

**CAIN AND ABEL MALIGNITY,**

**THAT IS**

**ENMITY TO SERIOUS GODLINESS ;**

**THAT IS.**

**TO A HOLY AND HEAVENLY STATE OF HEART AND LIFE :**

**LAMENTED, DESCRIBED, DETECTED, AND UNANSWERABLY PROV-  
ED TO BE THE DEVILISH NATURE, AND THE MILITIA OF THE  
DEVIL AGAINST GOD, AND CHRIST, AND THE CHURCH AND  
KINGDOMS, AND THE SUREST SIGN OF A STATE OF  
DAMNATION.**



## TO THE READER.

---

READER,

THIS reprehensive lamentation of English malignity, or hatred, and scorn, and persecution of serious godliness, by them who profess to believe in God, and to be Christians, was written in prison (but without any provoking sense of my suffering), in Anno 1685, or 1686. And by one that was not wholly ignorant, how much of the Papists' counsel and power was causal in our change since the return of King Charles II. 1660. And therefore it grateth so much upon the Papists, though they were professed Protestants who were the open agents.

It was written by one who can remember, at least since 1627. That the serious practice of godliness was the common scorn of the vulgar rabble; and he that did but read the Scripture, and books of piety, and pray in his family, and catechise children or servants, to hear a sermon at the next parish church from a godly Conformist, when he had none at home; yea, that did but seriously talk of Christ or Scripture, or the life to come, or preparation for death and judgment, when under the name of a Puritan, which was a reproach in the mouth of drunkards, swearers, fornicators, and all the sensual, worldly sort, both high and low. And that conformable ministers (yea and gentlemen) that were but seriously religious, no more escaped this scorn than Nonconformists (who were then so few, that they were in most places unknown). He sadly remembereth how greatly this malignant rabble triumphed in the bishop's visitation articles, and in the preaching and talk of many priests, who sharpened their sermons with invectives against Puritans as

dangerous hypocrites, though they had not a Nonconformist within many miles. He heard the godly conformable ministers lament, that the bishops and ecclesiastical courts by their jealousy and heat against the nonconformable Puritans, became the strength and encouragement of this malignant, vicious rabble; and that the young worldly ministers took it for the way to preferment, to preach against Puritans, while they treated the multitude of profane, prayerless families that had no savour of serious religion, as their good and peaceable flocks. He lived to see the godly, learned conformists, so grieved for this, that they longed for a reformation; and many conformists (as Bishop Robert Abbot, Bishop Downname, and divers others published their reproof and lamentation for it; and good Robert Bolton (in his Directions for Walking with God) thinks that since malice entered into the heart of man, there was never a word tossed with more malice in the mouths of drunkards and profane men, than the word 'Puritan.' Hundreds and thousands of these wicked scorers of religion, were either admitted (or driven) to the sacrament, or lived quietly in great parishes while they despised it, while these poor Puritans were strictly hunted after! And if they fasted and prayed with a dying or sick friend, without getting a licence for it from the bishop, the churchwarden must enter them into their inquisition, or be forsworn.

These Puritans having the greatest averseness to popery, in some things were too suspicious of all that they thought smelled of it. And when they heard that in Ireland the Papists had most barbarously murdered the Protestants (two hundred thousand), and that they boasted that they rose by the king's commission, and threatened to invade England, and that the English Papists were against the parliament; this made many think that the Protestant religion was not safe, but in the parliament's part and care: upon which the next year when our odious civil war began, many of them went into the parliament's armies; but the generality would fain have lived quietly at home, but the debauched rabble and their patrons would not suffer them; but they turned the name 'Puritan' into 'Roundhead,' and 'Down with the Roundheads,' was the common cry. I have myself by that cry been in present danger, in passing through a city where

no man knew me, because I wore not long hair. If their neighbours did but pray, and sing a psalm in their houses, the rabble would (like the Sodomites at the door of Lot) set up a cry against them in the streets, and say, 'Down with the Roundheads, the rebels, a Gowry, a conspiracy, &c.' Even where I lived they assembled with weapons, and sought my life, and knocked down (mortality being the issue) even strangers in the streets that meddled not with them, because they were accounted friends to the Puritans. By this means the parliament's garrisons and armies were filled with religious men, that were forced to fly from their houses by the malignant, ignorant drunkards, to save their lives : and this, even this was the ruin of King Charles, and his army, and of the persecuting bishops and clergy. Necessity made thousands to be soldiers that could not live at home : and most were moved by an argument that was not cogent, still saying, 'We cannot believe that God would suffer the generality of the most religious to choose the wrong side, and the generality of the Papists and ignorant drunkards and malignants to be in the right.'

O what shame and pity is it that the Antipuritan clergy no better remembered from 1660 till now, by what means they fell ; and that they no more understood, nor yet understand, what a torrent of sin, of danger, and of shame, is come upon them, by their strengthening themselves, by sheltering (to say no worse) the sensual, irreligious, malignant rabble, (rich and poor,) that they may tread down the Puritans, that by their own doings are brought into a dislike of them. Will God ever bless a profane rabble (or gentry) to be the honour and strength of the church, against the religious that desire a reformation ?

It is not their new foolish names and scorns, (as Whigs, Trimmers, Presbyterians, &c.) that will prove that it is not serious piety that they hate. As long as the most filthy wicked livers are the enemies and accusers, and in their own party and companions, the vilest debauchery passeth for sufferable, and a small disgrace, and thousands of such live at ease, when preaching the Gospel, and praying without their fetters or book, must cost men ruin, and imprisonment, and scorn. And Sulpicius Severus's sharp invective against Ithacius, Idacius, and the rest of the bishops in their synod

was that in prosecuting the Priscillian Gnostics, they brought the matter to that pass, that if godly men did but fast, and pray, and read Scripture, the bishops made them suspected as Priscillianists (even St. Martin himself). Woe to them that turn the sacred offices of magistracy and ministry against God that did ordain them, to be used as in his name, and in some representation of himself, sacrilegiously blaspheming him as an enemy to himself. Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with God, that frameth mischief by a law, to make sin common and allowed?

By this the reader may see that there is a double history needful to the full understanding of this book; and of the nature and causes of malignity; that is, 1. The history of Adam's fall, and the great depravation of human nature thence arising; and the true meaning of the enmity thence put between the woman's and the serpent's seed, exemplified in the two first brothers born into the world; as also in Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob; and frequently mentioned by Christ and his apostles.

2. The history of the advantages that malignity hath got into England since the Reformation; and especially since the return of Charles the Second. This must contain the sad differences begun at Frankfort in Queen Mary's days; the errors and extremes of both the differing parties; the biasing determinations of Queen Elizabeth; the difference between the first bishops that had been exiles, and their successors; the Presbyterians' provocations by over-opposing Episcopacy, and the bishops' design to root them out; and the making of canons to that end; the rise of a new sort of bishops, began in Laud, Neil, Howson, Corbet, and Buckeridge, with Mountague, and their growth under Buckingham against the old churchmen; the design of a coalition with Rome, and the French and English attempts thereto; the interruption of this design by the Long Parliament, and the wars; the Scots forcing the parliament (that in their straits asked their help) to take their covenant; the imposing that covenant on the whole ministry, and making it a divided engine on pretence of unity; the parliament's casting out with a multitude of flagitious ministers) some doctors, for being against them, for the king, contrary to the desires of the peacemakers; the Presbyterians under Monk restoring King

