedeth from an evident mistake of our Tenent, as if we required certainty of regeneration, and inward sincerity in such as were to be admitted Church- members; whereas we expressly declare ourselves otherwise, both in laying down our Tenent before our first Argument, and in the conclusion of the Argument itself, we express our Tenent thus: *We receive none as members into the Church, but such (as according to the judgement of charitable Christians) may be conveyed to be received of God into fellowship with Christ:* [or which is all one, such as according to the judgement of charitable Christians, we may conceive to be regenerate]. But Mr *Baily* carrieth it, as if I had said, *We receive none into the Church, but such as we are certain to be regenerate.* But there is abroad difference between these two: *We receive none but such as (according to the judgement of charitable Christians) may be conceived to be regenerate:* And this we receive none, but such as we are certain to be regenerate.

But, saith he, your consequent speaketh of inward sincerity, contradistinguished from all outward professions.

Come we therefore to the conclusion of our Argument whence those words are fetched, and stretched.

The members of the visible Church (saith the conclusion) cannot be (a the Apostle calleth them) the members of the body, or the spouse of Christ or the temples of the holy Ghost, or the sons and daughters of the Lord almighty, except in charitable, discretion they be (mark that, in charitable discretion) as the holy Ghost indeed describeth them to be Saints by calling, and faithful brethren: and that not only by external profession (for these are too high styles for hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Now there is the same wide difference between these two, as was observed before in the former. It is one thing to say, the Apostle acknowledged the members of the Churches planted by

44

himself, to be members and spouses of Christ, temples of the holy Ghost, sons and daughters of the Almighty: and therefore in charitable discretion he esteemed higher of them, then of hypocrites; he looked at them as *Saints and faithful brethren*, not only in outward profession, but in some measure of sincerity & truth.

And it is another thing to say, the Apostle gave then, such high-styles: and therefore he was certain of their regeneration, and of the inward truth of their sincerity. The sum of the Argument tendeth to this scope;

that as the Apostles received not, nor acknowledged Church-members, but such as in charitable discretion they conceived to be Saints, and faithful brethren: no more should we. He that in shooting aimeth at the top of a mountain, though he do not always reach it, yet he shall shoot higher, than he that aimeth at a molehill: so they that aim at receiving no members into the Church, but such as in judgement of charity are Saints, and faithful brethren; they shall keep their Churches more pure, than they that indifferently accept carnal persons, and gross hypocrites, if so be they will ordinarily hear the word, and receive the Sacraments.

As for Mr *Baily's* demand, *Why we should take such trial of members at their first admission, and not as well afterwards, when they give just ground of suspicion of their irregeneration?*

He may please to understand, that we do call them to trial upon far less offences, then such as give ground of suspicion of their irregeneration. There is no open scandal, whereinto any of our members do fall, but we call them to trial about it, although many gross offences will not give just ground of suspicion, much less of certainty, of irregeneration. *David's* adultery, and *Lot's* incest, *Noah's* drunkenness, and *Peter's* perjury may justly suspend our suspicion of irregeneration in gross offenders, when they formerly have made a good profession before many witnesses. And yet there is none of these offences, but may justly, expose a Church-member to a new trial, if he fall into them.

We have seen Mr *Baily's* exceptions against the conclusion of our Argument, as also against the major Proposition. He further proceedeth to except against the minor.

The minor (saith he) *we do deny as a very dangerous error, and avouch the contrary: every member of a visible Church is not in truth and sincerity a believer and Saint.*

45

Reply. See whether heat of contention, and misguided zeal will transport an honest mind. This minor is not only none of mine, but Mr *Baily* well knoweth it to be none of mine. For take my Argument, as himself was pleased to cast it into a syllogism, and the minor was this (in the 163 page of his *Dissuasives*):

But every member of each Church, is not only in profession, but in sincerity and truth to be a Saint, and faithful.

Now there is a vast difference between these two; every member of a visible Church is in truth and sincerity a believer, and Saint; and this, Every member of a visible Church is to be a believer, and a Saint.

The former expresseth what a Church-member is, *de facto*: this latter expresseth what he is to be (or ought to be) *de jure*. This latter I own as a truth, and he himself owned it as my minor: yea which is more, he owned it also as his own Tenent. For thus he expressly declareth his own judgement (page 156), *We grant (saith he) it is earnestly to be wished, and all lawful means would diligently be used both by Pastors, and people, to have all the members of a Church most holy and gracious.*

Surely then members of the Church (howsoever they be, yet) they are to be, that is, ought to be, holy and gracious.

If Mr *Baily* study out some other meaning of, *Are to be holy, then ought to be holy*, he must then take the minor to himself; it is none of mine, either in words, or sense, or scope.

But against this Minor of his own making, he reasoneth earnestly.

This, saith he, is against Scripture, and all experience in every visible Church. All who are called are not chosen: In the field of God, there are tares among the wheat: in his fold, goats among the sheep: in his net, bad fishes among the good: in his house vessels of dishonour, not of honour only. In the least Churches of the Scripture, we have too many bad members, Judas, Ananias, Sapphira, Simon Magas, Hymeneus, and Philetus, Demas, and the like, etc.

All this we acknowledge, if not as certain, yet as a probable truth, nor did we ever doubt of it. Only this we believe, that none of these bad members were known to be such, unto the Church, when they were received members into the Church. It is true indeed of *Judas*, that Christ knew him to be an hypocrite

46

from the beginning. But his hypocrisy was hidden from all the disciples: they as soon suspected their own treachery to their Master as his. And *Ecclesia* not *judicat de occultis*. Besides, Christ had some special reason, why he received him into his family, that the counsel of God, and the Scripture might be fulfilled, *He that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his heel against me: Psalm 41:9 with John 13:18.*

The proofs that they bring (saith Mr Baily) come not up to the Question.

And it is true, they come not up to the Question as it is stated in his invention. but they come up fully to the Question, as it is stated in our apprehension.

That in 1 Corinthians 1:1,-2, sanctified in Christ, and called to be Saints, if you understand it (saith he) of an outward calling alone, it is not pertinent: if ye understand it of an inward efficacious call, it is true, not of every member, but of some only; as is clear by the Apostles complaint of many among them: of some for incest: of others, for injurious defrauding of their neighbours: of some for carnal schisms: of others for profane drunkenness at the Lord's table: of others for fundamental errors.

Reply. We understand, the Apostle intendeth it of an inward and efficacious call. And though it might not be true of every member, that they were all of them effectually called, and sanctified: yet it was true, that in the judgement of charity (which is the conclusion our proofs come up unto) they were all conceived by him to be effectually called and sanctified. For so in like sort, he saluteth the brethren at *Philippi*, as saints in Christ (*Philippians* 1:1), and such Saints as were effectually called in his judgment. For he was confident of this very thing; that he which had begun a good work in them, would finish it to the day of Christ, verse 6. And this he intendeth not of some of them only, but of them all, for so he declareth himself, verse 7: *Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, in as much as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace.*

The Apostles complaint of some of them in Corinth, will not alter the case there. The incest of one did not argue the hypocrisy of his estate, no more then that of *Lot*. The injurious defrauding of their neighbors, was not so great a wrong, as *David's* defrauding

Vriah his wife, then of his sobriety, and then of his life; carnal schisms and divisions were to be found amongst Christ's disciples, who should be the greatest: and carnal emulations in the disciples of *John* against the disciples of Christ. Their drunkenness was rather at their love-feats, than at the Lord's table; and but occasionally in neither, not profanely intended. Their fundamental errors in denial of the resurrection might as soon be incident to young Christians newly converted from Paganacy, as it was found in *Peter* (concerning Christ) who yet was born and brought up, an Israelite, *Matthew* 16:21-22, In one word, there is no complaint which *Paul* maketh of any crime in the members of the Church of Corinth, but may be found, and hath been found, and in those that have been Saints, effectually called, not only in the judgement of charity, but in sincerity, and truth.

The text quoted out of *Galatians* 1:2: Mr *Baily* saith true, it hath nothing sounding to the present Question. But that Quotation was not mine, but the mistake of the Printer, who took, *Colossians* 1:2: for, *Galatians* 1:2, which Mr *Baily* might easily discern from the words of the text, which I expressly transcribed, and quoted. For as I quoted *Saints by calling*, out of *1 Corinthians* 1:2, so out of *Colossians* 1:2, I quoted *Faithful brethren*: which cometh at near the present question, as *Saints by calling*. But to the Argument taken from the relation of the Church to the persons in the Trinity (which he calleth, the main, and third proof of the minor but is indeed the first) he answereth,

That such privileges must be understood of the universal and invisible Church; or when any of them are applied to a particular visible Church, they must be understood of that Church, not according to everyone, but only the living and gracious members thereof, &c.

Reply. We had the same Answer before from Mr *Rutherford*: where to the same Reply returned to him, may serve here: and somewhat more may be added. As,

1. It is not meet, that the particular visible Church should be a heterogeneral body from the invisible Catholic Church. It were a monster in nature, if *Socrates* (a particular man) should be of an heterogeneral nature from *Homo*, which is an universal man, and as such, invisible.

48

2. The Apostle calleth the Church of *Corinth* (which was a particular visible Church) the temple of the holy Ghost, *1 Corinthians* 3:16. Where he speaketh of such a temple as may be destroyed, verse 17, which the universal Church cannot. And of the same particular visible Church *Paul* speaketh, when he telleth them, *Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular: 1 Corinthians* 12:27.

3. *Paul* dehortheth the visible Church of *Corinth* from fellowship with the temple of idols, because themselves are the temple of God, *2 Corinthians* 6:16. He dehortheth the visible members also from fornication, from making themselves the members of an harlot, by a reason taken from their membership with Christ, *1 Corinthians* 6:15.

4. The Pagan, who occasionally came into their visible Church meeting, he was convinced by the power of the holy Ghost breathing in their administrations, that God was in them of a truth, *1 Corinthians* 14:24–25.

5. *Paul* directing *Timothy*, how to order matters in the election and ordination of Elders and Deacons (which all concern the visible ministerial Church, as some call it) he telleth him, that he wrote these things unto him, that *he might know how to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the btruth*; 1 *Timothy* 3:15. Now between the house of God, and the temple of God, and the Church of God, I know no difference.

6. And whence is all that spiritual power and life; which the people of God do ordinarily find in all the visible Churches of the Saints, in all their holy administrations, if Christ be not the head of those visible Churches, and if the holy Ghost dwell not in them? Mr *Baily* may speak long enough of our leading men towards Anabaptism, and Socinianism: but (to speak the truth; as conscience, constraineth me before the Lord) if I should intend to drive men to Enthusiasm, and Familism (which is the worst kind of Anabaptism and Socinianism) I should take no other course, but these principles chiefly; why do men stand so much upon visible Churches, and their purity? They are neither temples of the holy Ghost, nor members of Christ, nor children of God almighty: these glorious styles belong not to them, but to an hidden invisible company of Saints scattered universally, and

49

invisibly all the world over. And will not this strengthen the hands of Seekers and Familists, to seek Christ (where he is found in true spiritual life) in deserts and secret chambers? *Matthew* 24:26, what stand we upon visible Churches, or ordained Elders, or censures? These are husks, and shells: the kernel and Spirit of life lieth in an hidden society. But surely it is neither good nor safe, to pluck away from the visible Churches of Saints, I say not, their ornaments, and vails: but their very vitals, and cordials, which is the fellowship of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost breathing amongst them.

Reply 2. Whereas Mr *Baily* saith, *That when any of these privildges are applied to a particular visible Church, they must be understood of that Church, not according to every one, but only the living, and gracious members thereof*: We say again (as we said before) they are to be understood of every one in that sense, which *Paul* expresseth it, to wit, in that Christian and charitable judgement, which he had of all their estates; even as his own words to the *Philippians* do plainly declare his meaning, Chapter 1:6–7, *I am confident* (saith he) *of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will*

also finish it unto the day of Christ Jesus. Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, &c.

But (saith Mr Baily) if these places of the Apostle he extended to every singular member of every particular Church, the absurdity will be great. For so it will carry to the Pelagianism of Arminius in the extent of the true grace of God beyond the elect, to all the members of a visible Church; yea so it will reach to the total and final apostacy of many who are the temples of the holy Ghost, the members of Christ, the faithfull and sanctified children of God.

Yea (saith he) this Argument driveth further than any of the Arminians will follow. For howsoever they extend the true saving grace of God beyond the elect members of a Church yet none of them ever said, that this sanctifying and saving gracemust be in every person before they can be admitted members of any Church. For this is that gross error, which Independents have learned, so so much from Arminius, as Soinius, to put all men unconverted without the Church, that so they may be converted (in this condition) by the preaching of private men: or if by Pastors, yet not as Pastors, but as private men, &c.

Neither do the Socinians (for ought I know) extend their Tenent thus

50

far, to require all before they be members of the Church to be truly regenerate, as if the only instrument of regeneration were the preaching of private men without the Church, &c.

Reply. These great absurdities are as easily avoided, as earnestly charged. For, 1. if we did hold, That all the members of every particular Church were truly sanctified, and regenerate, we would not stick to say, that they were elect also: and none of them truly sanctified, but the elect; and that none such ever fell away either totally, or finally. And surely the Apostle when he acknowledgeth the Church of the *Thessalonians*, to be in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus, and remembreth their faith, and hope, and love, and patience, he doth also acknowledge their election to be of God: 1 *Thessalonians* 1:3-4. And the Apostle *Peter* speaking of the Church at Babylon, calleth them, elected: 1 *Peter* 5:13. And surely so far as any Apostle, or orthodox writer calleth a Church, Saints, and faithfull brethren, so far do they acknowledge them, to be the elect of God, and accordingly freed by grace from danger of total, or final apostacy. What is then become of this heavy change of Arminianism, or Pelagianism?

2. We do not say, that every member of every particular Church is truly regenerate, and sanctified: but we say, that such they ought to be, and for such, the Apostles esteemed the Churches, and all the members of them

(in their times) to be, according to their charitable judgement of them: nor can it be showed that they willingly admitted any members into the particular Churches planted by them, but such as they conceived to be Saints, and faithfull, and the elect of God. Hypocrites when they appeared to be such afterwards, the Apostle accounteth them as false brethren, and therefore not suitable to th fellowship of Saints: and speaketh of them as creeping in, and therefore not received into the Church according to the right and due order of the Gospel. But can the Pelagianism of *Arminius* be imputed to such, as conceive some to be Saints, who are not Saints, nor elect and some reputed Saints (in judgement of charity) afterwards to fall away totally and finally?