Charles the Second; the return and preferment of his doctors, and their revengeful resolutions; their design to let all church-power, and preferment, and academic rule into the hands of them that most hated Puritans, or would endeavour their extirpation, and would educate youth in bitter prejudice and hatred of them; the vulgar hatred of serious godliness in Conformists and Nonconformists, under the name of Puritans; the power that a few returned doctors had with the king and chancellor in the disposal of preferments, and thereby to overrule the parliament, and to procure the acts of uniformity, corporation oaths, vestry and militia oaths, and the acts for banishments, confinements, imprisonments, fining, ejecting, silencing and ruining such whose consciences pleaded God's law and authority against any of their oaths, impositions, and silencing prohibitions to preach the Gospel; the great difference in the wars (I meddle not with the cause) between the adherents and soldiers of the king, (Charles I.) and the parliament's in point of piety and sobriety; the animosity and implacable heat by which the before-conquered, and now ruling party, proceeded towards the ruin of those that they took for enemies to the cause, civil or ecclesiastic, which they had owned; the unhappiness of the then present ministry, that being young then, had never meddled with wars, that they must equally suffer as enemies, for fearing the imposed oaths, subscriptions, covenants, and practices; the rejoicing of the common sort of the luxurious drunkards, whoremongers, and infidels, that they had got so many of the religious into contempt, and scorn, and ruin; the woeful increase of whoredom, luxury, and impiety, and Sadduceeism hereupon; the great numbers of religious people, who before hoped for peace and a pious prelacy, that fell hereupon into a hatred of prelacy, and a great disesteem of the conforming ministry; and so our divisions are grown to a fixed factious enmity; and malice and worldly interest will hear no motions or petitions for peace; and yet madly plead all for love and peace, while they implacably fight against them, and accuse those as the enemies of peace, who beg peace of them, and cannot obtain it.

This is the sum of the doleful history which this book presupposeth: but should I write it, the rage would be increased. The foregoing narrative is as much as is fit for

this brief discourse, which, if you will, you may style 'Acris correptio,' with Gildas ; or 'Planctus Ecclesie,' with Alv. Pelag. or, 'The groans of the church,' with a late conformable divine. It hath been cast by four years, at first because it would not be endured, and after in a vain hope that our church reformation would make such a complaint less necessary. But now I perceive the devil will be the devil, and mankind will be born blind, sensual and malignant, till there be a new heaven and earth in which dwelleth righteousness. Come, Lord Jesus.

August 24, 1689, the fatal day of silencing in England in 1662.



# CAIN AND ABEL MALIGNITY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### *A Lamentation for the Case of the Deluded, Malignant, Militant World.*

1. **T**HE depraved and miserable condition of mankind, hath long been the astonishing wonder of the sober and inquisitive part of the world : philosophers were puzzled with the difficult questions, whence it first came ; and why it is no more remedied. Christians are taught by the sacred Scriptures how to answer both, by laying it on man's misusing of his freewill, supposing God's permission of his trial and temptations ; and on his resistance and rejection of remedying grace, in the degree that it is vouchsafed or offered. But still there are difficulties, and our understandings are dark, and hardly satisfied. And whencesoever it comes, the case is doleful, and we cannot but think of it with astonishment and lamentation. When we saw a hundred thousand made dead corpses by the London plague, 1665, it did not take off the terror to know how it begun. And when we saw the city on a dreadful flame, which none could stop, it cured not the general astonishment to conjecture how it was kindled or carried on : no doubt but hell itself proclaimeth that God is holy, wise and just, and devils and men are the cause of their own everlasting punishment. But yet if we had a sight of it, amazement and dread would overwhelm us, And, alas ! what a map of hell is the greatest part of earth ! Hell is a place of lying, malignant and murderous, hurtful spirits, miserable by and for their wickedness : and is not this in a low degree, a true description of most of the earth ?

2. Nineteen parts in thirty of the earth are idolaters and heathens. And do I need to say, how ignorant, wicked and miserable they are? Many of them publicly worship the devil, as witches do with us; and he deludeth them, and appeareth in divers shapes to them, and ruleth them as he doth witches. And those that are more civil, are strangers or enemies to Christ. Six parts of the thirty are ignorant Mahometans, destroyers indeed of heathenish idolatry, and such as take Christ for a great and true prophet, but know him not as a Saviour, but equal to prefer a gross deceiver, and live under barbarous tyrants, who by violence keep them in the dark. The other five parts that are called Christians, alas! consist most of people bred up in lamentable ignorance, mostly barbarous or debased by the oppression of tyrants, such as the Muscovites, most of the Greeks, the Abassines, Armenians, and many eastern sects and nations. What ignorance the vulgar Papists are bred in in Italy, Spain, Germany, Poland, France, and other countries, and what enmity to true reformation prevaieth in princes, priests, and people; and by what lying and cruelty they fight against truth, and what inquisitions, murders, and inhuman massacres have been their powerful means, I need not use many words to tell.

And are the Protestant reformed churches free from fleshly, worldly, wicked men? From ignorant, malignant, cruel enemies to truth, and piety, and peace?

3. Our king's dominions are the best and happiest nations on earth. Here is most knowledge of the truth, and most proportionably that truly love it, and live in a holy obedience thereto, and fain would live a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness, honesty, and sobriety. But alas! they must be contented with their own personal uprightness and reward, and the peace of their consciences in God's acceptance. But with men there seemeth to be no hopes of common wisdom, piety, love, and peace.

We are all baptized with one baptism; we all profess to be the servants of one God, and the faithful followers of one Christ, and to believe in one holy, sanctifying Spirit, and to believe the same canonical Scriptures as the word of God, indited by that Spirit; and to be of one holy catholic church, which is all the members of Christ on earth; and to hold the communion of saints. We mostly in England and Scotland

agree in the Protestant reformed doctrine, and sacraments ; our concord in profession is so great, that if some men had not devised some oaths, professions, covenants, practices, knacks, and engines of their own (which they dare not say God made) to become the matter of unavoidable dissent, they could hardly have known how to pretend any difference in religion among us, and hell would scarce have found any cloak for malicious accusations, enmity and discord.

You shall scarce meet with a man that will not speak well of love and peace, and say that we must love God above all, and our neighbours as ourselves, and do as we would have others do to us. And yet is there any enmity or disagreement ? Alas how great, and how incurable !

4. Who would think that knew us not by our profession, but only by our actions, but that the three kingdoms consisted of the most deadly enemies to each other ? Of Turks and Christians ; of wolves and sheep ; that I say not of devils and men ? Yea, Turks and Christians can live together in Hungary and all the eastern countries. Orthodox and heretics can live together in Poland, Helvetia, Holland, &c. But Protestants and Protestants cannot live together in Britain. Cities and corporations, countries and churches, if not families also, are distracted in enmity and more than mental feuds and war. Guelphs and Gibelines, party against party, studying accusations against each other, as if they were scholars daily exercised in the school of him that is the accuser of the brethren. All their learning and wit is called up, and poured out, to render others as odious as they are able. All their power, interest, friends, and diligence, are used to ruin and destroy each other. No lies or perjury with some seem unlawful to accomplish so desired an effect. In all companies, the discourse and converse that should be to edify each other in love, and comfort each other by the hopes of dwelling together in heaven, is taken up with slanders, backbitings, scorning, railing, and plotting the overthrow of the best of their neighbours. Innocency never wants odious or scornful names. As if they were acting their part that called Christ and his apostles, and the ancient Christians deceivers, blasphemers, enemies to Cæsar, ringleaders of sedition, that taught men to worship God contrary to the law. Every drunkard and wicked liver can as easily make his conscionable neighbour a rogue, or a traitor, or a schis-

matic, or a hypocrite, as he can open his mouth and speak.

And to justify all this malice is become a virtue ; hating the most religious, is zeal for government and order ; destroying Christ's members, is standing up for the church ; hunting them as dogs do hares, or as hawks do the lesser birds, is a meritorious work, of supererogation no doubt, and will not finally lose its reward. God is served by hating and scorning them that are serious in his service. It is religion to make religion odious, and call it hypocrisy, and to be for that which is uppermost, and befriends their worldly interest, and to make him suspected of disloyalty, who is for obedience to God. Conscience, and fear of sinning, and of damnation, is the mortal enemy to be conquered or driven out of the land ; as if there were no quietness to be expected in men's minds, no concord in the church, no obedience to the clergy, or the laws, no safety from sedition, till conscience be silenced or banished, and men give over fearing God ; or as if Christ and Cæsar could not both reign, but God or princes must be dethroned.

And O that the sacred tribe were innocent, and none of them were the leaders in such hypocritical malignity ! Their canons 'ipso facto' excommunicate all (not excepting princes, parliaments, or judges) that do but say, that any of their ceremonies, liturgy, or officers in church government (not excepting the lowest, or laymen's power of the church keys by decreeing excommunications and absolutions) are repugnant to the word of God. And when they have 'ipso facto' excommunicated them all, they call them separatists for not coming to their communion. Think not the contradiction and hypocrisy incredible. Read but the fifth, sixth and eighth canon, and judge. They have a law, and by their law he is cut off from the church of Christ, that doth but call any of these the inventions of prelates sinful, or to say, that God forbids them. And the gaol must be his dwelling till he die there, who in ten cases remaineth excommunicate and doth not openly profess that he repenteth, and judgeth that to be sinless, which he is utterly unable so to judge. When we have preached seven and seven years, to persuade a drunkard, a liar, and profane swearer, or an atheist to repent, he liveth quietly out of the gaol though he repent not. But if a man repent not (when he cannot) of judging that God forbids such human inventions and impositions in reli-

gion, take him jailor; he that will not be for human offices, ceremonies, and impositions, shall not be of our church. And when we cast him out, we will say he separateth. And if he be not of our church, he shall be in gaol; as if the church and the gaol would hold all the land, except his sin be such a Peccadillo as Atheism, Sadduceeism, bestiality, Hobbism, Popery, manslaughter, adultery, drunkenness, swearing, &c., not aggravated by the crimes of breaking the canons in point of conformity; or if many thousands cannot or will not come within the doors of the parish church, so they will go to no unlicensed preacher, nor worship God in house or church at all, they live quietly out of prison. But if the mote of an oath or ceremony scrupled be in their eye, that eye must be pulled out (if the mote cannot) or else the whole body be cast into their hell. And if the preacher be but a candidate of domination, his way is oft to call to the magistrate to execute the law upon such as dare presume to worship God openly, till they hold all such imposed oaths, covenants, professions and practices to be lawful. He is to make his auditory believe that such men are dangerous, intolerable persons, and that their meeting to worship God and learn their duty, is to cherish sedition, heresy, and schism. and that rebellion is in their hearts; and that the preachers that even to a thing indifferent are not of their mind and obedience, are deceivers, and factious, and it is no sacrilege, but a duty to forbid them to preach the Gospel. If the people dare not trust the parson, vicar, or curate of the parish (be he what he will, whom a — patron chooseth for them) with the pastoral ordinary conduct of their souls, or if he preach not at all, if they go to the next parochial conformist for the sacrament, he is to be driven home, and used as disobedient.

Through the great mercy of God while the Bible is licensed, a preacher in England knoweth not how to spend his hour, if he say not somewhat for faith and godliness, love and peace. And when they come down, none are so hated by some of them, as those that believe and do to their utmost what they for fashion sake persuaded them to believe and do. Their neighbours who have not a word with the priest of any thing but this world; nor read a chapter, or put up a prayer in their families, these are good and quiet neighbours. But if any seriously prepare for their everlast-

ing state, and mind their salvation above the world ; especially if he pray without book, and dislike the ignorant and scandalous lives of sorry priests, these are the dangerous troublers of the land, away with them, and give us those that trouble us not with the talk of God and of death, and heaven or hell, of Scripture or of conscience, and that scruple nothing that we could have them say or do. If such pray, it is but in hypocrisy ; if they go to hear any other preacher, it is in faction. If they speak any words to God which are not written down for them to read, they saucily prate to God, and speak but nonsense. If they be earnest as knowing what they pray for, they do but whine and cut faces, and speak through the nose, or are a pack of groaning hypocrites. It is confessed that the spirit of adoption and supplication is God's gift ; and that this spirit taught the bishops and convocation in what words to pray to God. But if the most holy or learned besides them pretend to it, and think that any may pray by the Spirit's help but the convocation, there are reverend men that will deride that Spirit, or that prayer. I would at least they would let men pray by reason and the sense of their soul's necessities (as a child will beg pardon of an offended father), if they will not give them leave to pray by that Spirit (which all must live by that will be saved).

Physicians use their patients with some humanity, and will not say to him that saith, ' My stomach cannot take down this potion ; I shall cast it up,' You shall take it or die, or go to prison. Or if one say, ' This pill is bigger than my throat can swallow,' they will rather say, it shall be made less, than they will cut his throat wider to get it down. And sure the reason is because the law doth make them physicians to none but volunteers, and give them no compelling power. If it did, I know not what inhumanity they might come to. For I will not believe that there is any thing in divinity which tendeth to make men more inhuman than physicians. I have seen Jews and others, that will eat no swine's flesh ; and I have known many that a taste of cheese would cast into a swoon near death ; and I never knew any say, You shall eat this or die ; nor that ever motioned the making of a law that all men should be imprisoned, or forbidden all other meat, who refused to eat swine's flesh, for fear of tolerating Jews.

But we have priests too many, that will say, 'Take every oath, promise, or ceremony required of you, or preach not, nor worship God openly at all. Take me for your pastor, or you shall have none. Hear me, or hear no man. Receive the communion from me, or from none. Deny not the lawfulness of a ceremony, or be excommunicate.'

4. And is it now any wonder that the people say as they are taught? And these are lessons more easily learnt than a catechism, or the creed, or the meaning of baptism. How quickly can a man learn to call his neighbour Whig or Tory! Or to hate a godly man, or in a tavern or alehouse to scorn them, or drink and curse to their confusion, and to say, 'I hope to see them all hanged or banished out of the land. As a priest that knows not what divinity or the priestly office is, may before he taketh many degrees, attain the ability learnedly to call his godly neighbours schismatics, or hypocrites, or worse; so no doubt a few such sermons, if not a tavern, can quickly teach them that never knew what religion is, yea, that can scarce speak sense, to revile the wisest and best men, as if they were sinners against the true religion, if they will be serious in any true religion at all.

5. O sinful! O miserable land! who kindled all the hellish flames of thy malignity and mad divisions? And who continueth them, and for what? What cloven foot hath entered, and expelled concord? What spirit ruleth thee? Were it the Spirit of Christ, it would be for healing, love, and concord; it would set men on studying to promote love to all, even unto enemies, but much more to the most holy. It would make men zealous of good works, and if it were possible as much as in them lieth, to live peaceably with all men, to bless those that curse them, to pray for those that hate and persecute them, forbearing and forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake forgiveth us. It would teach them while they have time to do good to all men, but especially to them of the household of faith. Men's hearts would be constituted of love. It would become a nature in them. Their speech and converse would be the savoury breath of love. Their dealings towards all men would be the works of love. Their sharpest reproofs would be but to do the sinner good.

But alas, another spirit hath possessed thee, which rageth and teareth thee; and is blind and deaf. It calleth for fire

from heaven, and it kindleth a fire of hell. And sure his name is Legion, for there are many. It passeth under the names of Wisdom, and Hatred of some evil. But it must needs be earthly, sensual, and devilish, for it is neither pure nor peaceable, gentle, or merciful and impartial, but foameth with bitter envy and strife, unto confusion and every evil work. And yet thou knowest not what manner of spirit thou art of.