3. But when Mr *Bailey* would bear us in hand, *That we learned this Tenent not so much from Arminius as Socinus*; I cannot but sadly consider, whither the heat of disputation will transport a zealous

51

mind! Suppose it were true (which is utterly false) that we should hold, *That sanctifying and saving grace must be certainly found in every person, before he can be admitted member of any Church*:

Yet how will he make it appear, that we learned this gross error (as he calleth it) from *Socinus*? Doth *Socinus* himself, or the Socinians his followers, do they hold any such Tenent? I cannot speak of myself (as not having their books at hand) but I appeal to Mr *Baily*, whether the Socinians hold such a Tenent or no? His own words be, *Neither do the Socinians (so far as I know) extend their Tenent thus far, as to require all the members of the Church to be truly regenerate*. Then it seemeth strange to me, that he should say we learn such a Tenent of *Socinus*, when (so far as he knoweth) neither *Socinus*, nor his followers hold any such Tenent: and sure I am, neither do we ourselves hold it, much less have we learned it from them; and least of all can Mr *Baily* say it, who knoweth not whether they hold such a Tenent, or no.

And though we should hold it (which is far from us) yet we should not therefore *leave all unconverted men out of the Church* (as he inferreth) *that so they might be converted by the preaching of private men, and if by Pastors, not as Pastors, &c.* For I have showed elsewhere (in Answer to Mr *William's* Letter) that many children are born in the Church, to whom the Pastor is by his office a Pastor, whose conversion he is bound to intend, and attend. And besides, many hypocrites may, and sometimes do) creep into the Church, whose conversion the Pastor is to labour after, in the Lord.

And therefore let not brethren father upon us the learning of our tenents from *Arminius*, or *Socinus*, or their followers: with whom we have no communion, no not so much as themselves, who (for ought I know) are ready to receive them all into the bosom of their Churches, whom we refuse.

SECTION V.

Thus have we (by the help of Christ) clear'd Our 3rd Argument (but the first of those mentioned in the way of our Churches) to prove, that such, and such only are lawfully received into the fellowship of the visible Church of Christ, who do before the Lord and his people profess their faith in Christ, and subjection

52

to him, and do not deny him in their works: that is, such as in judgement of charitable discretion, we conceive to be Saints.

A 4th Argument to prove the same conclusion (which is the 2nd Reason mentioned in the way of our Churches) is taken from *Acts 2:47*, *The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved*. The Reason standeth thus:

Such, and such only may we lawfully receive as additional members to the Church, whom the Lord addeth to the Church.

But the Lord addeth to the Church such as shall be saved (at least in the judgement of charitable Christians): nor do we read that he received others: And therefore such, and such only may we receive as additional members to the Church as in the judgement of charity shall be saved.

The major Propontion was confirmed by *the stewardly office of the Church and Elders thereof*. *We are not lords, but stewards of God's holy things: and therefore as a steward is not to do anything in his lord's house, but according to the mind and will of his lord: so neither are we in God's house, but according to the mind and will of Christ, receiving whom he receiveth: refusing whom he refuseth: casting out whom he casteth out*. Whence Paul exhorted the Romans to receive unto them the weak in faith upon the ground, because the Lord had received him: *Romans 14:1-3*.

The minor Proposition, *That the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved*, it is the express letter of the text, *Acts 2:47*, saved at least, in judgement of charity: nor do we read that the Lord added any (by way of ordinance) but such. What Answers are returned either by Mr *Rutherford* or Mr *Baily* (to spare the often repetition of their names, whom I honour) I shall only propound them in order, as objections, and return such Replis to them, as I conceive may suffice.

Objection 1. God's acts of special and gracious providence are not rules to us of duties. God addeth to the Church, as it is invisible and Christ's body: it followeth not therefore, we are to add to the Church visible, as visible. God's adding is invisible by giving faith, and saving grace to some to profess sincerely: but because we see not faith, nor sincerity, therefore God's adding cannot be a rule to our adding. God doth add a person falling into open scandal to the Church invisible, having given him true faith: but the Church is not to add him, but to cut him off. Nor is the place in

Romans 14, expounded by any, except yourselves, of receiving into Church-communion.

Reply 1. It is true, the acts of God's special providence, whether of grace or judgement, are not rules to us of duty. And therefore through Christ elected and ordained *Judas* to the Apostleship (to him a known devil, and traitor): yet we may not elect, or ordain a known *Judas* to a pastoral office. The Lord cut off the first known hypocrites by death (*Ananias* and *Saphira*): we may not do the like. These were acts of special providence, and of sovereign power in the Church, and so extraordinary. But when the Lord is said to add unto the Church such as should be saved, it is said also, he did it *daily*; *The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved*. That therefore was no speciall extraordinary act, but an act of daily dispensation: and therefore a pattern and rule to us.

2. The Lord's act in adding daily to the Church such as should, be saved, was not only by giving them faith, and thereby adding them to the invisible Church: but by giving them an heart to offer themselves to the fellowship of the visible Church, and to profess their faith before them, and by opening the hearts of the Apostles and brethren to receive them. For the adding of them, and of such like to the Church, it is expounded of their admission into visible communion in visible ordinances. For so it is said of them (*verses 41-42*): *They continued in the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and breaking of bread, and prayer*. These are acts of visible communion in the visible Church.

3. Though we see not faith nor sincerity (as God seeth them): yet we see them in their fruits, to wit, in the profession of their faith, and in their outward Christian conversation. And therefore God's act may be thus far a pattern to us, that as he added daily to the visible Church such as were in a visible state of salvation both before him, and men: So we may receive into the Church such as we conceive (according to Christian

charity) are in a visible state of salvation. In brief, such as God daily added to the visible Church, such (according to our discerning) are we to receive into the Church.

But God added daily to the visible Church such as were in a visible state of salvation. And therefore we are to receive into

54

the Church such as (according to our discerning) are in a visible state of salvation. If we could find it written anywhere else in Scripture, that the Lord added daily to the Church ignorant, or profane Worldlings, who as yet gave no signs, nor hopes of their salvation, we should then think it safe to open the doors of his house as wide, as he himself setteth them. But till then, let it not seem an unjust scrupolosity if (according to our weak discerning) we put a difference between the precious and the vile: the righteous and the wicked: such as profess godliness, and such as profess it not.

4. It is true, *God may add an open scandalous person to the invisible Church by giving him faith: and yet the Church is not to receive him into their visible communion, but to cut him off, and refuse him.* But this will not argue, *That God's adding proveth nothing.* It may prove indeed, that God's adding to the visible Church, is not always a pattern of our adding to the visible Church. But God's adding daily such as shall be saved to the visible Church, and nothing else known of them but such things as do accompany salvation, it may justly lead us by the hand, to go, and do likewise: and not to do otherwise, unless we had as good a pattern for the contrary.

5. That place in *Romans 14:1-3*: where *Paul* exhorteth the *Romans* to receive the weak in faith, because God hath received him; it argueth plainly.

1. That we may make it a rile to receive such into communion with us, whom God hath received: or else the Apostles argument were of no force: and yet to make God's act our rule, is one thing denied us, in this objection.

2. That God doth receive the weak in faith, not only into the invisible Church, but into the visible also. Which is nowhere said of men of no faith, or of false faith.

3. That therefore we are to receive men of faith (though of weak faith) into the Church, as God hath received them.

Neither is it a true exception, that the place (in *Romans 14*) is not so expounded *by any except ourselves*:

Diadatus (a godly learned Minister of *Geneva*, and not any of us in Mr *Rutherford's* sense) he thus expoundeth the place, *Receive you] that is, saith he, into the communion of the Church, into the*

charity of your hearts, and into sweet Christian conversation, as a true brother.

But beside the Exposition of such a Commenter, the Apostle himself (the best Expositor of himself) leadeth me to this Exposition. For he prosecuterh the same argument, throughout this Chapter, to the 12th verse of Chapter 15, and in verse 7 of Chapter 15, he reneweth the like exhortation (as in Chapter 14:11) by way of conclusion: *Wherefore receive ye (saith he) προσλαμβάνεσθε* (the same word in both places) *receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God; Now I say that Christ Jesus was a Minister of the circumcision, &c.*

The Argument standeth thus; If Christ a Minister of the circumcision received us Gentiles, to the glory of God, that we Gentiles might rejoice and glorify God with his people, then we Gentiles ought to receive them of the circumcision to glorify God with us.

But Christ a minister of the circumcision hath received us Gentiles to the glory of God, that we Gentiles might glorify God with the people of the Jews: *verse 7–10.*

Therefore we Gentiles ought to receive them of the circumcision (howsoever scrupulous about *Moses* rituals) to glorify God with us: the which is chiefly performed in the fellowship of public Church-worship.

And the Apostle doth hereby repress and prevent the arrogancy of the *Roman* Ministers, lest any of them should say, I will not be a Minister to the circumcision; I am not called to be a minister of circumcision, or of *Moses*, but of Christ and the Gospel: and therefore let us not receive any of these Jews into our Church-fellowship; why, saith the Apostle, Christ was a Minister of the circumcision, and yet received us: why then should not we receive them to all brotherly communion?

Objection 2. If where there is no show of saving work of conversion (or regeneration) there the stewards of God's house, should keep such out of the visible Church, because God hath not received them: then if any after they be received into the Church shall be found not to be regenerate, they should be cast out of the Church, because God hath not received them.

For it is the same power which casteth out of the church, that holdeth out of the Church.

56

But we are not to cast any out of the Church for non-regeneration even known, except he break out into open scandal.

Reply. The connection of the major is not necessary. Non regeneration notoriously known may be a just cause of holding out of the Church before a man be received: which yet is not a just cause of casting him out of the Church being received.

As in other relations grounded upon mutual covenant, so is it here. A Christian may not lawfully marry an Infidel woman, because of her infidelity: yet if he have received her, he may not lawfully put her away, nor cast her off for her infidelity sake. The Church may not lawfully choose a man to the office of a Pastor, or Elder, who is self-willed, and not given to hospitality (for it is against the rule, 1 *Timothy* 3:2, *Titus* 1:7–8). But yet if an Elder be found to be such after he is chosen I cannot say, it is a sufficient cause to cast him out of office. So here, non-regeneration evidently known may be a just cause of holding a man out of the Church, before he be received, which is not a justification of casting him out of the Church, after he be received.

The Reason of the difference is from the diversity of Rules, which the Lord hath given to walk by, towards persons without, and those within the Church. To call any persons out of the Church who are within the Church, the Lord hath allowed but two-causes: 1. Obstinacy persisted in, against admonition for an offence at first private: (*Matthew* 18.17), 2ly, breaking out into some heinous crime against the light of Nature, 1 *Corinthians* 5:11. If an unregenerate man give no offence in either of these kinds, his unregeneration will not expose him to Church censure, otherwise. But when an unregenerate man is to enter into the Church, it is a sufficient cause of holding him out, if he make no show of godliness; or if a show, yet such a show, as bewrayeth him to deny the power of godliness. For from such *Paul* wisheth *Timothy* to turn away, 2 *Timothy* 3:5. And therefore not to receive them.

The Reason to the contrary will not hold. For though it be true, that *it is the same power that casteth out of the Church, which holdeth out of the Church:* yet they are not always the same causes, which cast a man out of the Church, that hold him out of the Church, as hath been showed.

2. I would not deny, but that non-regeneration being known

57

(and known publicly) may easily fall out (by the just hand of God) to be a just cause of casting out of the Church. For, suppose a man born and baptized in the Church, after he be grown up to years, do continue grosly and securely ignorant of the principles of Religion, I suppose, such an one may justly be esteemed unregenerate (for without knowledge the mind cannot be good): and being such, he may justly be debarred from the fellowship of the Lord's table, and such other Church priviledges, as be peculiar to confirmed members. Suppose further, that such a person being admonished by the Elders and brethren of the Church, for his gross ignorance, do nevertheless still continue in gross ignorance, and in neglect of means of instruction, and (as is the wont of such) suppose he be known to neglect Family Duties, prayer, Catechising of his household, examination of their profiting by public ordinances, and shall after admonition for these known defects, still continue in his ignorance, and negligence, and that after public rebukes for the same before the Church, I demand, whether such a person may not justly be cast out of the Church for his unregeneration, and these offensive fruits of it?

The Reasons against it will not here hold: which all fall into one: *De occultis non judicat Ecclesia*.

Reply. But these are known and palpable offences: and may be proved by many witnesses: and public scandals they be, though they be rather sins of omission, than commission.

Say not God goeth before the stewards of his Church, in adding them to the visible Church (though they be unregenerate) when they profess the truth.

For such grossly ignorant persons cannot profess the truth: how can a man profess what he understandeth not? And if he could make some piece of a profession: yet he denieth the truth and power of it, whilst he bringeth forth no answerable fruits. Surely Christ would have had the dressers of his vineyard to cut down the barren fig-tree, and cast it out of the vineyard. And though the dressers interceded for respite another year: yet if it continued the 4th year, then they also thought it meet, to have it cut down, *Luke 13:6-9*.

Objection 3. *If the stewards in God's house, should not add to his Church, whom God doth not add: it seemeth to infer, that all the people are stewards, and so officers, contrary to God's word, Ephesians 4:11, 1 Corinthians 12:29.*

58

Or that only officers admit Church-members, which is against our brethren's doctrine. For they teach, That the whole multitude of believers are only to add, and cast out.

Reply. We acknowledge no such doctrine for ours, That the whole multitude if Believers *are only to add and cast out*, when they are furnished with officers. For the officers are the stewards of God's house by special calling: 1 *Corinthians* 4:1. And though we allow the multitude of brethren a concurrence and consent in the public acts of the Church: yet we reserve to the elders, that ruling power, which the Lord hath commanded to them: 1 *Timothy* 5:17. But so far as the Lord hath committed any concurrence of power in the Church acts to the multitude of brethren, so far hath he made them stewards, or (which is all one) dispensers of that power: according to what we read, 1 *Peter* 4:10. *As every man hath received the gift, so let him minister the same as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.* Therefore, that the style, and some act of stewardship should be allowed to all the brethren of the Church, is not abhorrent from Scriptural language.

Objection 4. *This Argument from Acts 2:47 (as did the former) inferreth firstly, that no other must be received as members in a visible Church, but such as are first tried, and found to be really holy, and such as shall be saved. We would not be deceived with their distinctions of inward and outward holiness, of seeming and real grace, of charitable and veritable discerning. This conclusion beareth expressly, that none may be members of a visible Church, But those who shall be saved, and so who are truly elect.*

Reply. Neither the former Argument, nor this from *Acts* 2:47, as it is framed by us, doth infer such a conclusion, That no other must be received as members of the visible Church, but those who are truly elect, really holy, and shall be saved. We infer no further conclusion but this. That as God added none to the visible Church, but such as should be saved: so we ought to receive none into the visible Church, but such as we in judgement of charity conceive to be in a state of salvation. As Mr *baily* would not be deceived with our Distinctions: so we would be loathe, he, or any else should be deceived by them.

The Distinctions are made not to cloud, but to clear both the truth, and our judgments. If he be deceived in his apprehension of our meaning, it is not we that deceived him, but he deceiveth himself by forcing a meaning upon us beyond our words, and against our words.

59

Objection 5. *This place of the Acts is distorted: such as were to be saved were added to the Church: is this indefinite Proposition to be understood universally, that all who were to be saved were added to the Church? Then men must be justified, and sanctified, and put into the way of salvation before they be admitted to the Church; and then though they were never added to the Church they may well be saved.*

And then why do not they add to their Church all that are to be saved? Why do they exclude many, whom they grant to be truly gracious and elect, upon this ground alone, That they cannot approve of their Independency, or Covenant?

Or suppose the proposition to be universal: yet must it be reciprocal and convertible? Be it so, that all who were to be saved were added to the Church: yet must all who are added to the Church be saved? This is an evident untruth. Judas was made a member of the Apostolic society by Christ: and many men were brought into the Church by the Prophets and Apostles, who shall not be saved. Shall damnation and want of true grace cast them all out of the true Church, and take from the power and right to do the actions of Church-members?

Reply 1. Is the place in the Acts distorted, when it is thus applied? The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved: therefore such as shall be saved are lawfully and fitly added to the Church, and none other but they who are conceived to be such. If this be a distortion, then it is a distortion and depravation of our ways, to walk so as we have Christ for an example.

Whether the indefinite Proposition be universal, or no, it is, indifferent to us. It is enough to us, if the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved, and none but such, either in his own judgement, or in the judgement of the Apostles, and brethren, of the Church. For mine own part, I believe it to be the duty of all men that shall be saved to join themselves to some particular Church of Christ or other, if they have opportunity. But whether all the godly Israelites and proselytes did join to that primitive Apostolic Church, is more then I will affirm. It sufficeth us, that none else were said to be joined by the Lord to the Church, but such as should be saved.

And such being justified, and sanctified, they might indeed have been saved, though they had not joined: but yet they had sinned, if they had not joined, at least assayed to be joined. Church-ordinances may not be taken in vain: and they are vain to us, if

60

they be neglected; and neglect them we do, if we willingly live without them.

The objector is too credulous, if he believe every such fabulous Report, *That we exclude any from our Churches whom we grant to be truly gracious and elect.* We exclude none such, and much less, upon this Ground alone, *Because they cannot approve of our Independency and Covenant.* We have received some members in our Churches, who are not only Presbyterian in judgement, but Episcopal also. Nor do I know, that ever we refused any approved godly person upon point of difference in judgment about Church-government. Nor do we pinch upon any godly man's conscience in point of Covenant, in case he be willing to profess his subjection to Christ in his Church according to the order of the Gospel. Nor do we limit him to our own way of the order of the Gospel, but as it shall be cleared and approved to his own conscience. *Facessant fabulæ, και φλυαρίαι:* A Citizen of Zion should not take up an evil report (much less a false report) against his neighbour. As for the conversion and of the reciprocation of the Proposition, we say the same of it, as of the universality of it, before. It is possible the Apostles Proposition was neither universal, nor reciprocal, in the objectors sence. There must be some to be saved, not added to the Church: and there might be some added to the Church, who should not be saved. It is enough to us, if all those whom the Lord added to the Church were such as were to be saved, either in the judgment of the Lord, or in the judgement of the Apostles and brethren.

And I hope the Objector will not say, that that is an evident untruth. *The admission of Judas as a member into the Apopolic society,* was not an act of Christ's daily dispensation, but an act of his special and sovereign power, and so extraordinary: and not to be taken up by us for our imitation. If we knew a man to be a traitor and a devil, we have no rule to elect or ordain him for a Church-officer. Yet if such a man be admitted into the Church either as as officer, or as a member, we do not hold, *That his want of true grace doth take from him the power and right to do the actions of a member, or officer,* till the Church upon just grounds have proceeded against him. It may be so (as the objector saith) that many men were brought into the Church by the Apostles and Prophets, who were not saved: But this remaineth to be proved by him. That they brought any into the Church, whom they did not conceive to be in a state of salvation.

SECTION VI.

A Fifth Argument (but the third mentioned in the way of our Churches) tending to prove it to be no unjust scrupulosity, but our faithfulness, to admit no members into our Church, but such as we conceive to be faithful Brethren, and Saints by Calling, is takep from *Matthew* 16:16–19. The Argument standeth thus:

If the Lord Jesus make the Profession of the Faith of his Name (and such a Profession, as Flesh and Blood hath not revealed to a man, but his Heavenly Father) to be the Rock, or Foundation upon which his visible Church is built, then we shall build a Church without a Foundation, by receiving such Members into the Church as do not hold forth such a Profession, but either through Ignorance make no Profession at all, or such a verbal Profession, as favoureth not of any gracious work of the Father upon their hearts.

But the former is true, as appeareth by the Texts where Christ maketh *Peter's* confession of Christ revealed to him by the Father, believed on, and professed by himself, to be the Rock on which his Church is builded.

Objection 1. This maketh as much against yourselves as against us, except all, and everyone whom you admit, be builded upon this Rock. If there be Hypocrites in your Church (as you cannot deny it) then you build without a Foundation.

Reply. As it is with a particular Christian, so it is with a particular Church; as with a private member, so with a whole Church in matters necessary to their estate. A private particular Christian, that maketh not such a profession of Christ as is suitable to a Christian conversation, he buildeth his house not upon a Rock, but upon sand, *Matthew* 7:24–27. And so doth every particular Church, build upon a sandy Foundation, and not upon a Rock, and will not stand but fall in the day of Trial, if their Profession be only verbal, without any favour of Christ in

heart or life. But yet if the body of the Church, or a considerable part of them make a good profession of Christ, which themselves do not deny, but approve by a Christian conversation; the receiving of some Hypocrites among then, will not be a subversion of the foundation, nor of them that are builded upon it; but it will only prove (that I may allude to the Apostle's words) a building of hay and stubble upon a golden foundation,

which will in time (if not healed) be consumed; but the Foundation and precious Members built upon it, will stand. When everyone in the Church at *Jerusalem* was an Hypocrite, and an evil doer, their wickedness kindled such a fire of God's wrath, as burnt them up like briars and thorns, *Isaiah* 9:17–18, But if there be a remnant of an holy seed amongst them, they may be the substance and supportation of the rest, at least for a season, *Isaiah* 6:13, which may be a necessary and wholesome warning against the promiscuous and secure admission of all sorts of Hypocrites, and evil persons into the Church without putting difference between precious and vile.

Objection 2. By this Argument, *Peter* before this confession was an unchurched Pastor, built upon no Church foundation.

Reply. The words of Christ to *Peter*, are a promise of reward to his Confession, *That upon it he will build his Church*, not that thereby he was now admitted into the Church. For there was no Christian Church yet planted, but only fit materials prepared for it, gathered by *John Baptist* and the Apostles out of the lost sheep of the Church of *Israel*. Neither may it be said, That the Members of the Church of *Israel* were built upon no Church-foundation, or no Church confession: For every Israelite though borne in the Church, was to make an holy Profession (or Confession) before the Lord in his Tabernacle, when he was to present himself solemnly before the Lord, *Deuteronomy* 26:2–18. Besides, *Peter* himself, if he were baptised by *John Baptist* (as all the twelve Apostles were) he was admitted thereto by way of confession, *Matthew* 3:6.

Objection 3, By this place is not proved, That the Keys are given to the Church of Believers but to the Ministers; for then against no Parochial Church can the Gates of Hell prevail. All the Fathers with good reason, as *Augustine*, *Chrysostom*, *Cyrl*,

59/2

Tertullian, *Hierow*, *Nazianzen*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, &c. and our Divines against the Papists (whom you side with in this) deny, that Christ meaneth here of the vible Church (as of *Rome* or *Corinth*) but of the Catholic and invisible Church.

Reply 1. The question in hand, is not to whom the Keys are given, but what manner of persons are meet to be received Members in the visible Church. But if the Question here were, To whom the Keys were given; The Objectors reason maketh no more against a Parochial Church, than against the Ministers, For 'if the consequence be good, That in case the

Keys be given to the Church of Believers, then against no Parochial Church could the Gates of Hell prevail; then in case the Keys be given to the Ministers, against no Ministers could the Gates of Hell prevail.

As for those ancient Divines (whom he calleth Fathers) whom he alledgeth to prove that Christ meant not the visible Church 'but the Catholic and invisible Church: I shall make further Answer to them, when he declareth their Testimonies. It is not unusual with them, to call every visible Church a Catholic Church, which professeth the Catholic Faith. And every visible Church in respect of the spiritual life and nature of it, which is hidden, may be called Invisible. Otherwise, the name of an invisible Church is rarely to be found (if at all) in the Writers of those times, for ought I remember. As for our Divines, though some of them understand our Saviours words of the Catholic invisible Church, yet all do not. And they who do understand his words of the Catholic invisible Church, not of the particular visible Church, (as of *Rome* or *Corinth*) they speake it in regard of defection of such a partiular visible Church, against which in such a case the Gates of Hell do prevail. But such particular visible Churches as the Gates of Hell have prevailed against onto defection, they were not built upon the Rock, not upon Christ believed on and professed, by the Revelation of the Holy Ghost; For against such a particular visible Church so built, the Gates of Hell did never prevail, to draw them to defection; no more than the Gates of Hell can prevail against any particular Saint to draw him to defection. Whence it is at sundry of our Divines from this word,

60/2

do prove the impossibility of the defection of any faithful Saint, as well as of the Catholic invisble Church. But let the Text be duly weighed: Is not the Church (in *Matthew 16:18*) called the Kingdom of Heaven (the keys whereof were given to *Peter*) verse 19? And will it sound for good Divinity, to say the gates of Hell can prevail against the Kingdom of Heaven? wherefore is it called the Kingdom of Heaven, if it be not above the prevailing assaults of Earth or Hell? Now that Kingdom of Heaven (of which Peter received the Keys) is not only the univerfal Catholic invisible Church, but the particular visible Church also: Or else *Peter* and other Elders dispense these Keys in particular visible Churches, without a Commission. Now if a particular visible Church be the Kingdom of Heaven, it may be removed (as a Candlestick to another place), but it cannot be extinguished; hence Christ threatneth the Apostatizing Jews,

that the Kingdom of God shall be taken from them, and as Vineyard let out to either Husbandmen, but not destroyed, *Matthew 21:43* and *41*. Hence also the Lord threatneth the Church of *Ephesus*, That he will (in case of their impenitency) remove the Candlestick (that is his Church) our of that place, but not extinguish it, *Revelation 2:5*. Me thinks the servants of God should tremble to erect such a state of a visible Church (in hypocrisy and formal profession) as whose very foundation threatneth certain Dissolution, and Desolation.

SECTION VII.

Against the Argument propounded (and hitherto cleared in the former Section) there be other Objections raised by others: Let us follow them in order.

The next Objection (which after the former, is the fourth) is propounded by Mr *Bayly*: We may not (saith he) admit, 'That the Church founded upon the Rock, is every particular visible Church. The priviledges of the Catholic and visible Church (he meaneth haply the invisible Church) which the Jesuits by all their wrestlings have never been able to extort

61

from us for their Idol of *Rome*, shall we throw them away upon every Independent Congregation? How unstable Rocks these & Congregations are, and how easily by small temptations shaken in pieces themselves may remember.

Reply. We do not say, that every particular visible Church is founded upon the Rock, too too frequent experience demonstrateth the contrary; many are built upon the Authority and Laws of the State, and many upon the hypocrisy of Professors; but: this is it I say (as the Text saith) that every Church which the Lord Jesus buildeth, is builded upon this Rock, to wit, upon himself believed on, by the revelation of the Father, and professed before the Lord, and his people. Many Plantations there be (and so, many Churches) which the heavenly Father hath not planted; and they shall in time be rooted out, whether Churches, or Church-members, or Church-traditions. That the priviledge of stability against the Gates of Hell belongeth not only to the Catholic invisible Church, but to every particular visible Church built upon Christ by such an holy profession as *Peter* made, hath been declared in the end of the former Section; the Argument alledged to the contrary taken from the Topics of indignation against the Jesuits, and the indignity of a particular Church of Christ to enjoy the priviledge, which the Jesuits cannot get for *Rome*,

might as justly be applied against any particular faithful member of a particular Church, *Bucer* and others of our judicious Protestant Writers, do from this very promise of Christ, argue the stability of every true Believer, and this impossibility of Apostacy. What if an Arminian should take up the objectors Argument and say, 'The privileges of the Catholick and invisible Church which the Jesuits by all their wrastlings have never been able to extort from us their Idol of *Rome*, shall we throw them away upon every particular Believer? but if a Particular Believer or Saint may claim the privileges, or promises made to the Catholic Church, I see no reason why a Church of Saints, and faithful Brethren may not claim as much? The Church-estate of Saints doth not weaken, but rather confirm and increase the promises and privileges given to Saints and Believers. And so (as hath been mentioned above) *Paul* applieth a promise, and privilege peculiar

62

to Saints and faithful Brethren unto the whole visible Church of *Philippi*, *Philippians* 1:6-7.

The objector mistaketh us, if he think that we call every Independent church a Rock; but we say, they are built upon a rock, if they be built by Christ, or if they be built upon such an holy profession of the faith of Christ as *Peter* made; if any of them have been shaken, and easily shaken in pieces (as he saith) either they were not built by Christ, upon such a Profession as *Peter* made, or else their shaking hath been but a scattering of Seed out of a Garner into the open field, where every grain hath multiplied to an handful; as the Church at *Jerusalem* being scattered assunder, multiplied into many Churches in *Samaria*, and *Antioch*, and elsewhere.

Objection 5. The Rock whereupon the Church is builded, is Christ; we may not make any man's profession (be it never so clear and zealous) the foundation of the Church in such a Fashion, that the ignorance or hypocrisy of any man may remove the foundation of any Church.

Reply. It is true, the Rock whereupon the Church is builded is Christ, yet not Christ sleighted or rejected, but Christ believed on and professed; and as Christ believed on is the foundation of the invisible Church, so Christ believed on, and professed, is the foundation of the visible Church.

We do not make any mans profession (though never so gracious or zealous) such a foundation of the visible Church, as that the ignorance or hypocrisy of any man can remove the foundation of the Church. Such

a conceit cannot be wire-drawn out of any tenet of ours, but if there be some (though but few) who are built upon Christ, believed on, and professed (as there were but a few names of such in *Sardis*) yet (as there was, so) here is a true visible Church; the ignorance and hypocrisy of others cannot disannul the Church-estate of the rest, nor remove Christ from being their foundation; yea further, if all the Members of the Church should make but a verbal, and ignorant, and hypocritical confession of Christ, and of faith in him, yet I will not deny that such a society may have the name of a Church, and thus far, the nature of it, that the actions thereof are not nullities, though neither themselves nor their actions

63

are acceptable in the sight of God, nor will stand in the hour of temptation.

Objection 6. if none but the Elect, and those who are filled with the Holy Ghost may be members of Churches, then the Anabaptists have won the field. However, it is not true of *Peter* himself, who long before that confession was a member of the Church.

Reply. We willingly grant, That the children of believing Parents (Parents professing the Faith of Christ) are Members of the visible Church; which whilst it is held and maintained, the Anabaptist can never win the field. But this membership of children (I meant Infants) is founded in the faith, and profession of their Parents, God accepting a Believer and his seed, as when the fruit of a Tree is good, the Tree with its Branches are accounted good.