Is it God that setteth rulers and people against each other? Doth he divide his own kingdom against itself, when he tells that the devil will not do so by his? Is it God that sets the parts of the same body in a hatred and war against each other; as if it were the interest of the nobler and the servile parts to weaken or destroy each other? And it were an addition to the health and welfare of the one, which is gotten from conquest from the other? Is it God that maketh people despise or dishonour their lawful governors, or any rulers to hate the best subjects, and desire more to be feared than to be loved, and rather to have power to do hurt, than actually to do good? Is it God that sets corporations, and churches, and neighbours, and families, in a state of malice, vexation, strife, and a kind of war against each other? Doth the Spirit of God indite the malicious pamphlets, which exercise the utmost of wit and hatred, to destroy love, and to call the nation into the devil's camp, by mutual hatred to live as enemies, and fight against the Lord and the ways of peace? And if any endeavour a reconciling healing of our wounds, it is turned into scorn, and his healing motions are represented as the grand causes of division; and to beg for peace is heinous schism, and next rebellion against the church, and a crime sufficient to forfeit that man's peace and reputation: and he that tells men of the only possible terms of concord, is made the chiefest cause of discord. To serve and worship God no otherwise than Peter and Paul did, and than God prescribeth, is enough to render us unworthy to live on English earth; and if England may not suffer such, why should any other nation suffer them? There are men that keep holy days for St. Peter, and St. Paul, and dedicate churches to them, and their bellies are maintained at divers rates, and their wealth, and revenues, and grandeur help up, by that which is dedicated to these churches, and to alienate any of this super-



fluity from their flesh were worse sacrilege than to cast out and silence a thousand faithful preachers; and yet if St. Paul were a preacher now in France, Spain, Italy or England, and would worship God but as he did when he was on earth, and would not swear, say and do as much more as the bishop's canons bid him, I think we should again hear those words, Acts xxii. 22., "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live" (here); unless he wrought miracles to convince men; and whether those would prevail is a doubtful case; or whether he would not pass for a deceiver and fanatic.

6. As in times of war, all broken, beggarly and idle fellows, turn soldiers, as the easiest trade to live by, are never after good for any other trade, but to kill and rob men; so the love-killing regiments, have forsaken other trades, and this is like to put down all. Booksellers complain that they can sell few books but news, and scorning and invective libels. And what is the subject of our (formerly weekly and now daily) news-books? Why, they tell us that such a city or corporation are all together by the ears as enemies, some choosing one mayor and some another; some called Whigs, and others Tories; some seeking the ruin and blood of others, and some hardly escaping the power of false witnesses and oaths! One jury acquitting a man whose life is sought, and another condemning him. In such a town or city so many fined, and so many distrained on, and so many crowded into jails, and such and such preachers cast into prison, and such an one dead there, for praying to God, and openly worshipping him without book, or by no book but his own. In such and such a country the people prosecuting each other on such accounts, and some flying into other parts, and some into America to seek that peace among savages, and wolves, and serpents, in wildernesses, which they could not have under sacred Protestant prelates and their clergy. In France the poor Protestants hunted like hares, neither suffered to live at home, nor to fly naked to beg their bread in other lands; and all this for the concord and peace of the holy Catholic church; a pattern so worthy of imitation, that even such excellent men as Grotius think, that it is all hazards, labour and cost, to reduce England and the Lutherans to the French church consistence, and to silence and ruin all as Calvinists that are

against it. From Hungary we must read, how the persecuted Protestants, after their utmost suffering and patience, are fain to call in Turks to save them from the cruelties of Christians. And that those parts that are under the Turks have far more prosperity and freedom in religion, than those that are under the Emperor and Papists.

And Protestants under them are kept in continual fear, as knowing that it is their law and doctrine, that princes are bound to do their best to exterminate or destroy them, on pain of excommunication, deposition and damnation: and remembering the inquisitions, the Piedmont, French, Dutch, Irish, &c. massacres: so that they are brought to this hard dilemma, choose whether you will be dead men, or be proclaimed rebels. If whole countries will not lie down and die patiently without self-defence, they are odious rebels.

These, and such other are the subjects of our news-books, which have broken the poor booksellers, who were wont to live by selling books of learning, and of practical divinity. And too many preachers are fain to be short as well as formal in their sermons for Christian love, because they spend so much time in preaching up hatred and destruction. Were there but an art that could devise any engine that could reach the heart, and turn it into the hatred of those that never did them wrong, (as they say some philters and charms will make men mad with love;) or if any apothecary had an effectual medicine against brotherly love, I doubt these would become the most accustomed shops and prosperous trades in all the city: but for want of such, some pulpits, printers, booksellers, clubs, drinking-houses, and play-houses, (to pass by fouler) must serve the turn. But if God have not mercy on the land by restraining them, gunpowder-makers, gunsmiths, sword-sellers, soldiers, swearers and executioners, will swallow up most other trades in the land. It is worth inquiry whether in foresight of this, they set not their sons to such trades as these, or apprentices to such lawyers as are best at preparative accusations, and have learned Tertullus's art; or to such schools and tutors as can teach them the learning of Zedekiah, and the four hundred prophets; 1 Kings xxii.

7. And all this is the more inexcusable and lamentable, because they came but lately out of the fire, which this same malignant spirit kindled; the very same causes cast the

three kingdoms into dreadful flames and blood. The histories of the bloody murder of many hundred thousands called Albigenses, Waldenses and Bohemians, in Piedmont, Germany and elsewhere, and of the Netherlands' cruelties, the Spanish inquisitions and invasion, the murder of thirty or forty thousand at once in France, and of two of their kings, the powder-plot here, as well as the bonfires in Queen Mary's days, and much more their councils and doctors defending and commanding such usage of Protestants, did set all our parliaments one after another into a vehement unwillingness to be so used, and to fall into their hands that will do it if they can: and when the evil spirit hath raised cross interests and distrusts between king and parliament, the Papists seeming to be for the war and king, and suddenly murdering in Ireland no fewer than two hundred thousand, and pretending the king's commission, and threatening the like in England, frightened people into the army, after raised by the parliament. And though I think all that war in England killed not the fourth part so many as the Papists had murdered in Ireland; yet so dismal and odious was it, and had so direful an end, as loudly told us how bad the causes and beginnings were. Few parts of the land were free from spoil, plunder and poverty; yea, or from terrible sieges and fields of blood: Englishmen labouring to destroy each other, and some hiring foreigners to help them: and lads running from their parents to be as apprentices to the man-killing trade. Counties were against counties, cities against cities, neighbours against neighbours, single persons flying from men as from bears and tigers, as after in the plague-time, afraid of almost all they met: and at last the very armies falling out among themselves; the first raised for the parliament, were mastered by a second party, that brought in (as auxiliaries) a new imposition; and that party after mastered and cast down by a third that brought in a new cause; and that prevailing, pulling down their masters, an usurper odiously destroying the king, and setting up himself with another title, and subduing and ruining those that were against it, even both the parties that began the war; and yet when he was dead, to shew the world what divisions can do, that same victorious, rebellious army, fell all into pieces by its own discord, and was totally dissolved as by a miracle, without one drop of blood that ever I could hear of, and

the victorious leaders many of them hanged, drawn and quartered, and their heads and quarters hanged up on the city gates.

And would not one think that a nation of men in their wits, should after so long and sad experience of the mischiefs of hatred and division, be willing of the reviving of love and concord, and hate all motions of dividing any more? But alas, they hate them that would heal our wounds; and if any one lay on a healing plaster, there are hands too many, both lay and clergy, ready with rage to pull it off, and yet it is all on pretence of healing us, that they will not suffer us to be healed; for the way of peace they have not known. Unhappy surgeons that know no balsam but corrosives and distilled vinegar, yea, no way of healing but by dismembering, even the most useful members of the body. Having learned of the Romish leeches that live on blood, when they are for exhausting the vital stock, and cast the kingdom into a palsy or marasmus, they tell you it was all but corrupt or hæmorrhoidal blood, and the loss of it necessary to cure the madness of the land.