As for *Peter's* Membership before that confession, it is answered above in the Reply to the second objection.

SECTION VIII.

FOR the confirmation of the former Argument, taken from Christ his promise unto *Peter*, to make himself (so believed on, and so confessed as was done by *Peter*) the foundation of his Church, there was added in the way of our Churches) a Parable or two, as an illustration of the same. The former was taken, from *Matthew 22:12* 'Where the Lord expostulateth with the Guest, that came into the fellowship of his Church, even unto his Table, not having put on a Wedding Garment: which expostulation seemeth also to intimate a taxation of them by whose connivance he came in.

Against this, two objections are made:

Objection 1. The Text is contrary to the Argument, for in verse 9 charge is given to the Ministers, to invite all; *Go ye into all the High-ways, and as many as ye find, bid.* And their obedience is commended, verse 10. *So those servants went out into the High-ways and gathered all, as many as they found, both good and bad.* This is a praising rather than taxing; for as many as you find is as good in sense, as good and bad; and the latter doth expound

64

the former. The Lord commanded them to bring in as many as they find; they find (in the streets) both good and bad, therefore they were commanded to bring in both good and bad.

Reply 1. The charge given to the Ministers must be interpreted according to the nature of the business in hand; the charge was to invite all, as many as they found, and to bring them in, but not as they found them, but first to cause them to put off their beggerly rags (which they wore in the Hedges) and to put on a Garment fit for the Marriage solemnity; else if it had been the King's meaning (who gave the charge) to charge his Servants to invite all whom they found, and to bring them in as they found them, he would never have expostulated with him that wanted a Wedding Garment, for coming in wanting a Wedding Garment; for that man might soon have answered, I came in as I was bidden, as I was commanded; yea as I was (in some sort) compelled. The Answer is full and satisfactory to God and man, to alledge, and alledge truly, I have done what I was commanded from God, and his Messengers, and as I was commanded; I was commanded by them to come in to the Marriage, and to come as I was found, in my rags. Why am I taxed for doing as I was commanded? But in that such a Guest was found speechless, it argueth; Though he was invited to come, yet he was commanded also to put on a Wedding Garment, and had one offered to him for that purpose by the Servants, or if they did nor offer it him, they were to blame; yea it argueth, he had made some show of putting on the wedding garment, or else still the Servants were to blame to let him in; but if after he came into the house, he put it off, or made it afterwards appear, that he did not assay to put it on, but did not in truth, then the Servants indeed are blameless; but such a Guest is justly left speechless, and inexcusable.

Reply 2. As I have elsewhere answered to the bloody Tenet concerning the Parable of the Tares; so it may be said here, Commandments in Parables are not always given as an injunction of what ought to be done by way

of Ordinance, but as a Prediction of what will be done by way of providence. *Calvin* giveth an hint of interpreting that Parable (*Matthew 22* with the

65

parallel Parable, *Luke 14*) in an historical way, as the call of God hath been tendered to Jews and Gentiles in course of providence. The marriage Feast, which God made for his Son, was set forth from the beginning of the world. Four several Calls God gave to the son of men to come to that Feast: The first call God gave as to some others, to chiefly to the Israelites; but that Nation always resisted the call of God, as *Moses* and *Stephen* complained of them, *Deuteronomy 9:24. Acts 7:51*, whence it is said, *Matthew 2:2-3. They would not come.* And this was before the coming of Christ, when Israel after the flesh refused saving fellowship with the Lord Jesus in the sure mercies of his Covenant

The next solemn call was given to them when Christ was come in the flesh, when God's dinner was prepared, and his fatlings killed, and all things were now ready. But the Jews fearing the loss of outward comforts, if they should embrace so mean a Messiah, they set light by him, and dealt shamefully with his Ministers, beat them, and slew them; whence it is said, They made light of the Feast, and the call to it, and went their ways, one to his Farm, another to his Merchandise; the rest took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them, which so far kindled the wrath of the King, that he sent forth his Armies (the Roman Legions) who destroyed those Murderers, and burnt up their City *Jerusalem, Matthew 22:4-7*. The third call is recorded by *Luke* chapter 14:24. When the Matter of the house sent forth his servants, to go out quickly into the Streets and Lanes, and to bring in the poor, and maimed, and the halt, and the blind. This seemeth to be the vocation of the Gentiles (after the rejection of the Jews), by the Ministry of the Apostles, who quickly called the chief Cities and Villages of the World, but in them chiefly the meaner sort of men. The fourth call is mentioned in the same Chapter of *Luke* (verse 23) when God sent his servants into the high-ways and hedges to call and to compel men to come in, that his house might be filled. And this call was given, when upon the ceasing of the primitive persecutions, God called in the Emperors and princes, the great rulers of the Earth to embrace the Gospel of Christ, and to come into his Church, whose very example compelled many thousands to profess

Christianity and to come into the Church; as *Peter's* example in another kind (in prevarication) compelled many others with him to the like dissimulation, *Galatians* 2:14. The two last calls, *Matthew* joineth; and in respect of this call it was said by him, That the servants gathered all sorts into the Church, good and bad; when indeed the watchfulness of Shepherds growing more remiss; all sorts of men (good and bad) crowded, and thronged into the Church. At which time one Guest (and such an one as carried a great train with him, more than all the rest beside) sat down at the Table, and openly profess against the wearing of the wedding Garment, the Righteousness of Christ by faith, This Guest was the Church of *Rome*, and the Pope, the head thereof, who by the oscitancy of the servants, took up so great a room at God's Table in the Church, that in respect of him, all the Christian Guests in the world were but few. And so our Saviour's accommodation of the Parable is fitly inferred, *Many are called, but few chosen*. Otherwise, if this Guest, who had not on a wedding Garment, had been but one single person, the *Apodosis* (or Reddition) of the Parable, had not fitly been inferred, *That many are called, but few chosen*; but rather the Inference had been thus, *Many are called, and many chosen, and yet one of many not chosen*, which were contrary to our Saviour's scope. If any shall think this interpretation of the Parable to be more argute than solid, let him enjoy his own judgement; allowing the like liberty to others to accept it, if they see cause. But taking the Parable in this sense, The word of the King unto his servants, to, call in as many Guests as they should find, either the servants misunderstood it, to intend men of all sorts (good and bad) or else, it is not a word of injunction by way of Commandment what ought to be done, but a word of prediction, of what in time would be done in course of providence.

Objection 2. The very scope of the Parable is contrary to this (thee taxing of the servants for admitting good and bad unto the Marriage Feast): The scope is, that many are called externally, and so are of the visible Church, and that by God's special Command, both here, *Matthew* 22:9–10, and *Luke* 14:17,21,24. And yet few are chosen, & of the invisible Church. And *Luke* 14 the Servants or Pastors call all (by the Lord of the Feasts

Commandment) without exception of regenerate or unregenerate.

Reply. That which already hath been returned to the former Objection, may suffice here also. But be it, that the scope of the Parable tendeth to show, That many are called externally, and yet few chosen. For though Ministers call all their hearers to the grace of Christ; yet many refuse so much as subjection to an external call, and do openly profess their love of the pleasures and profits of the world (their Oxen, their Farms, their Wives) rather than the love of God. And these are intended in the Parable, not so much as to enter into the Church, the house where Christ's Marriage Feast is kept. Again, of those that come into the house, there may be not one only, but one with a greater train than all the rest of the Church beside, that hath not on a wedding Garment. And in respect of such also, who do enter into the Church, many may truly be said to be called, and but few chosen. For let the Ministers use as much diligence and vigilancy, as they well may; yet such is the dimness of discerning in human frailty, and such is the subtlety of many hypocrites, that it may be ninety-nine hypocrites may creep into the Church, to one simple sheep of Christ. Besides, many Ministers may, mistake their Commission, and when they are commanded to call all as many as they find, they think they may bring in as many as they call, though they be not only poor, and maimed, and halt, and blind (for so they may) but even such as are openly wicked (as well as the good) yea such as despise a wedding Garment, not only of imputed Righteousness (as the papists do) but also of external holiness, as profane Epicures are wont to do.

Yea but the servants are said several times to call all without exception of regenerate or unregenerate, and that by Commandment.

True, they are commanded to call all, even the unregenerate; but they are not commanded to bring into

the house all whom they call; but such as in obedience to their call, do put on a wedding-Garment, or at least profess so to do. Or otherwise, They themselves should as well displease their Lord, to bring in such unmeet Guests to his Table, as the Guest

68

themselves did, that presumed to come to his Table, not having on a wedding Garment.

SECTION IX.

If *Augustine's* Judgement may be accepted in the interpretation of this Parable of the Guests, he consenteth with us, both in the sense of this, and of the other Parable of the Tares, which we also alledged (in the way

of our Churches) as a confirmation and illustration of the truth in hand, that evil Persons openly known (even Hypocrites known to be such) are not to be received into the Church. 'For (said we) doth not Christ in the Parable impute it to the sleepiness (that is, to the remissness and negligence) of his Servants, that Tares were sown in his field amongst the Wheat? *Matthew* 13:25,38-39.

In this point Augustine's words may give light to both the Parables, in his Book, *De fide & operibus*, cap. 17. '*Absit autem, ut sic intelligamus quod scriptum est, ad convivium nuptiam adductas, quos invenerunt bonos & malos, ut eos adduxisse credantur, qui se malos perseveraturos professi sunt. Alioquin ipsi servi Patris-familias zizania semi-naverunt, falsumque erit illud, Inimicus autem qui ea seminat, Diabolus est, sed quia hoc falsum esse non patet, adduxerunt servi bonos & malos, sive qui laterent, sive qui jam adducti & intromissi apparent, &c.*'

Objection 1. But this interpretation (of the Parable of the Tares) doth but strengthen the Anabaptists who alledge the same.

Reply. If the Anabaptists alledge this Parable, to prove, that either no hypocrites are found in the visible Church, or if they be, that we are to separate from such Churches, neither *Augustine's* interpretation thereof, nor ours doth strengthen them therein. But if they should alledge it for this end, to argue the sleepiness or remissness of Christ's Ministers, when known Tares are received into the Church, I say no more (but as *Bellarmino* sometime spake of *Calvin* in another case, so I of them) utnam sic semper errassent *Anabaptistæ*.

Objection 2. It is a fault which a very Popish Doctor *Aquinas* condemneth, to argue from Parables; *Theologia Symbolica non est Argumentativa*.

Reply. I am not ignorant, better Divines (I mean more orthodox)

69

then *Aquinas*, say as much. But by his leave, and their favour, I think the speech is neither Logical, nor Theological, neither good Logic, nor good Divinity. Not good Logic, for *Comparata etiam ficta arguunt*. And if they do *Arguere*, they are *Argumentativa*. Nor good Divinity: For if all Scripture be profitable, *πρὸς διδασκαλίαν καὶ ἔλεγχον*, then Symbolical. And why should Christ (as well as some Prophets before him, and *John* the Apostle after him) delight so much in Symbols and Parables if they were not Doctrinal and Argumentative? It is true, the Legs, of the lame are not equal; so is a Parable in a fool's mouth saith *Solomon*. But Christ the wisdom of the Father) was no fool: He would never have so much

accustomed himself to Symbols and Parables) if so much of them were to be pared off (as husks and shells) in the interpretation thereof (as commonly is done by Expositors) or if Parables were not effectually Argumentative to all those ends of Ministry, for which any other word of Doctrine might serve? Evident it is to any that shall observe and meditate on the Parable of Christ: without a forestalled prejudice taken from that Thomistical unsound principle, That whether Christ be to teach, or convince, or reprove, or confirm, or comfort his hearers; all these ends he both intendeth, and attaineth in his Parables. I never yet observed any part of a Scripture Parable, but without carnal affectation, or straining of wit; it might holily be applied both with power, and profit, and delight to an honest heart. I know great Divines have been (I fear) too shy of searching particularly into the interpretation of Scripture Parables. But I believe that shyness hath sprung from that Axiom of *Aquinas*, which after him obtained too great credit in the Schools of Divines; For before him, ancient Divines erred too much on the other hand, both in turning plain Scriptures into Parables, and in squeezing many curious notions out of Parables, which the Holy Ghost never intended.

Objection 3. But it is not said in the Parable, that the envious man sowed tares, while the servants slept, but whilst men slept.

Reply. But if the men that slept, had not been the servant, that slept, other men's sleeping had given the Enemy no more opportunity.

70

to sow his Tares, then if they had been awake. For if other men (who are strangers) see one thing, or other, sown in a field, they matter it not.

Besides, if the Servants were awake, and saw the envious man sow the seeds in the Field, why should they make themselves ignorant, how these seeds came to be sown there?

Yea (as *Augustine* saith right) the Servants themselves had sown these Tares in the Field, If they had admitted known evil ones into the Church.

Objection 4 Cajetan saith, Here is not accused the negligence of Pastors.

Reply. Cardinals, and Popish Prelates (such as he was) had need to say so; else they should condemn their own negligence, and security with their own mouths.

Objection 5. But it is beside the Text, that, by the sleeping of men should be understood the negligence of Pastors, neither is it at all expounded by Christ.

Reply. Christ doth not expound sundry of his Parables at all; but when he hath opened the main scope, he leaveth other parts to be expounded, according to the scope of his Doctrine in hand, and the Analogy of other Scriptures.

It is true what the Objector saith, That men cannot see the hollowness and falsehood of Hypocrites, till it break out in their actions, no more then the sleeping Husbandman can see, when weeds grow up in his Field: And that is it, which Christ sigifieth by the sleeping of men.

But then by the sleeping of men should be meant, the sleeping of the Servants, which the Objector even now would not admit.

Besides, whether men sleep or wake, Weeds will grow in the field nor discerned till time of open difference come on.

Objection 6. If the Lord here condemn the sleepiness of Ministers, for suffering scandalous Professors to be members of the Church, how doth the Lord forbid those Servants to pluck up those Tares, but to let them grow till Harvest? For he commandeth the Officers to cast out of the Church, and to excommunicate scandalous persons.

71

Reply. All are not openly scandalous persons and excommunicable, who are Tares, It may be some are good Wheat, whom the Servants may take for Tares; and so in plucking up Tares, they shall pluck up wheat also.

2 It hath been showed above, that though known Hypocrites are not to be received into the Church; yet being received, they are not to be cast out merely for hypocrisy, till it break foth into notorious scandal.

3 I deny not, That the word of Command to suffer the Tares till the Harvest, may be rather a Prediction of what will be done in the Church by course of providence, then an injunction what should be done by way of Ordinance.

Objection 7. But certainly seeing the Field is the Field of the visible Church, It maketh for us against our brethren, that wicked men are growing in the visible Church.

Reply. I willingly grant, that the Field is the Field of the visible Church dispersed in any part of the world, and am far off from the Exposition of such as mean it of the world out of the Church. But yet this maketh nothing at all against us, who do acknowledge, that not only Hypocrites, but oftentimes more open wicked men are growing in the Church. Else how come openly wicked men to be cast out of the Church, if they were not growing in it? But this we say, That neither openly wicked men

should be tolerated in the Church, nor known Hypocrites received into the Church.

SECTION X.

A Sixth Argument (but the fourth alledged in the way of our Churches) was fetched from 2 *Timothy* 3:5, where the Apostle forbiddeth us to join with such, yea commandeth us to turn from them, who have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof.

To this is objected by way of Answer:

Objection 1. So our Brethren by this argument profess the lawfulness of separation from all persons and Churches, except from their own.

Reply 1. In that place the Apostle foretelleth, That in the latter

72

days shall come perilous (and as the word signifieth), difficult times; and the reason thereof he giveth to be, the vicious qualifications of Christians: For men (saith he) shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers (or slanderers), disobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholy, &c. lovers of pleasures, more than en lovers of God, verses 1-4. And that which maketh the times worse, these ill-conditioned Christians shall profess a form of godliness, though they deny the power of it, verse 5. For the redress whereof, and for the preservation of the honour of the Name of Christ and of the unity of his Churches, the Apostle prescribeth this remedy, From such turn away. Therefore say we, It is according to the will of God, and the counsel of the Apostle, not to receive such into the fellowship of our Churches but to turn away from them.

Yea but (saith Mr *Rutherford*) our Brethren by this profess the lawfulness of separation from all Churches (and persons) except from their own.

But (say we) by this Mr *Rutherford* confesseth, that all Churches besides our own, consist of many such ill-qualified members, as make the times wherein we live more difficult and dangerous; or else there were no ground for his obsession. And if all Churches be ill-qualified, how then can the Churches (without manifest prevarication) come and confess before the Lord (especially in days of solemn Humiliation) That the times are difficult and dangerous, and that in respect of the evil conditions and courses of Church-members (such as are here described) and yet we ourselves admit such into our Churches, yea and justify our receiving of them? Can we pray for the healing of such perilous and difficult times, when our selves make the times perilous and difficult by receiving such

gross Hypocrites into nearest visible communion with the Lord and his Saints, yea and justify our practice in so doing? Can a man look to be justified from such sins, which he himself justifieth in the encouragement of others that live in them? were it not that the Lord hath said, He dealeth not with his children according to their works: And that where sin aboundeth, Grace doth superabound; we could never expect a change and serious Reformation of these evil and diffiult times, whilst such vicious Hypocrites are admitted

admitted into Churches, and their admission and toleration justified. It is not such ill conditioned persons in the world that maketh the times perilous, but their admission and toleration in the Churches.

Reply 2. Calvin judgeth that these Qualities express a lively description of the Romish Clergy and *Monkery*. And have not all the Reformed Churches justly turned away from them?

Reply 3. This commandment of turning away from such doth chiefly concern Church-Rulers, and with them the Churches themselves. And though we be commanded to turn away from such ill-qualified Hypocrites; yet we are not forthwith called to turn away (or to separate) from such Churches and Congregations of Saints, who do not straight-way turn away from them. We may justly conceive, the Churches tolerate them as burdens, and groan under them, and cannot be eased of them, the greater part over-pouring the better. We are not to withdraw ourselves from our Neighbour's Horse or Ox groaning and falling under his burden; much less from our Brethren, or from Churches in such a case. But yet if any of the Saints wearied with the burdens and iniquities of the times, when they cannot cast off their burdens in their present fellowship, shall withdraw themselves from that fellowship (wherein they find it difficult and perilous to bear such burdens) and yet still continue fellowship with their holy Brethren in all those holy things wherein they may keep fellowship with them without fellowship in sins; we believe such withdrawing, will fall under the Apostles Precept here. For in so doing, we turn not away from the Saints, but from the ill-qualified members amongst them.,

Objection 2. No marvell, if *Paul* will have *Timothy* to separate from Apostates, from Resisters of the truth, verse 8, and from Proud, Boasters, Blasphemers, Traitors: For such are to be excommunicated, as 1 *Timothy* 6:3,5. *At loquitur Paulus de Fundamentalī corruptione istius Doctrine que est secundum pietem*, saith *Parker*. But *Paul* here forbiddeth to exhort the

Proud and malicious Blasphemers, and Resisters of the truth, and not to wait upon them any longer. Whereas otherwise he had said in the end of the preceding Chapter verse 24–26. Those who are detained in the snares of Sathan must be waited on, and instructed, if God will

74

give them Repentance. *Ergo, Timothy* was as a Pastor to instruct unconverted persons, and to join in communion with them. But as for desperate Enemies, and Blasphemers, he was not to wait on them, nor to instruct them with meekness. So that if this Text prove anything, it will conclude against our Brethren. That such as deny the power of godliness, should not be hearers of the word, and much less (as our Brethren reason) members of the visible Church.

Reply 1. If such persons (as the Apostle here describeth) be to be excommunicate (as Mr *Rutherford* saith) to wit, when they do notoriously appear to be such, it is as much as we desire. For then if they do appear to be such aforehand, they are not to be received into the Church. Howsoever due watchfulness in Church-officers is here requisite; for these vicious Qualities are such as are not at first easily espied without due observation. For saith *Calvin*, *Ejusmedi vitia enumerat Paulus, quæ non protinus apparent: imò quæ fictam sanctitatem ut plurimum comitantur. Quis enim Hypocrita non superbus, non amans sui, non aliorum contemptor, non ferex ac crudelis? non fraudulentiùs? sed hæc omni latent hominum oculos.*

Reply 2. What *Parker* speaketh of the fundamental corruption of Doctrine, hath not reference to this place, but to 1 *Timothy* 6:3,5. Nevertheless I easily grant, those whom *Paul* here describeth may easily wax worse and worse (as *Paul* saith, 2 *Timothy* 3:13); and so may become like to those in 1 *Timothy* 6:3,5. But yet before they grow on to such fundamental corruption of Doctrine, they may be turned away from, when such moral vitious Qualifications are discerned in them.

Reply 3. As for those in the preceding Chapter, who were detained in the snare of Satan, and whom *Timothy* was to instruct with meekness, proving if God will give them Repentance. It doth not appear, That *Timothy* was a Pastor to such; or that knowing them to be such, he was to join in communion with them. Things are λήμματα, mere suppositions without any colour from the Text. He might be an Evangelist to them, and so preach to them, all publicly, and confer with them privately, as a Pastor also may do; but not to join in Church fellowship with them,

whilst they are under the snare and captivity of Satan to do his will. *For what fellowship hath Christ with Belial?*

75

Reply 4. When the Objection saith, Though *Timothy* was to exhort those in the end of Chapter 2, but not to exhort these in Chapter 3, and therefore that such should not be hearers of the word (which he thinketh maketh against us).

I see no ground for such an Inference. For not only moral vitious persons, but even proud, blasphemers, and resisters of the Truth, may hear the word if they will; and if such, come into the Congregation, whilst *Timothy* is preaching, must he break off his Sermon, lest they should hear it? yea, may he not apply a word of conviction to such? (unless he knew they had it sinned against the Holy Ghost) *Titus* 1:9.

Objection 3. (which is Mr *Baylies*) this consequent is naught, saith he; *Paul* biddeth *Timothy* to turn away from such, who have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof, *ergo*, They who are not found to have positive and satisfactory signs of Regetacration, ought not to be admitted Members of any Church.

Reply. We gather no such consequence, as Mr *Bayly* is pleased to fasten upon us: But our consequence is this, *Paul* biddeth *Timothy*, to turn away from such, who have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof. Therefore the Elders of the Churches are not to admit such into the communion of the Church, as have no better show of godliness, then what is joined with the denial of the power of it.

Objection 4. The Apostle speaketh of persons openly scandalous and flagitious.

Reply. *Paul* doth not say, That they were such at first (and so *Calvin* interpreteth him) but that in time they waxing worse and worse, will manifest themselves to be such, verses 9,13.

Objection 5. The Apostle speaketh of such as are to be cast out after their admission. But our Brethren will not cast out all, of whose Regeneration they are not convinced, &c.

Reply. Turn away from such, doth rather express a separation from such, or a diversion from admitting such unto communion, then a proceeding to the casting forth of such out of communion. But grant it to be so, as the Objector saith; yet when such shall show forth the inward hypocrisy of their hearts, by some open scandalous crime in Doctrine, or manners; in such a

76

case we should think it meet to cast our of our fellowship any such of our own members, as are so qualified: And we should think also less meet to admit them into our fellowship.

SECTION XI.

A Seventh Argument (but the fifth laid down in the way of our Churches) was taken from *Revelation* 2:4, where such as leave their first love (as all Hypocrites will at length do) are argued to procure the removal of the Candlestick. And therefore they being more fit for the ruin and destruction of the Church, are not to be judged fit materials for the constitution and edification of it.

Against this, the chiefest objections arise from miscasting the Argument, not as the words offer themselves, but as they may lie most obvious to exception. The words do of themselves offer this Argument.

Such as are destructive to the estate of the Church, are not fit materials for the building of the Church; and being so discerned, ought not to be received as members into the Church.

But Hypocrites and backsliding Professors, are destructive to the estate of the Church, *Revelation* 4:5.

Therefore Hypocrites and backsliding Professors, are not fit materials for the building of the Church, and being so discerned, ought not to be received as members into the Church.

Objection 1. The Argument must thus be formed.

All those whom God intendeth shall edify, and not ruin the Church, are only to be members of the visible Church:

But all known Hypocrites are such. *Ergo, &c.* The Proposition is false: for if we speak of God's secret intention and decreeing will, It is not a Rule for the Church to square and regulate their actions by. God may intend in his decreeing will, that many Hypocrites, such as *Judas* and *Demas* shall be Church-members. If we speak of God's revealed will, the Proposition is still false; for by our Brethren's Doctrine, it is God's revealed will, That the Church receive (as members) latent Hypocrites, such as *Simon Magus*, and yet latent Hypocrites are no less unfit materials to build the Church, then known Hypocrites.

77

Reply. We freely acknowledge God's secret intention and decreeing will is no Rule to the Church to order his affairs by it, but only his revealed will signified in the Scriptures. Now it is revealed in the Scriptures,

That Hypocrites and backsliding professors are destructive to the Church, *Revelation 2:4-5*. And God hath given no power either to the Church or Church-officers to do any thing to the destruction, but only to the edification of the Church, *2 Corinthians 13:10*, and Chapter *10:8*. And therefore by the revealed will of God, neither the Church, nor the Church-officers have power to receive into the Church known Hypocrites, or backsliding Professors.

Why (saith the Objector) by your own Doctrine, latent Hypocrites may be received; and yet latent Hypocrites are no less unfit materials to build the Church, than known Hypocrites.

Reply. It is not true, that latent Hypocrites are no less unfit materials to build the Church, than known Hypocrites. For a latent Hypocrite may be furnished with many and great edifying gifts, when yet he is destitute of regenerating grace; and when his hypocrisy commeth to be known by some open scandal, his best edifying gifts will be then blasted, and made unserviceable, to the Church. *Judas* and *Demas*, the one had the gifts of an Apostle, the other of an Evangelist; and both of them were of great use to the edifying of the Church. But when their hypocrisy came to be known (*Judas* by his Treachery, and *Demas* by his Apostacy) both their gifts were now blasted, and made unprofitable to the Church: The talents which they had, and the use of them to the Church was taken from them.

Objection 2. We do not think, That Hypocrites fallen from their first love, and by scandalous living declaring themselves to be such, should be kept in the Church.

Reply. Be it so: Then such being out of the Church are much less to be received into the Church, till they profess their Repentance.

But (saith the Objector) the Author so alledgeth, *Revelation 2*, That the Church of *Ephesus* falling from her first love, must be a false-constituted Church, in which there were members fitter to ruin, than to edify the Church. And yet certain it is, *Paul* (in

78

Ephesians 1) and Christ (*Revelation 2*) acknowledgeth the Church of *Ephesus* to be a true visible Church.

And so doth the Author too, and never doubted of it, which maketh him wonder, why the Objector should father upon him such an intention in his Allegation of *Revelation 2*.

But Mr *Bayly* is far more adventurous in fathering an Argument upon me out of this Tenet, and more censorious in judging of it. The Argument he calleth thus:

No Hypocrite, none who at last will leave their first love, are to be admitted into the Church. For all such will ruin the Church, and procure the removing of the Candlestick. But all that cannot prove their Regeneration convincingly are such.

Whatsoever the major Proposition may be, doubtless this minor is no Assumption of mine, but his own presumption.

But what is his answer unto this Argument, such as it is? After the two former it will make a third Objection: This is (saith he) a bold and rash Argument, laying a necessity to exclude all Hypocrites from the Church, and all such as may fall away from any degree of their first love.

Reply. The Argument, as I laid it down above, layeth no necessity upon the Church to exclude all Hypocrites, but known Hypocrites; much less, to exclude all such as may fall away from any degree of their first love. For what Saint of God is there, but may fall away from some degree of his first love who can excuse *Asa* in this case? or (if you think good) *Solomon* also? But ἀνεσις is one thing, ἄφεσις another. The best may fall away from some degree of their first love (which is ἀνεσις) who yet do not fall away from their, first love, which is ἄφεσις.

But (saith he) The *minor* is very false; for many gracious persons far from hypocrisy, and free from all decay of their first love, may be unable to satisfy themselves, or others in the certain truth of their Regeneration.

I consent with him herein; but let him know therefore, this *Minor* is none of mine, but his own only.

But the *Major* (saith he) is more false, against the practise of Christ and his Apostles, who did always receive divers Hypocrites: And our Brethren do not deny that they do so also; for

79

their Churches consist not all of real Saints.

Reply. I dare not be to bold, as to say (though Mr *Bayly* think some of my expressions bold and rash) That Christ and his Apostles did always receive divers Hypocrites. Sure I am, when *Christ* received *Peter* and *Andrew* into his fellowship (*Matthew* 4:18–19), they were neither of them Hypocrites. And when soon after he received *James* and *John* (*Matthew* 4:21–22) neither were they Hypocrites: nor do we read that at those times he received divers Hypocrites with them. Yea when many did

believe in his Name, he did not receive them into any near communion with him, because he knew their hypocrisy, *John 2:23–25*. And though he received one *Judas* an Hypocrite and Traitor; yet his hypocrisy was not openly known, but his spirit as well approved amongst the Apostles, as their own (*Matthew 26:22*). And, Christ had a special ground for receiving him, that the Scriptures and counsel of God might be fulfilled, *Luke 22:21–22*, with *John 13:18,21*.

And for the Apostles, we never read, That they received any known Hypocrites: though true it is, that some of them whom they did receive, did afterwards discover their own hypocrisy. As for ourselves, though we neither dare, nor will deny that we do receive some Hypocrites; yet neither always, nor known Hypocrites, nor with allowance of ourselves therein, if we should so do.