The beginning of some reconciliation between the first contending parties, began to flatter us with the hopes of restored love and quietness: secret consultations prepared the way: lords, knights and gentlemen, print their protestations for oblivion and reconciliation, and against revenge. Hereupon those that by land and sea, in the three kingdoms had fought against the king, restore him: the land rejoiceth in the smiling hopes of reviving charity and concord. The king chiefly causeth these hopes by his declarations and act of oblivion, and especially his healing gracious declaration about ecclesiastical affairs. The house of commons and the city ministers give him thanks for it: who would have thought now but such experience, such protestations, such obligations, such authorities, should have put the whole kingdom into a longing desire to perfect the work of love and peace? But it proved clean contrary: some had other things in their heads and hearts; outlandish fashions, especially French, have long been the badge of English folly! There are men in Spain that trade much in the fire, and Queen Mary brought the trade into England: there are men in many other foreign lands, who are so devout, that their canons and religion rule their appetites; and they love no

meat like a carbonadoed Protestant, nor are pleased with any perfume or incense so much as with the smell of a roasted saint, first called a heretic or schismatic : like the Roman tyrant that gloried in the sweetness of the smell when he smelt the stink of the carcasses which he had laid to dung the field. And there were men abroad that learned these fashions, and contracted such a familiarity and love to foreigners, as that for obtaining union with them, all the divisions, distractions and calamities of England and Scotland, are not thought too dear a sacrifice : and as some sons of Nonconformists must be doubly virulent to expiate the guilt of their original sin ; so some Englishmen must, like Samson and David, bring double testimony of their real enmity to the Philistines, from their skins, before they can be trusted abroad as real reconcilers : and they say that there are some things that will be closely united, by no cement so well as by human blood. Doubtless the Gospel as used in English, and preached by true Protestants, (such as the pseudo-bellamy in Philanax Anglicus hatefully calleth Protestants off sincerity,) goeth not with many beyond sea, for the same Gospel which they believe. And therefore no wonder if the preachers of it be displeasing to them ; and he that will please them, and unite with them, must silence or oppose those that they would have to be silenced or disgraced. And some think that union with many kingdoms of Christians, which call themselves the Catholic church, is much to be preferred before the love and concord of a hated party in our island. And as Dr. Saywell (the master of a college, and bishop Gunning's chaplain) saith (to prove that there is a universal and legislative power in the clergy, over kingdoms as well as persons,) " If more persons or particular churches give offence by heresy, schism, &c. the CHURCH UNIVERSAL, or the rest of the bishops may reprove them for it, and then there is no reason why one man should be censured and many should go free, and consequently our Saviour hath established the authority of his church over all Christians, as well particular churches as private men : churches of kingdoms and nations have a SOVEREIGNTY over them to which they must yield obedience. " The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish : yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted ;" Isa. lx. 12. p. 343.

Though kings have no civil universal sovereign over

them but Christ, yet it seems all the world, both kings and kingdoms, have an ecclesiastical sovereignty over them all. Communion of equals and Christian counsel and reproof is not enough, such as all neighbour princes may use towards one another; nor the denial of such communion to the incapable: but all kings and kingdoms must be under church sovereignty, which hath a legislative and judicial power over them all, to excommunicate, absolve them, &c. And how much more 'in ordine ad spiritualia', the common exposition of ecclesiastical power, tells you: as experience long told many kingdoms what the excommunicating of a king, and the interdicting a kingdom the worship of God, do signify towards their dethroning or invasion.

And all this must be done, not as for the pope, but under the name of a general council, and the poor pope shall have no power, but, say some, to call that council, and call it general when there is no such thing, and preside in it, and rule us as chief patriarch and St. Peter's successor, in the intervals of general councils, (that is, continually) and that not arbitrarily, but by the laws of the church or councils, (and no mortal man can tell which those authorized legislative councils are, among the hundreds of erroneous or contradicting ones.) So that Popery in England is an abhorred thing; for it is nothing with some but the pope's absolute government of the whole church, as without or above laws and ecclesiastical parliaments.

And can you reconcile all this to our oath of supremacy, and the canons that establish it, renouncing all foreign jurisdiction? Yea, easily, we have been told it meaneth only foreign civil jurisdiction which belongs to the king, and not foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction, (which is all that the sober popes do claim, save indirectly 'in ordine ad spiritualia'). To command a nation on pain of excommunication and damnation (according to divers councils), to renounce their allegiance to their excommunicate prince, and to depose him, and set up another, is no act of civil, but of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which yet hath dethroned emperors and overthrown dominions.

And saith archbishop Laud, in Dr. Stillingfleet's defence of him, p. 540. "It doth not follow, because the church may err, therefore she may not govern. For the church hath only a pastoral power, to teach and direct, but a pretorian

also, to control and censure, &c. And for external obedience to general councils when they err, "Consider whether it be not fit to allow a general council that honour and privilege which all other great courts have;" Stillingfleet, page 534.

So that instead of a counsel of equals for concord (as princes use for peace with their neighbours,) we have an universal sovereign court set up with pretorian power, to make binding laws, and pass judgment to all the Christian world, and (say some) they are schismatics that obey not these universal laws; and obedience to them, and suppressing all forbidden assemblies for God's worship is the only way to Christian concord.

And where this foreign jurisdiction is made of such absolute necessity, that without subjection to it by kings and kingdoms, there is no concord to be had, nor any avoiding of the guilt of schism, what wonder if some can wish that silencings, reproaches, ruins, and confusions may be thought no dear price to obtain an universal union; for which Christ and his law are sufficient. They 'that have read Grotius, Cassander, Baldwin, Hoffmeister, Erasmus, Archbishop Laud, Dr. Heylin of his life, Bishop Sparrow, Archbishop Bromhal, and the Prefacer Bishop Parker, Thorndike, Bishop Gunning and his chaplain Dr. Saywell, and such others, and against them all have read Dr. Isaac Barrow of the supremacy against Thorndike, &c. may understand where our difference and danger lieth.

8. And is England's self-destroying disease incurable! God hath in wonderful mercy given us peace from foreign enemies: and is there no hope of prevailing with Englishmen to live together in peace? Must that of Isa. xlix. 36. be our case, to eat our own flesh, and be drunk with our own blood as with sweet wine? Alas, no counsel no petitions, no tears, no experience, no judgments of God by plagues and flames have hitherto one jot prevailed; but the ulcer of men's minds grows more and more putrid and malignant!

Two ways are by some proposed: first that all the conscientious worshippers of God in the kingdom, should bring their judgments to a full conformity, in every particular to their rulers; when as first they cannot tell us who these must be: some say to the king or law; some say to the bishops in a national convocation; others say, to the aforesaid fo-

reign universal sovereignty of general councils, (with the patriarchs). If the first be the way, what kingdoms must it be in? Is it no where but in Britain? Or also in France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland? And must there be as many religions as kings and laws will make? And how far must this go? And where must we stop? Must kings choose us a God? Or choose whether we shall have any God, any Christ, any Bible, any worship of God, and so any heaven?

If it be the bishops that must be the common rule of our religion, what countries and ages doth this rule serve for? Was it the rule where princes and prelates were Arians, or Nestorians, or Eutychians, or Monothelites, or Papists? Is it the rule now in France, Spain, Italy, &c. Or was it so in the Pope's Catholic church from Anno 700 till the Reformation?