Objection 4. However, the Text itself proveth our; Tenet; for, *Ephesus* to Christ there is a most true Church, notwithstanding their fall from their first love, and his threatning of them with removal of their Candlestick, &c.

Reply. Touching the superlative truth of the Church of *Ephesus* as it then stood (That it was to Christ a most true Church) I have little to say. For if *forma stat in indivisibili, &c neque recipit magis, nec minus*; then it is enough if it were a true Church at that time (as believe it was) though it were not styled a most true Church. But if the truth of a Church be capable of degrees of comparison (as in some sense it is in respect of purity) I suppose, it might rather be called a most pure Church, when it was fervent in her first love to Christ, then afterwards when she had left her first love, *Paul* did foretell to the Elders of *Ephesus*, That after his departure,

80

grievous Wolves should come in amongst them, not sparing the flock; and that out of themselves should men arise speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after them, *Acts 20:29–30*, which if it came to pass in *Johns* time under *Domitian* (after *Pauls* departure under *Nero*) surely the Church had lost something of the superlative truth of her profession, though it did retain some positive truth of her Church estate.

SECTION XII.

For an illustration of the Point in hand, I did instance cursorily in a Type or two of the Old Testament, which yet are not without their due weight. We pass by (said I) the Types of the Old Testament. Rough stones

were not laid in the building of Solomon's Temple, till they were hewn, and prepared before, 1 *Kings* 6:7. And behold a greater then *Solomon* is here, and a greater Temple, then that of *Solomon's*.

'The attendance and watchfulness of the Porter's suffering none to enter into the Temple, that were unclean in anything (2 *Chronicles* 23:19) doth it not evidently type forth the watchfulness of the Officers of the Church of Christ, to suffer none unclean (unclean in estate, or course of life) to enter into the fellowship of the Church, which ought to be a communion of Saints.'

Objection 1. In this Argument many things are loose and doubtful; *i.* we desire a warrant from the word, that the Temple was a type of the visible Congregation; and that all must be as really holy before they enter into a visible Congregation as they behooved to be typically holy, before they entered into the Temple of Jerusalem.

Repy. The Temple was a type of the body of Christ, both of his natural body (which was the Temple of the Godhead) *John* 2:21, and also of his mystical body, the Church; and that not only of the invisible Church (which it is more seldom brought to represent) but ordinarily of the visible particular Church, *Know ye not* (saith *Paul* to the vilible Church of Corinth) *That ye are the Temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* 1 *Corinthians* 3:16. And indeed it was the Assembly of the visible Church of Corinth, of which the stranger professed, *That God was in them of a truth,*

81

1 *Corinthians* 14:25. And if there were any weight in that Argument alledged above, to prove that the Church in *Matthew* 16:18, was meant not the visible, but invisible Church, because it could not be destroyed: then it will as strongly convince, That the Church here spoken of is not meant the invisible, but the visible Church, For the Apostle speaketh of such a Church (or Temple), as may be destroyed; *If any man* (saith he) *destroy the Temple of God, him will God destroy,* 1 *Corinthians* 3:17. When *Paul* demandeth (2 *Corinthians* 6:16), *What fellowship hath the Temple of God with Idols?* he speaketh of the visible Church, where the Sacraments were administered, whereof he telleth them, they cannot be partakers of the Taile of the Lord, and of the Table of Devils, 1 *Corinthians* 10:21; And the Scripture whereto *Paul* hath reference (*Leviticus* 26:12, *I will dwell in them, and walk in them*) hath respect to the visible Congregation of the Church of Israel. In 2 *Thessalonians* 2:4. Antichrist is said to sit in

the Temple of God which cannot be meant of the Invisible Church. The Temple that was said to be open in heaven (*Revelation* 11:19 and 15:5) was not the invisible, but the visible Church.

Objection 2. The Lord's spiritual building (or Temple) whereof the corner stone, and foundation is Christ, is the Church invisible, built by faith, as lively stones upon Christ, 1 *Peter* 2:7, *Ye are God's building*, 1 *Corinthians* 3:9, and *Ephesians* 2:20–22. The building are expressly those, who are built on the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, and grow up to an holy Temple in Christ, and are the habitation of God through his Spirit. This cannot agree to a visible Church, the members whereof (as our Brethren teach from *Revelation* 2) may be Hypocrites, who fall from their first love.

Reply. All this doth well agree to the visible Church duly administred. For Christ is the head of the visible Church as well as of the invisible; and therefore also the foundation. The visible Church of Corinth was built upon Christ, as a foundation, and upon none other 1 *Corinthians* 3:10–11. And it hath been showed above (in opening *Matthew* 16:18. That Christ believed on, and confessed, is the rock (or Foundation) upon which God will build not only the invisible Church, but the visible also, whereto the Keys are given. And Christ is the Corner-stone not

 82

only of the invisible Church, but also of the visible Churches of Jews and Gentiles. In Christ, an uncircumcised Heathen (but a professed Believer) may be received a member into any visible Church of Jews. And a circumcised Jew (but a professed Believer) may be received a member into any visible Church of Christian Gentiles. The members of the visible Church ought to be built by Faith as lively stones upon Christ, as *Peter* speaketh; otherwise the Lord will cast them out. For living stones in the building are all one with living and fruitful branches in the Vine, The Vine (whereof Christ speaketh in *John* 15:1–6) was meant the visible not the invisible Church. For in the invisible, there be no dead, nor unfruitful branches to be cut off and withered, and cast into the fire, as in the other there be, verses 2 and 6. The life of *Peter's* living stones doth not weaken or infringe their memberthip of the visible Church, but establish it rather. What though we grant that hypocrites may be in the visible Church? Yet we say, as *Paul* doth, They come in by stealth, as creepers in. And their dead-heartedness and hypocrisy, both not kill the living estate of the other members who are sincere. What though *Paul*

call the Church of Corinth God's building, 1 *Corinthians* 3:9? doth he therefore speak of the invisible Church? Surely every visible particular Church is God's building; or else it is but an human plantation, and then it will certainly be rooted up, *Matthew* 15:13, What though the building (in *Ephesians* 2:20) be built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles? Cannot that agree to the visible Church? So indeed the Objector argueth; but verily it doth so necessarily agree to the visible Church, that it is in truth, no visible Church, if it be not built upon that foundation. For as the invisible Church is built upon the faith of the foundation laid by the Prophets and Apostles; so is the visible Church built upon the profession of the faith of the same foundation. What though the same building be said to grow up unto an holy Temple in Christ and to be the habitation of God through the Spirit? Cannot that agree to the visible Church? Doth not *Paul* call the visible Church of *Ephesus* wherein *Timothy* ministered, the house of the living God? 1 *Timothy* 3:15. And is not the visible Church of *Thyatira* commanded by Christ for growth in Christ, so that her works were

 83

more at the last, than at the first? *Revelation* 2:19. If God was sometimes pleased so far to honour *Solomon's Temple* (a Temple of stones and timber) as to call it his Temple, his House, his Habitation (as *Matthew* 21:13, *Psalms* 132:5). Is it a strange thing, or incompatible to a congregation of visible Professors, that they should be called his House, his Temple, his Habitation through the Spirit? That which may agree to any visible Christian (1 *Corinthians* 6:19) may it not agree to a visible Church of Christians?

Objection 3. But (saith the Objector) The laying on of stones upon this building, is not the act of In-churching, or of union to a Church; but the joining of the stones to the building is the union of these stones by faith to Christ, as is expounded, 1 *Peter* 2, *To whom coming as to a living stone*, verse 5, yea Peter writeth this comfortable Doctrine not to men as built up in a Church estate in a single congregation. For many of these to whom he wrote were dispersed and persecuted, through *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Cappadocia*; and might have, and had union with Christ by faith, without a Church-union.

Reply. What doth this Objection argue, but only this, that living members of Christ whether in visible Church-fellowship or out of it, have access to Christ, and are joined to him by a lively faith in his Name? which we freely acknowledge. But this will not argue, that *Solomon's Temple* was

not a Type of a visible congregation; which is the point to be proved. May not a visible congregation of Saints come unto Christ, as living stones, and be joined to him by faith? Yea but the coming of these stones to Christ, and their joining to him, was not an act of In-churching or of union to a Church, but of union to Christ by faith. But it should be union to a Church if the comparison prove the Point.

Reply. The comparison proveth the Point, though this Text speak nothing of the Church as visible, but as invible. It is warrant enough from Scripture to make the Temple a type of the visible Church, if other Scriptures do apply the type of the Temple to the visible Church, though this place of *Peter* should apply it to the invisible Church also. The Church whether it be considered as visible, or as invisible, doth both ways require the hewing and squaring of the members before they be received either

 84

by faith into union with Christ, or by blameless profession into union with the visible Church; a sincere believer, though he hath been hewed by the Ministry of the Law, and squared by the Ministry of the Gospel, and so joined by faith to Christ; yet if he shall live in any scandalous corruption either of Doctrine or conversation (which yet may befall a member of Christ) he will yet need further hewing, and squaring (conviction, and profession of Reformation) before he be joined to the visible Church. The comparison therefore proveth the point in hand, though this Text in *Peter* speak rather of joining to Christ, then of joining to the visible Church. 'What though, these dispersed Saints (to whom *Peter* wrote) were not joined in Church estate: in one single congregation, as being dispersed throughout *Pontus, Asia, Cappodocia*? Yet they were joined, though not in one single congregation, yet in many particular congregations dispersed up and down throughout those Countries, For *Peter* writeth to the Elders set over them, as to Pastors, and to the Brethren as to the flock, 1 *Peter* 5:1-4. And therefore, it is not safely said, 'That these Saints had union with Christ by faith, without Church-union. For they had both union with Christ, and with the visible Church also.

Objection 4. Though in this Type (of hewing and preparing the stones for the Temple) there were signified a moral obligation, That all before they be In-churched into a visible congregation should be converted: how is it proved, That the Church should receive none to a visible congregation, till they be converted? For these are far different. All should

be converted, but there is no new Law commanding the Church to receive none into the Church but the converted.

Reply. If that Type of preparing stones for the Temple, imply a moral obliation, That all should be converted, before they be In-churched into a visible congvegacion; Then it will also imply a moral transgression, if their conversion be not attended, nor regarded before their In-churching. For, though these two be different, the duty of members to be converted, and the duty of the Church to admit no members but the converted; yet they are not so far different, but thus far they mutually infer one another, that if it be the duty of such as are to be received into

85

the Church to be converted, then it is also a duty of the Church, not to admit such into their Church fellowship; whom by their fruits they plainly discern not to be converted. For as it is in Church-Elders, so it holdeth by proportion in Church-Members. If such qualifications (as the Apostle specifieth, 1 *Timothy* 3) be required in those who are to be ordained Elders, then *Timothy* and the *Presbytery* with him, are not to admit any to Church-office, whom they see to want such qualifications, or seee not that they have them. In which respect they are commanded to lay hands suddenly on no man, nor to be *partakers of other men's sins, but to keep themselves pure*, 1 *Timothy* 5:22. In like case, when God-requireth Sainthood, (or conversion) in such as are to be admitted members into the Church, then it is the duty of the Church, not to receive such into their Fellowship as they see to want such qualities, yea, or see not some ground to conceive that they have them. Else if they lift up their hands too suddenly for their admission, they will be partakcers of other mens sins, and neglect to keep themselves pure.

Objection 5. The Hewers of stone, or builders of the Temple must typify Pastors in office, dressing stones for the spirituall building. Our brethren make them to typify private Christians out of office, and deny that any Pastors as Pastors, do fit and prepare stones to be laid on the spiritual building. Also none, laid stones on that Temple, save only builders by office; but by our brethrens doctrine, only Pastors do not convert souls. There were no stones at all in the Temple of *Jerusalem*, but choice, and well-squared stones: are there no Members of the visible Church but the chosen of God?

Reply. We willingly grant that Pastors or Teachers by office, are the principal Hewers and Squarers of spiritual stones, for the spiritual building

of the Church. Principal I say, not the only Labourers in this work, as knowing, that godly Parents, and Masters Schoolmasters, and Tutors do afford no small help to the preparing of sundry persons unto Church-fellowship. It is an untrue and unjust report, if it be applied to the Pastors or Teachers in *New England*, to say, that we make those Hewers of stones to be only private Christians out of office. We have pleaded and proved the contrary in answer to Mr

Williams, and in other Tracts. If some others who walk in a way of ridged separation, be otherwise minded, we would not their private and singular opinions should be fathered upon us. Though we do not conceive ourselves called to be Pastors to them who are not yet received into our Churches, yet being called to be Pastors to our several Churches, we attend the conversion of the carnal hearers, and the edification of all. It is more than the Objector can prove; 'That none but Builders by office laid stones on that Temple. Why might not any lay stone on that Temple, who had only the gift or skill of Architecture, though they were not builders by office? We do not say, that there are no members of the visible Church, but the chosen of God: But this we say, that none should be laid in the Fellowship of the Church, who are but sandy and miry Professors, and hold forth no solid firmness of a Christian Profession: Though we cannot easily judge, who are the chosen ones of God in his eternal counsel; yet we way discern a difference between precious and vile, as *Solomon's* builders did discern a difference between Freestones and the common Pebbles of the streets; and as bulchy swellings of stones in the quarry, had need to be hewn and squared that they may lie level with other stones in the building, and suit the proportion of the house: So we conceive natural and carnal worldlings, and malignants opposites to grace and truth, had need to be hewn, and plained by the Ministry of the word, that they may lie level to the Ordinances of God, and to the fellowship of their Brethren, when they come to be laid together in the Church-building, And such as are so preparcd, may be accounted choise persons in comparison of many others.

Objection 6. To argue that stones in *Solomon's* Temple, were not laid rough in he building: *ergo*, men unregenerate must not be admitted members of a Christian Church; this is a wanton Argument, for though the Temple might be a type of every Congregation, and the stones of the Temple (a type) of the members of a particular visible Church: yet that

the roughness of the stones should be a type of ir regeneration, and above all, that the place of showing these stones should be a type, and that Argumentative, to infer, that the place of our vocation, Regeneration,

87

justification, and Sanctification must be without the Church, and that it is necessary we be like a stone perfectly hewn before we be laid in the Church-building: This is a kind of Ratiocination, which solid Divinity will not admit.

Reply. By the same liberty, whereby the Author of this objection called a former Argument (from *Revelation 2:4*) a bold and rash Argument, by the same he calleth this a wanton Argument. But as the former Argument was taken (if I may so speak with holy reverence) from the Tophicks of God's fear, lest Churches should come to be ruined, or dissipated (which is far from boldness or rashness) so this is taken from the Tophicks of spiritual chastity (which is contrary to wantonness), to keep the Church of God from becoming a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. *John Baptist* was not of a wanton or light disposition, but rather of an austere and sad spirit, and yet he taught the necessity of making rough ways smooth, to prepare men to Christ, and to his baptism: which argueth, *John* did not esteem it a point of wantonness, to account that roughness and harshness (which usually accompanieth corrupt nature) to be a fit emblem or type of an unregenerate estate, 'As for that other point of wantonness, to make the place of our Vocation, Regeneration, Justification, and Sanctification, that it must be without the Church, and that we must of necessity be perfectly hewn before we be laid in the Church-building; It is an inference that followeth not from our Tenet. For though we hold, that men ought to be Saints (and so Regenerate) at least in the judgement of charity, before they be received as Members into the Church, yet we believe this Saintship and Regeneration is wrought ordinarily not without the Church, but within the Church; that is to say, wrought in such, as in the Assembly of the Church do attend upon the means of grace dispensed by the Ministry of the Church; not in such as live out of the benefit of Church Assemblies, amongst Pagans and Infidels. Nevertheless many may be converted in the Church, who yet are not of the Church. Besides we say further, that many Infants may be born in the Church, of the Members of the Church, and they if they come to be afterwards regenerate (which often falleth

out) they being of the Church are regenerate within the Church, without any prejudice to any Tenet of ours. The like may be said of such as creep into the Church being hypocrites, when they afterwards are converted to unfained sincerity. But this hindereth not the truth of what we believe and profess, That carnal worldlings and profane persons, appearing to be such, whilst they are out of the Church, they ought not to be received into the fellowship of the Church; and that such as being born in the Church do show forth the carnal ignorance and profaneness of their hearts, when they grow up to ripe years, They ought not to be received to the fellowship of the Lord's Table.

But of all others, this inference doth least of all follow from our Tenet, That it is necessary we must be (like a stone) perfectly hewn, before we be laid in the Church building. As he saith, This kind of Ratiocination, solid Divinity will not admit. So I may say likewise, This kind of Ratiocination from any Tenet of ours to infer such a consequence as this, no solid Logic will admit, nor any Christian ingenuity (without too much prejudice and partiality) will extort. To be perfectly hewn we do not expect in this life, till all Church administrations have finished their course, and we our course together, and so come to be dismissed into the fellowship of that Church, which reigneth above human frailty in heavenly glory:

SECTION XIII.

The other Type taken from the Porters of the Temple, whose watchfulness suffered none that were unclean to enter into the Temple, was brought for the same end as the former, to illustrate and prove, That none who were discerned to be unclean or vicious should be admitted into Christian Church-fellowship.

Against this is objected:

Objection 1. If Porters typify the Ministers of visible Churches, then *i.* As only Porters hold out the unclean; so only Pastors should hold out the scandalous. But you admit the whole Church

Church with equal authority to take in or refuse Church-members.

Reply. I did not say, That the Porters did typify the Ministers, but the officers of the visible Churches; which reacheth to ruling Elders, as well as to Ministers, or Pastors only. And though it did belong to the Porters by office, to see that none unclean did enter into the Temple; yet any other Israelites (out of regard of public purity) were bound to discover

to the Porters, who they be, whom they knew to be unclean, And to prevent (as much as in them lay) the Defiling of the holy things of God by the fellowship of unclean persons. Hence it was, that the Jews of *Asia* (though they were not Porters, yet) they complain of it, as a pollution of the Temple, That *Paul* had brought in an uncircumcised Gentile into the Temple, *Acts 21:27-28*, wherein though they were mistaken in *Paul's* act; yet it argueth the common care of all the Israelites to prevent the entrance of unclean persons into the Temple. Nor is it any more power that we allow to the whole Church, then the fellowship of the like care in brotherly faithfulness, which lieth upon the Elders by office, to prevent (so far as they see just cause) the pollution of the Church by the entrance of unclean members. This is not (as Mr Bailey is pleased to call it the cheating of the people of the Keys by such symbolising for it alloweth them all that brotherly watchfulness and liberty, or power, which Brethren out of office are capable of.

Objection 1. If the Temple be a type of the visible Church, then no profane person, or uncircumcised in heart should meet with the visible Church, to hear the word; for hearing of the word (by such) profaneth the holy things of God. This you can not say; for Infidels may be (as you say) fellow-partners with the Church in hearing the word.

Reply. It followeth not, That if the Temple be a type of the visible Church, then no profane person should meet with the visible Church to hear the word, For 1 this Objector (Mr *Rutherford* himself) confesseth in the next words an answer to Mr *Robinson*) That Adulterers, Thieves and Wicked, persons did come into the Temple of the Lord, *Jeremiah 7*. And therefore though the Temple were a type of the visible Church, yet

90

(by his Argument) profane persons might come in to hear the word.

2. Though the Temple were a type of the visible Church, yet there was some more regard to prevent ceremonial uncleanness in coming into the Courts of the Temple, then now lieth upon Christian visible Churches in these days of the New Testament, whilst the partition wall stood between Jew and Gentile, no uncircumcised person, no Gentile might enter into the Courts of the Temple, so much as to hear the word; if they did, it was a defilement of the place. But now that the partition wall is broken down, now all sorts of people may enter into the places of our Assemblies to hear the word, without either profaning the holy Ordinances of God, or without polluting the presence of God's people. For so did

the Infidel Corinthian come in to hear the Propheysings of the Church,
1 *Corinthians* 14.

Objection 3. *Robinson* holdeth, That *Abraham's* seed, and so all the Jews were to separate themselves from the world, that they might be a visible Church to God. But we read not, That the Porters were to hold out any wicked person. Yea in *Jeremiah* 7, profccffedly they came to the Temple of the Lord, who were Thieves, Adulterers, and wicked persons. And so by that, neither are the Porters of the visible Churches of the New Testament, to hold out unconverted persons, because unconverted.

Reply 1. If this reason did prove anything, It would as well argue, That Adulterers, Thieves, and wicked persons are not to be cast out of the Church (which yet our Brethren dare not justify) as that they are not to be received into the Church.

2. Those Adulterers, Thieves, and profane persons in *Jeremiah* 7 were either not openly known to be such (and then no marvel, if the Porters admitted them) or else if they were openly known, it only argueth a neglect of their charge and offices to suffer such to come in amongst them. For by the Law, such morally unclean persons should either have been cut off from their people, whether by Civil or Church censure (as learned Mr *Gellespy* proveth, and I wave it not) or else, in their first approach into the presence of the Lord, after such wickedness committed, they

91

should have brought a trespass offering, and other sacrifices, and made confession of their sins over the same, before they had been allowed to come to join with their brethren in Temple worship.

Objection 4. Where did our brethren learn to make the Porters of the Temple types of Church officers? There is no argumenting from symbolic types, except where the Spirit of God in Scripture, applieth a type to such a signification of use.

By what Scripture will they make legal uncleanness to typify the estate of ir regeneration? And above all, how will they make exclusion from the Temple, for legal uncleanness, a type of rejection from Church membership for irr tgenation? Nothing more common then legal cleanness in a person ir regenerate, and legal uncleanness in a person regenerate. Legal uncleanness did never hinder any from Church-membership under the Old Testament, albeit for a time it might impead their Fellowship in some

services, but irregation did never hinder any from communion in any service, whether of the Tabernacle or Temple.

Reply 1. To make the Porters of the Temple, types of Church Officers, we learned it of the Lord Jesus. For who is that Porter, of whom Christ saith, he openeth the door of the sheepfold but only the officers of the Church? *John* 10:3.

2 To make uncleanness a type, as of other scandalous sins, so of irregation, we learned of the Apostle Paul, who maketh unbelievers, and unclean or defiled persons all one *Titus* 1:15. But take our Tenet, not as Mr *Baily* mis-conceiveth, but as ourselves propound it, and we shall willingly interpret legal uncleanness, to mean any open scandalous vice, whether it manifest irregation, or the fall of a regenerate person into open offence. And so the Argument will hold *à fortiori*: If any legal uncleanness did exclude an *Israelite* from entrance into the Temple, then any open scandal will exclude a Christian from entering into the visible Church. And if any open scandal, then much more such gross and heinous scandals, as are not incident to a regenerate person through infirmity, but are certain evidences of irregation.

It is too vast a hyperbole, to say, 'Nothing more common

92

then legal cleanness in a person irregenerate, and legal uncleanness in a person regenerate: For though hypocrites will *tithe the Mint, and Annis, and Cummin, when they neglect the weightier matters of the Law*, yet the most common sort of men are not Hypocrites, but either ignorant or irreligious persons, if they be irregenerate, and make little conscience of any spiritual duty. And Hypocrites themselves, that make most show of legal cleanness, yet when they are unfaithful in the greatest matters, who can believe they will be faithful in the least?

It is a very unsafe, and indeed an untrue speech, to say, 'That legal uncleanness did never hinder any from Church-membership under the Old Testament.

The neglect of circumcision was a legal uncleanness, and did cut off a man from all Church-communion with the people of God, *Genesis* 17:14. Eating of blood was a like legal uncleanness, and did in like sort cut off a man from Church-membership, *Leviticus* 17:10.

It is true what the Objector saith, 'That it is a question, whether sins very scandalous did keep men ceremonially clean from the Temple and Sacrifices. But surely such as committed those very scandalous sins, were

either to bring a trespass offering, and other sacrificer, to the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and to confess their sins over their sacrifices for their atonement, or else it was a sinful neglect in the Officers of the Temple, to admit them to fellowship in the holy things of God. And so it is also in Evangelical Church Discipline: Penitential confession presenteth a man clean to the Fellowship of the Church, though otherwise unclean.

But when he maketh it a matter out of all doubt, 'That irregeneration alone was never a bar to keep any from the most Holy and Solemn Seivices, whether of the Tabernacle or Temple.

He may be pleased to understand, That if he will take our Tenet from our own expressions, and not from his own forestalled prejudice: Neither amongst us doth irregeneration alone keep any from Church-Fellowship with us. Not irregeneration alone, I say, unless it be accompanied with such fruit as are openly scandalous, and do convincingly manifest irregeneration,

 93

on, as gross ignorance, palpable Hypocrisy, or such like spiriual wickedness. Nevertheless, I conceive (under favour) more positive fruits of regeneration are required in the Church members of the New Testament, then of the Old.

SECTION XIV.

Against the Argument alleged from Revelation 22:15, *Without are Dogs, Whoremongers, Idolaters and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie*: It is objected.

Objection. The place is foully abused, when it is applied to the visible Church, where there may be, and ordinarily are Dogs, yea and liars, *Revelation 2:2*. Idolaters, *verse 14*. Napier, *Pareus, Marlorat*, expound it of the kingdom of Glory, for that is the Kingdom spoken of, *Revelation 21:27*, within that Kingdom cannot enter anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, and lies, but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life. But it is against all reason, and the Lord's Word, that in the visible Church is nothing that defileth, that is, no sin, but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life. This is the very doctrine of *Anabaptists*, though we know our dear brethren hate the sect, and their doctrine.

Reply. Though I attribute much to the judgement of Mr *Rutherford* (whose objection this is) in matters of Doctrine, yet I must crave leave to depart from his interpretation of this place, and many such like which

concern discipline. Doubtless when this place excludeth Dogs, Idolaters Liars and such like gross scandalous persons, he meaneth them who are known to be such. And they who are known to be such, are not to be received into the visible Church: nor suffered in the Church, if being received they be found to be such. To admit or tolerate such, were a manifest violation of the order of the Gospel, *which forbiddeth the casting of holy things to Dogs, Matthew 7:6*, and forbiddeth also Church-communion with Idolaters, *1 Corinthians 5:11*, and commandeth the putting away of lying, *Ephesians 4:25*, a vice which *David* would not suffer to abide in his house, *Psalm 101:7*. And behold Christ (of whom *David* was a shadow) was of purer eyes than *David*, and the House of Christ (by order from him) should be kept more pure

94

than that of *David*. What if Liars were found in *Ephesus, Revelation 2:2*. It is neither said, they were received into the Church (but rather prevented by timely discovery), nor is it said, they were born withall in the Church; but rather expressly contrary, for Christ himself beareth them witness, I know thou canst not bear them which are evil, &c. And what if Idolaters were found in the Church of *Pergamus, verse 14*, doth not Christ expressly blame them for suffering such amongst them?

I deny not *Napier, Marlorat, and Pareus* do interpret those two last chapters of the Revelation of the Kingdom of Glory, the Church triumphant in Heaven, not of the militant Church on earth.

The men I dearly reverence, but yet I dare not deny, but that some others partly by light from *Napier's* principles, but principally by a clearer light received by the holy Ghost, for the interpretation of Prophetical Scriptures, have with far more evidence of truth, interpreted the same chapters to be a description of the state of the Church of the Jews, after their conversion, upon the desolation of *Rome. Brightman, Patricke, Forbes, Bernard*, all of them well affected to Presbyterian Discipline; yet Interpret those chapters of the estate of the Jewish Churches here on earth. Their reasons are extant in their books (which are in every man's hand) so that I need not to recite them.

It is true which the objection faith, 'That the Kingdom spoken of *Revelation 22:15*, is the same mentioned, *Revelation 21:27*. Of which it is said, *That into it shall nothing enter that deflieth, or that worketh abomination, or maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.*

But what is this more then the Prophets have fortold of the New *Jeruslaem* on earth? *Thy people shall be all righteous*, *Isaiah 60:21*, *from henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised, and the unclean*, *Isaiah 52:1*. *The Inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity*, *Isaiah 33:24*. I doubt not, Mr *Rutherford* will acknowledge (and all Orthodox with him) that such as have their iniquities forgiven, are written in the Lamb's book of life. 'Yea, but it against all reason, and against the Lord's Word, that in the visible Church, is nothing that defileth, that is, no sin.

It is not every sin, that defileth a Church, but sin openly known, and allowed, at least tollerated and not proceeded against by due admonition, and censure according to the rule of the Gospel. And in that sense, the Lord's Word expressly foretelleth, that nothing that defileth shall enter into the Church of the *Jews*, *Isaiah 52:1* as well as, *Revelation 21:27*. And why should it be thought against all reason, that after the Whore of *Babylon* is destroyed, the Spouse of Christ should appear in gracious and glorious parity, according to the primitive pattern of the Apostolic Chuches? where great grace was upon them all, *Acts 4:33*. And close Hypocrites (such as *Ananias* and *Sapphira*) were soon discovered, and severely removed. Let no man decline the evidence of this truth, by the wonted evasion of the invisible Church. For take the corruptest times of the Antichristian Apostacy; and even then, none entred into the invisible Church, but such as were undefiled, and whose names were written in the Lamb's book of life, *Revelation 14:1,4*, unless that also be interpretable of the visible Churches of the *Waldenses*, who separated themselves from the Antichristian Synagogues, But in those two last chapters of the *Revelation* doubtless greater purity of Churches is promised, not above what was before required, but above what was ordinarily before either attained or attended.

As for the *Anabaptists* he saith truly, we neither approve their sect nor doctrine, for their doctrine was the same which *Augustine* taxeth in the *Pelagians*, that the Church consisteth of such just persons, as are perfect without sin. And so *Calvin* reporteth of the *Anabaptists*; at least, of some chief of them *Institutes*, *l.4. c.2. ss.13*, which all men know, that know us, we disclaim, as seeing cause to bewail the manifold infirmities, of the purest members, of the purest Churches.