If it be general councils, I am weary of repeating the proofs that there never was one, nor ever is like to be one, or ought to be. If it be an European council, who shall call them, and who shall judge whether it be equal, and so far general? And are not the greater number of European councils, who shall call them, and who shall judge whether it be equal, and so far general? And are not the greater number of European bishops known Papists? And will they not then be the major vote? And so we must be as bad as they? And if the rest of the Christian world be not bound by them (in Greece, Ethiopia, Armenia, Syria, &c.), why are we? Is it the council of Arminum, Sirmium, Milan, &c.; or of Ephesus 2, Nice 2d., many at Constantinople, at the Lateran, at Lyons, at Florence, at Constance, at Basil, at Trent, that are our rule? Must all that will be Catholics and saved, hold all the heresies, contradictions, and corruptions that councils have held, and obey all their load of canons? If the Italians, French, English, &c. are all disagreed, how many and which councils we must obey, can all poor people know which is the right? And hath Christ left religion so uncertain a thing? Or so mutable that general councils of prelates may be still increasing it? If he was the maker of it, by himself and his apostles, we may know more certainly where to find it: most Christians may say, 'Christ we know, and Peter and Paul, &c. we know; but your councils are too many, too voluminous, too uncertain for us to know.'



But if they are such an absolutely necessary rule as you pretend, why do not teachers preach them to us daily as they do the sacred Scriptures ?

If any would come down to confine these universal laws only to things indifferent, alas, must the world be confounded and divided about things indifferent? Are not things indifferent variable as countries and ages are? And must the world have one sovereignty to make laws for them? Cannot we have life, liberty, peace and love, without things indifferent? or without agreeing in them? Are there any two in the whole world that are not ignorant, and that differ not about many greater matters than things indifferent? Doth he know himself, or know what a man is, that thinks all tolerated Christians must be so skilled in all things indifferent, which men may impose, as to know them to be such; when it is so hard to teach the people things necessary, few and plain? Alas, Lord! why must the churches be left in such hands?

9. But some have found out another remedy for our divisions; and that is, that only the bishops shall be engaged to a foreign jurisdiction, or profess the necessity of obeying them, (under the name of a general council, and in the intervals, of a college of the bishops of the whole world, as one aristocracy;) and that this shall not be imposed on any lay-communicants, but their consciences shall be left at liberty; nor at the first on the inferior clergy, till they are prepared to receive it; but only that the people obey the priests and prelates, and the priests obey the prelates and all their governing officers, and the prelates only profess obedience to the pretorian court, called The Catholic Church. Bishop Gunning's chaplain tells us that the laity are not required in order to communion to declare for general councils. Whether they use the like moderation in France, Spain, Germany, I know not, viz. For the bishops only to profess obedience to the pope, and the priests to the bishops, and the people to the priests and bishops. I hear they go further.

And if conventicles (as they will call them) are also suppressed, we need not fear religious violence, murder and ruin (upon a feared Roman successor). For, saith the same bishop's chaplain, p. 283. 'For matters may be so ordered, that all officers, ecclesiastical, civil and military, and all that

are employed in power or authority of any kind, be persons both of known loyalty to the crown, and yet faithful sons of the church, and firm to the established religion, and the laws that they act by may be so explained in the favour of those that conform to the public worship, and the discouragement of all dissenters, that we must reasonably be secure from all violence that the Papists can offer to force our submission : for when all our bishops and clergy are under strict obligations and oaths, and the people are guided by them ; and all officers civil and military are firm to the same interest, and under severe penalties if they act any thing to the contrary : then what probable danger can there be of any violence or disturbance to force us out of our religion, when all things are thus secured, and the power of external execution is generally in the hands of men of our own persuasion.'

*Answ.* The Dr. says well ; I am of his mind in this. When they have subdued and cast out all dissenters (as they do in France), and the bishops and clergy are settled under a foreign church-jurisdiction, and the people settled in obedience to them, and all offices, civil, military and ecclesiastic in their hands, I do not think they need to fear that the Papists will use violence to change their religion, whoever reigneth.

But the question is, whether this supposes an union with all in England that are now against a foreign jurisdiction, or only the destruction of them, or else the forcing them to these terms ? As to a destruction of them, or forcing them to such terms, surely violence must do this. And what though the subjects of foreign power fear no violence, are all the rest (that is, the Protestants) of the kingdom inconsiderable ? We suppose the old church of England, and all our parliaments since the Reformation, were against a foreign jurisdiction : and will it be no loss to England to destroy so many, that is, the body of the land ?

But the question is, whether they may not be thus brought to concord by consent ? I answer, no ; unless you suppose them to be men that indeed have no religion, and therefore can easily part with the bare name. For they are sworn by the oath of supremacy against all foreign jurisdiction : and put the case that the pope and a council, or the king of France would bring the emperor's or the king's army to serve him, and be at his command, and he would only desire that the general officers and colonels may be engaged

to obey him, and the captains and lower officers to obey them, and the soldiers to obey the officers; but the common soldiers shall be bound to no more, than this obedience to their officers. Query, Whether all these soldiers be not traitors to the king or emperor? Cromwell's common soldiers took no commissions against king or parliament; they did but obey their officers that pulled down both. And were they therefore guiltless? Protestants will not thus follow such prelates against their oaths, and against the known truth, and against their duty to God and the king.

10. But though it be notorious that domination and jurisdiction be the things which cause the Papal clergy to trouble and tear the Christian world; what is it that makes the laity so mad, and getteth this clergy such a militant crowd against their own tranquillity and salvation? It is as visible as any moral thing, that the church's divisions, and wars, and miseries have about a thousand years risen, from satan's thrusting such worldly, fleshly, unholy men into holy offices, who seek them but to serve their pride and covetousness, and fleshly appetites, and ease, and who are enemies at the heart to the serious obedience to Christ, which formally they preach. Christ's own apostles in their time of ignorance, began to strive which of them should be greatest; of which we have recorded his sharp rebuke; which St. Peter himself did after second, in 1 Pet. v. 1—3. in words so plain, that if his pretended successors had not first claimed a power (as the church) to be the determining expounders of all the Bible, they had lain under the condemnation of Christ and Peter, naked, without a defence or cloak: but this church-expounding authority sets them above all the word of God, which is now but what they please to make it, and an instrument to execute their wills. And indeed it is now rather the pope and his prelates and councils than Christ, that are the law makers to the church; for it is not he that maketh the words only that makes the law, but he that giveth them their sense. The words are but as the body, and the sense is the soul of the law. The ministerial church now scorn the name of ministers, and being become pretorian and magisterial, they give Christ and his Spirit in the apostles leave to make the words and body of the Scripture or divine law, as God formed Adam's body of the dust, so that they may give it the breath of life, and also may make far more volu-

minous laws of their own, and cut off and condemn all the children of God, that cannot believe that it is lawful to obey them.

And though the ignorant think that the claim of universal legislation and judgment, in the universal church and general councils, be no service to the domination of particular clergymen, no, nor to any, (seeing there never will be a general council,) they understand not the mystery of iniquity, and mistake. We have English writers that have told them, 1. That indeed power is first given to the body, (fine doctrine for royalists,) but by the body it is given to the prelates to use for them. 2. That as a general council hath the supreme power, so the prelates under them have the inferior ruling power, and the executive in the intervals of councils. 3. That as councils represent the church in sovereignty, so every bishop is by his office, the true representative of the clergy of his diocese, and every metropolitan the representative of his province, and every patriarch of his patriarchate; and then are not the patriarchs (at least with the metropolitans,) universal rulers in such intervals? 4. And the pope is the patriarch of the West, and hath a primacy in the church universal, and must be confest to be 'principium unitas catholicæ,' and say some, to be the president of councils. 5. To which others add, that it belongs only to the president to call councils, and to judge which are lawful, without whose call they are so far from binding us, that they are themselves but unlawful routs. And what would you have more?