SECTION XV.

In the shutting up the discourse of the qualification of Church-members, 'it was noted in the way of our Churches, that it could not be thought an unseasonable curiosity, but rather held a due and faithful watchfulness, to take a due trial of men by a confession of their sins, as *John Baptist* did, *Matthew* 3:6,

96

and by a profession of their faith, as *Phillip* did, *Acts* 8:37. And that it was not an excessive austerity in *John*, but an holy faithfulness, and godly zeal, not only to repulse the Scribes and Pharisees, *Matthew* 3:7, but the profane people also from his baptism, *Luke* 3:7.

Which Mr *Baily* divideth into two Arguments, the one from, *Matthew* 3, the other from *Acts* 8, and answereth by way of objection against them both.

Objection 1. The consequence (saith he) is not good, but a loose kind of reasoning from *John the Baptist*, to all the officers, and body of the Church; from baptism or any sacrament to Church-membership, from the Scribes and Pharisees, and profane people, to every irregenerate person.

Reply. This reasoning is so far from looseness, that I see no colour, why it should not strongly bind, from *John's* faithfulness in dispensing his Baptism, to urge the like faithfulness in the Ministers of Christ in dispensing Christ's Baptism, unless we should conceive the baptism of Christ's, inferior in purity to that of *John's* which seemeth to me too gross for any man of judgment to imagine.

That mention was made of the body of the Church, it was not to infer the power of Baptism to belong to them, but to imply it to be a seasonable duty in them, to inform their Ministers of any profane persons, who might offer themselves, or their children to baptism, and by such information to retard their baptism.

And I can but wonder, why he should call it a loose kind of reasoning from baptism to Church-membership, seeing baptism is a Sacrament sealing to us, as other spiritual benefits, so our intintion into Church-membership. Whereupon I conceive it to be an undeniable truth, that to whom baptism (the sign and seale of Church fellowship) is denied, to them Church-fellowship is denied also. As for that 'loose reasoning from Scribes, and Pharisees, and the profane people, to every irregenerate person; that is none of mine, but his own. All that I did infer from thence

was, that as *John* did repulse the Scribes, and Pharisees, and profane people from his baptism, so the Ministers of the Gospel ought in like sort, refuse to admit any

89/2

such persons to Church-Fellowship whose hypocrisy (as that of the Scribes and Pharisees) or profaneness (as that of the people) did evidently discover their irregeneration.

Objection 2 jut (saith he) the worst is, that the antecedent is clearly against the places of Scripture alledged. *John* did not exclude, either the Scribes or the Pharisees, or the common people from his Baptism: He received all that came, both the Scribes, and Pharisees, and *Jerusalem*, and all *Judea*, and all the Region about *Jordan*, requiring no other condition for their admission to his Sacrament, then the confession of sin, and promising of new obedience: Acts very feasible to irregenerate people.

Reply. This objection hath been answered above in chapter 2. Either *John Baptist* excluded the Scribes and Pharisees and profane people from his baptism: or else he made himself more unfaithful in God's house then the Scribes and Pharisees. For this was a great part of their Temple-pollution, that they *made the House of God a Den of thieves*, *Matthew 11:17*. But if *John Baptist* received them to his baptism, he then made the Church (or House of God) not only a Den of thieves, but, which is worse, a Generation Vipers. The Scribes and Pharisees were Heretics in doctrine. Superfluous in worship, notorious Hypocrites in their profession, and covetous Worldlings in their conversation: 'If that be the worst we say, to say, that *John* repulsed a generation of Vipers from his baptism; consider if it be not far worse to say, he did admit them.

It is a very groundless imagination, 'to think that *John* admitted to his baptism all that came, both the Scribes and Pharisees, and profane people; although the text saith, *There went out to him, Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan*: For though from all those parts sundry came to him, yet not all that came to him, were baptised; but such only as being touched with repentance confessed their sins *Matthew 3:6*. And indeed wherefore was his baptism called the baptism of repentance? but because he received none to baptism but such as professed their repentance. As *Peter* exhorted the Jews first to repent, and then, to be baptized, *Acts 2:38*. But as for the Pharisees and Sadduces, they are spoken of with an adversative

90/2

particle, as intimating he did exclude them from his baptism; which he admitted so many others unto. For so the Evangelist relateth it, *There went out unto John, Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sinne.* But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism (instead of entertaining them to his baptism) he intertaineth them with a sharp reproofe, *O Generation of Vipers, &c. Matthew 5,6,7.*

‘Yea but *John* required no other condition to his Baptism, but the confession of sin, and promise of new obedience, acts very feasible to irregenerate persons.

Yes, *John* required more, to wit, That they should bring forth fruits meet for repentance *verse 8.* Neither do we require any more, then that men confess their fin, and profess their repentance, and new obedience, and bring forth such fruits, as do not prevaricate, and deny such a profession. And though some irregenerate persons may hold forth all these, yet we refuse not to accept such profession, when we see no fruits to the contrary. Whence it was, that in the way of our Churches, it was added in the same place, ‘We had rather 99 Hypocrites should perish through presumption, then one humble soul belonging to Christ, should sink under discouragement, by despair.

SECTION XVI.

Objection 2. In the Argument from *Acts 8*, for shortness sake, I observe (saith he) but one fault, in the consequence, yet a very gross one: That profession of faith is made a certaine Argument of true grace and sanctification. Will any of our brethren be content to admit their members upon so slender terms, as Phillip, or any of the Apostles did require of their new converts? will the profession, that Jesus is the Christ, or such a confession, as *Simon Magus* could make, and the rest of the *Samaritans*, after a little labour of *Phillip* among them, be an evident, and convincing sign of regeneration?

Reply. This very gross fault in the consequence, which *M. Bayly* saith he marketh, is (as his consequences are wont to be) none

91/2

of ours, but his owne. *Phillip* admitted none to his baptism, but upon profession of faith; *ergo*, none should be admitted members of the Church, without certain evidence of their regeneration: This inference we leave to himself. But surely it is not found in any writing of ours, either in the

proposal of this argument, or any other. But all that we would infer from that example of *Phillip*, may be expressed in these consequences.

If *Phillip* required it as a needful preparative to baptism, that a Proselyte of grown years should believe with all his heart; then faith unfained is a needful requisite in a man of grown years to Church-membership.

But *Phillip* required in the *Eunuch* (a Proselyte of grown-years) as a necessary preparative to his baptim, *That he should believe with all his heart* (which is all one with faith unfeigned) Acts 8:36–37.

Therefore faith unfained is a needful requisite to Church-Fellowship.

For I take the right of Church-fellowship, and the right to the sign of Church-Fellowship, to be convertible

2. Our other consequence is this, if *Phillip* received the *Eunuch* unto baptism upon the voluntary profession of his faith in Christ, when he saw no cause to suspect the sincerity of it, by any evil fruits; but rather had just cause to approve it, by the testimony of the Angel, and his own conference with him; then the Officers of the Church, may receive a Proselyte into the Church, upon the profession of his faith in Christ; when they see no cause to suspect the sincerity of it, but rather to approve it.

But the former is true, *Acts* 8:37–38. Therefore the latter.

Let not then M. *Baily* say, 'That we would be loth to admit our members upon so slender terms as *Phillip*. or any of the Apostles required of their new converts. For we admit them upon more slender termes, then they required; though we would not willingly admit them upon other terms, then they accepted. *Phillip* required faith unfained; but he accepted the Profession of his faith, such as was not denied with contrary fruits, and so do we, and that upon more slender testimony from men, then then the testimony of the Angel intimated to *Phillip* of the good estate of the *Eunuch*. The Apostle *Peter* required repentance and faith in Christ of those new converts, *Acts* 2:38. He accepted their

93/3

gladsome profession, receiving his words, *verse* 41. which profession, nevertheless, was expressed with such life of gracious affection, that amongst 3,000 souls, not one of a thousand proved hypocritical. *Ananias* and *Saphira* where but two persons, who proved to be hypocrites: but the Church-members were then not 3,000 only, but 5,000 *Acts* 4:4. And *Simon Magus* was but one Hypocrite, and the only one of all the *Samaritans*, that discovered his Hypocrisy afterwards; but all the rest, though they

were new converts, yet were enlarged in abundance of illumination, and holy affection, to make up what was wanting in their late conversion, yea and *Simon* himself though no better than stony, or at most, than thorny soil, yet even he might be strongly and deeply affected for awhile. For the stony soil receiveth the word incontinently with joy, *Matthew* 13:20. And the thorny soil wanteth not depth of earth; though the stony do.

SECTION XVII.

Having thus (by the help of Christ) rescued our arguments laid down in the way of our Churches, from the objections, and exceptions taken against them: Let me proceed to rescue in like sort a passage or two in our Apology.

1 In the Apology, chapter 9, we said, we should open the doors of the Church more wide then God alloweth, if we should wittingly and willingly lay dead stones in the living Temple, if Christ be an head of pure gold, and the Church a golden Candlestick, how shall we be allowed to put in leaden members?

Against this, it is objected by Mr *Rutherford*:

objection 1. This Argument is against the Lord's dispensation, because not without his providence are Hypocrites in the Church.

Reply, It is very unsound arguing from God's providence, to God's Ordinance. Many, not only Hypocrites, but profane and scandalous persons, are not only in the Church, but in the Ministry also, by God's providence: But it will not therefore follow, that profane and scandalous persons should be admitted either into the Ministry, or into the Church, neither of them standing with God's Ordinance, or Commandment.

Objection 2. It is not against God's Commandment, for he alloweth and

94/2

'commandeth the Church to take in Hypocrites, so that they profess the truth, and so commandeth that leaden toes, and members be added to Christ a head of gold. Christ is the head of the Church properly, and according to the influence of the life of God, but he is the Head of the visible Church, as it is such, according to the influence of common gifts, which may be in Reprobates. And they may be this way in Christ's body who are not of his body, as *Augustine* saith.

Reply: It is not safely said, that God commandeth his Church to take in Hypocrites. He commandeth indeed his Church (or rather the Ministers of it) to call all, both good and bad to the marriage of his son; but he

doth not command them to take all in, till they be clothed with the wedding garment. He commandeth them to preach the Gospel to every creature, Mark 16:15, but to baptize only the disciples, *Matthew* 28:19. And the infant-children of beleivers are counted Disciples, as well as their fathers, as hath been showed elsewhere, in the grounds and ends of children's baptism, lest M. *Rutherford* should think, that in alledging, *Matthew* 28:19, we might seem to doubt of the lawful warrant of baptizing children, whereof he warneth us, chapter 9, of his peaceable plea, page 266. And though Christ compareth his Church to a field, wherein are sown good Wheate and Tares: yet he nowhere commandeth his servants to sow Tares in his field, but accounteth the sowing of them to be the work of the Devil, *Matthew* 13:39, which maketh me to marvel, that the objector should say, 'God alloweth, and commandeth his Church to take in Hypocrites. It is true indeed, that God alloweth them to take in such as profess the truth, so that they do not renounce, and falsify their profession, by a wicked conversation. But that is not because he alloweth them to take in Hypocrites; but because he alloweth men to be men: the Church to judge of men's holiness not by the estate of men's hearts (which are certainly known only to God) but by their outward profession, and conversation: 'God never allowed or commanded, that leaden toes and members should be added to Christ, an head of gold: no more then he alloweth Ministers to build upon a golden foundation, wood, hay, stubble, 1 *Corinthians* 3:12

It is a limiting of the grace of Christ and an injury to the visible

94/2

Church, to say (as the objection doth) 'That Christ is the Head of the visible Church, as it is such, according to the influence of common gifts, which may be in Reprobates. For Christ is the Head of the visible Church as visible, not only according to the influence of common gifts, but of such gifts also as accompany salvation. Or else the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and censures in the visible Church, were only a Ministry of common gifts, not of regeneration, or saving edification, which God forbid.

'It is true, what is alledged out of *Augustine*, that some maybe in the body, that are not of the body, as ill humours in the natural body.

But such ill humours as are to be purged out of the body, are not to be drunk into the body: And it is one thing *de facto*, for such to be in the body; another thing *de jure*, to allow them a place in the body.

Another passage in the apology to the same purpose (touching the qualification of members) against which exception is taken, was this.

‘A faithful servant (or Steward) would admit none into his Lord’s house, but serviceable Instruments, therefore neither may the Steward of Go’s house (which is a spiritual building) admit any but men of spiritual gifts, living stones, sanacted and meet for the Lord’s use.

Objection: The comparision halteth many wayes. i. All in a Nobleman’s house are not Stewards: you make all the Church to be Stewards, having the power of the keys, to put in and out. 2. Members are received into the Church, not only because they are serviceable for the Masters ufe, but to be made serviceable, and to be polished by the Word of God, and care of Pastors: but servants are taken into great houses because they are serviceable. For if they become more serviceable afterwards, it is not the intent of the Lord of the house or of the under-Stewards. 3. The Oeconomy of Princes houses, is no rule for the Government of the house of the king of Kings.

Reply. The halting of this comparison lieth not in the inequality of the things compared, in that wherein they are compared: but in the unequal either organ or medium, by which they are

95/2

discerned. A staff when it is seen partly in the air, partly in the water seemeth crooked, though it be never so straight. Look at the ordering of a Nobleman’s house, or of God’s house, partly as they are, and should be ordered according to the word, and partly as either of them are ordered according to the sinful customs of men; and so this double medium may easily present an halting. Or take a Nobleman’s house as it should be ordered by the word, and the Church as it is commonly ordered by men, and so there will be an halting: not otherwise in this case.

For the first, We make not all the Church, Stewards by office(as hath been often said) but by fidelity, to have a common care of the honour and welfare of God’s house. And such a Stewardly fidelity ought every child and servant in his Lords house to have.

2 For the second, I think it cannot be truly said, That it is not the intent of the Lord of the house, nor of the under-Stewards, that the servants received into his house, should become more serviceable. Doubtless the longer an servant continueth in the house, the better he knoweth and doth his Lord’s will, and ought so to do, and his Lord expecteth it. And as in the house of God, some are received into the Church that they may

be made serviceable, but those are children; so in a Nobleman's house some children are received (especially the children of Servants) that they may learn to be serviceable,

3. For the third, The Oeconomy of Princes houses, it is true, It is no rule for the Government of God's house. But surely it is a dishonour to God's house, if God's house be more loosely and dissolutely ordered, than the house of any earthly King or Lord. Else *David* was mistaken when he said, *holiness becometh thine house, O Lord, for ever, Psalm 93:5.* Though the Oeconomy of Princes houses be no rule for the ordering of God house; yet me thinks the ordering of God's house (the King of Kings) might be a rule or pattern, (at least in some proportion) for the Oeconomy of Princes' Houses. Methinks the Stewards of God's house should blush, to admit such unserviceable persons into Gods house, whom, if themselves were Stewards of a Nobleman's house, they could not for shame admit into their Lord's house.

FINIS.



OF THE HOLINESS OF CHURCH MEMBERS