But what is all this to the poor priests? What? Why 6. The people know not what the volumes of councils say, and it is the priests (or nobody) that must tell it them, (both what their exposition of Scripture is, and what their own additional laws are,) without which they cannot be obeyed. So that indeed the people's faith is ultimately resolved into the authority of the priest, who tells them what the bishop saith, who tells them what the metropolitan and his synod saith, who tells them what the chief patriarch and a general council saith, who tell them determinatively what Christ and the Scripture saith and meaneth.

But what is this to councils when there are none? Yes, 7. Those that are past and gone, have left all those binding

laws by which the present bishops as an aristocracy must govern all the Christian world.

But are not they for monarchy in the state? How come they then to plead for a sovereign aristocracy over the catholic church, and how come even the French clergy to be for the power of a church parliament above the pope? I cannot answer that; let the pope and they debate it.

But I wonder that archbishop Laud should be for the derivation of all power from the body, as Richard Hooker is. See Dr. Stillingfleet's Defence of him, p. 544, 545, &c. "No body collective, whensoever it assembled itself, did ever give more power to the representing body of it, than a binding power upon itself and all particulars; nor ever did it give this power, otherwise than with this reservation in nature, that it would call again and reform, and if need were, abrogate any law or ordinances upon just cause made evident, that the representing body had failed in trust or truth. And this power no body collective, ecclesiastical or civil, can put out of itself, or give away to a parliament or council, or call it what you will, that represents it.—The power which a council hath to order, settle and define differences arising concerning faith, it hath not by any immediate institution of Christ, but it was prudently taken up by the church from the apostles' example."

I confess that the generality of politicians and lawyers, heathens, Papists, and Protestants go much this way, as to civil government, and say that the 'majestas personalis' is in the king or senate, but the 'majestas realis' in the body which giveth the organical power, and on just cause may take it away. It is no honour to be singular in politics, and I have said enough of this elsewhere, (Christ. Direct. p. I.) But if it be the body of the whole church on earth that must give church officers and councils their power, and recal it when there is cause, if ever the whole Christian world meet together to vote it, when it cometh to polling, we will give both the monarchical and the aristocratical conciliary Papists three for one, to try who hath the power given by the body. But while two or three parts do already disown almost all their councils, the case is decided. But if an old council's heresies, errors, or tyranny can be invalidated only by a new one that is truly general, or a new one as papal as

the last, we confess that Trent canons are like to be the law to the end of the world.

But again, what is it that maketh so many of the laity serve the popish prelate's universal claim, or keep up the destructive enmity and divisions of the Christian world? A stranger would think that it were chiefly caused by some great contrariety of real interests, or that one party adhered to some principles or practices, which were already hurtful to the other's rights; while both were serious for Christianity. But it is become by long experience notorious, that all the Christian world's calamitous divisions are principally from the old enmity between the woman's and the serpent's seed, and that all is but the prosecution of that which their first patriarch Cain began; exemplified after in the discrimination of the children of men, and the sons of God, and in Esau and Jacob, Ishmael and Isaac, and so down to the days of the apostles. And saith Paul, as he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." Among us it is notorious, that if we knew how to cure men of the radical enmity of the flesh against the Spirit, and of a carnal mind's averseness to God and serious godliness, the rest of our differences were never like to continue our wounds and cruel factions.

In families you may hear that this is the fundamental difference. Husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, upon the mere account of serious godliness, do live like enemies, that are impatient of each other. If the husband be ungodly, the wife, children, or servants, that have but a care of their salvation, are still under his restraints, or frowns, or scorns. This praying, (especially if it be without book,) so much preaching and hearing, yea, any serious talk of God, or heaven, or Scripture, is a troublesome weariness to him; and he tells them it is but hypocrisy, or more ado than needs. If any compassionately tell him of the evil of his swearing, or tippling, or profaneness, he tells them they are precise Puritans or fanatics, and worse than he. If they will needs hear sermons, he will have them go but to some cold or ignorant preacher, or one that will please him with a calumny or scorn at Puritans, or that will say as he doth, that this stir for salvation, and meddling so much with Scripture and religion, is but proud, self-conceit-

fanaticism. In a word, it is serious preaching, and hearing, and reading God's word; serious praying, and preparation for the sacrament; serious discourse of the state of their souls, and preparation for death, judgment, and eternity; serious fearing and avoiding sin, and speaking against the sin of others, that is the common eyesore and troubler of the world, which they secretly hate, and cannot bear with in their families, in their neighbours, in magistrates, in ministers or people.

And because it easeth their minds by vent, and by keeping up some hopes that they may be saved without this serious godliness themselves, they cherish a conceit that the persons that herein differ from them are as bad, if not much worse than others; and gladly hear those that slander and deride them. Such company, such pamphlets, such sermons please them. And to make them odious, they have for them some contemptuous scornful nickname; which, though it be of no signification, is as effectual as the truest charge. Among the Roman sects, do but call a man a heretic or schismatic, a Lutheran, a Calvinist, a Zuinglian; and elsewhere do but call him a sectary, a schismatic, a Puritan, a Calvinist, a Nonconformist, an Independent, a Presbyterian, a Roundhead, a Fanatic, a Whig, and it serveth the turn as well as if you had proved him a proud hypocrite, or a rebel. And there be among the real schismatics also some persons, that if you do but call a man Episcopal, a Conformist, an Arminian, a Church-of-England-man, that goeth to the common-prayer, they think that he must needs be a temporizer, graceless or dangerously unsound.

And thus the miseries of the land are continued and increased. But because the spirit of Cain is the grand incendiary, and the enmity against serious holiness throughout all the world, is the principal cause of divisions, hatred, wars and bloodshed, I will here annex many reasons which, with men that have any reason left them, should cure this malignant enmity to holiness, if men will but soberly consider them.

I have said so much to such already, especially in my "Saints' Rest," "Now or Never," my "Family Book," and "A Saint or a Brute," that I cannot do this work again without repeating much that is said. But seeing all that doth not serve, and the ulcer breaketh out more dangerously than

ever, till it come to a 'noli me tangere,' we must continue some hope and use of means; and if we lay on fresh plaisters of the old materials, while only new books are by such regarded, we are bound to do our best. It is but so much labour lost; and it is not utterly lost to ourselves, while we have peace of conscience in God's acceptance.

But being sure to be misrepresented when I have done my best to be understood, that I be not guilty of it, I will first shew what I mean by serious godliness, and next what I mean by malignity or enmity to serious godliness.

---

## CHAPTER II.

*Whom I mean by Godly Persons, and whom by Malignant Enemies to Godliness.*

By Godliness I do not mean, 1. Any superstition, or making religions, or religious duties which God never made, and extolling these, and the party that are for them. God hath made us religious work enough. Could we do that well, we need no more. Religion, so far as it is made by men, is no religion, but a contradiction or equivocation; for religion is our obligation and duty to God, and conscience of it. Could I be for superstition, or more religion than God hath made us, I might be for all the new religions of Rome, Franciscans, Dominicans, Carthusians, Jesuits, Oratorians, and all the rest. And I might be for their works of superelevation, their massings, worshipping bread, angels, dead saints, images, their pilgrimages, relics, and all their pretended traditions and councils, their new-made church-laws, and I should know no end.

And 2. By godliness I mean not any singular, odd opinion differing from the Scripture, and making a sect, or any error whatsoever; nor any opinion which is contrary to any thing which the whole church on earth did ever hold as necessary to salvation or communion.

Nor 3. Do I mean any truth or duty of inferior moment, which only makes to the wellbeing of a Christian, though this be an inferior part of godliness; at least not



that which a godly, willing person knows not to be his duty.

Much less, 4. Do I mean any proud, false conceit of a man's own godliness, and becoming one of an unwarrantable sect, that he may be conspicuous to others, or cherish this presumption in himself, and say to others, "Stand by, I am holier than thou." Or as the Pharisee, "I thank thee Lord, that I am not as this publican." (Though yet all that will be saved must differ greatly from the ungodly, and must with thankfulness own God's grace.)

Nor 5. Do I mean any unlawful practice, which on the pretence of godliness may be done, whether unjust censures, backbiting, unwarrantable separations from others, divisions, disobedience to authority, sedition, rebellion, &c. These are all contrary to godliness and true religion. Christ is the strictest condemner of them, and godliness the best cure. If any godly or religious person be guilty of any one of these, 1. It cannot be as known and in a predominant degree. 2. And it is his disease (as a leprosy to a man) and not his godliness.

But by godliness I mean only the serious consent to and performance of the covenant which we made with God in our baptism. That we seriously believe that there is one only God, of most perfect power, knowledge, and goodness, our Creator, Maintainer, Governor, and end, whom we must obey, and serve, and love, above all creatures whatsoever; and that he is the "Rewarder of them that diligently seek him," and will give everlasting blessedness to the faithful, and everlastingly punish the ungodly. That we seriously believe that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer and Saviour, who teacheth, ruleth, pardoneth, sanctifieth, and saveth all true penitent believers; who is our Intercessor, Head, and Judge. That we seriously believe that the Holy Ghost indited and sealed by his gifts and miracles the doctrine and writings of the prophets and apostles, now recorded in the Scriptures, and that he is sent from the Father and the Son to regenerate, sanctify, comfort, and strengthen those that shall be saved.

And that we seriously consent to love and obey God our Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier, as his creatures, subjects, and children in these relations, that we may be pardoned and saved by him. And that we be willing to forsake the devil

and his works, and the world and flesh, so far as they would tempt us to break this covenant against God, and our obedience and salvation.

And lastly, That we seriously or sincerely (though not perfectly) endeavour in our lives to keep his covenant preferring God in our love and obedience, and our hopes of life everlasting, before all the pleasures and treasures of this world, and resisting the temptations of the devil, world, and flesh, which would turn us from him, and from our obedience and hope. And that we truly (though not perfectly) trust God and our Redeemer for the heavenly glory which he hath promised.

This is plainly, distinctly, and fully what I mean by godliness or holiness. And such are the persons (though all imperfect, and of divers degrees) which I call saints or godly. He that feigneth me to mean any thing else, doth but abuse himself and me. If there be none such, there are no Christians, and all the word of God is vain.

But every duty commanded by God is a part of the matter of our obedience and religion; viz. As according to the first commandment to take God for our God, to be absolutely obeyed, loved, and trusted, and to renounce all idols, and neither to obey love, or trust ourselves or any other creatures before him; so also according to the second commandment, to renounce all scandalous symbolizing with idolaters. in the outward worship of God in their sinful way; especially by images, and other appearances of idolatry. And that we worship God according to his word.

And according to the third commandment, that we avoid all profanation of holy things; all perjury, false vows, and fathering falsehoods upon God or his words, and rash swearing, and irreverent using of God's name, and turning his worship into a lifeless form.

And according to the fourth commandment, that we worship God publicly in solemn assemblies, and devote the Lord's day to holy exercises; that we search the Scriptures, pray for what God hath promised, or commanded; meditate and confer of holy things, and celebrate the sacraments in the communion of saints.

And so according to the second table that we honour and obey our parents, and (as far as their right of government reacheth) all other that God sets over us. And dishonour

them not, nor obey civil, ecclesiastical, or domestical usurpers against them.

That we do our best to save our neighbour's life and bodily welfare, against murderers or usurpers; and hurt no man's life or health either violently or by Jezebel's pretence of justice.

That we keep our senses, thoughts, affections, passions, and actions, from all unchastity and immodest lasciviousness.

That we wrong no man in his estate, but to our power help them.

That we avoid all injustice, lying, false witness, false judgment, and oppressive, unrighteous government; and promote truth and justice to our power.

And lastly, that we love our neighbour as ourselves, and take his welfare and his sufferings as our own, and do as we would have others do by us, and covet not to draw from him to ourselves.

So that he that pretendeth to love God and godliness, and obedience to Christ, and yet loveth not such a life as this, he lieth, or says he knows not what.

And he that hateth men or opposeth them, for any one of all these duties (for hearing or reading God's word, for praying for things promised, for holy conference and meditation, for sanctifying the Lord's day, for desiring a shepherd and not a wolf; for abhorring profaneness, and other great sins), doth thereby declare that it is so much of godliness or obedience which he abhorreth; and it is through ignorance doubtless if he seriously love and practise the rest of God's commands.

II. By malignant enemies of godliness, 1. I do not mean every one that hath any backwardness to any duty, which he overcometh in the practice; nor every one that is guilty of some omissions. The spirit is willing, and the flesh is weak.

2. I mean not those that are godly in the main so far as they can know, but through education or otherwise are ignorant of some integral truths or duties, and have an opposing contentious zeal against them by mistake; and by factious company are taught therefore to speak evil falsely of those from whom they differ. I hear some revile all even with terms of enmity and unchristian threatenings, yea, seek-

ing their ruin, who do not swear, say, and practise all that is required to English conformity. I do not conclude them therefore malignant enemies of godliness, if they live soberly, righteously, and godly in their way, and prefer God before men, heaven before earth, the soul before the body, and a holy life before the pleasures and profits of the flesh. If they are uncharitable against all that are not for Diocesans, laychancellors, excommunications, symbolical crossing of children as a covenanting sign of Christianity, and all the rest, I wish them more charity, but I call them not malignant enemies.

I find Bishop Gunning's chaplain thinks that he doth say well, when he saith, that 'Not only murderers, adulterers, drunkards, but such schismatics as disturb the peace, and weaken the authority of the church's disciples (*theirs*), are to be excommunicated and reckoned among heathens and publicans; and enemies to the Gospel of Christ (if they preach it without a Diocesan's license.)' page 214. And that it is already our case, that it is a very difficult matter to find a jury and witnesses, especially among the dissenters, upon whose credit we may rely. All this signifieth how little blind faction is to be believed; and how far it conquereth even human modesty and veracity. But yet I differ it from the enmity to godliness which I speak of. And that you may see that he is no Papist, though for a foreign jurisdiction, he tells you of Cromwell that 'There is too great a reason to suspect that he intended to settle popery in the nation, when matters had been ripe to go through with it.' I confess this is news to me. I have roundly told him to his face of his disloyalty in deposing our English monarchy, and told the world then of his treacherous usurpation, but it never came into my thoughts that he intended to settle popery in the nation. But if these words come from clergy truth and modesty, they are very considerable. I hope the old royalists will be against popery the more if Cromwell was for it. And the Papists I hope will be more angry with Dr. Moulin, that answereth Philanax Anglicus, for making the king's death to be caused and concluded by the Papists, if Cromwell was for them. But faction will face men down, that snow is black.

So on the other side, I hear some that are against infant baptism, sharply censure all that are not of their mind.

And some over sharply censure the prelatists and conformists; and almost all the Christian world is divided into parties, that too little stick at the injurious censuring of others; the Papists, Greeks, Abassines, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, &c. And among the Papists, the Dominicans and Molinists, and Jansenians, &c. And among the Protestants, too many. This is no small sin, but it is not that enmity to godliness itself which I mean.

3. And I mean not by malignity, men's differences in civil and political controversies. Though I take popery to be half a civil controversy, and to be insufferable by such princes and people whom they bind themselves to depose and destroy. And that to subject all the Christian world to the legislative, judicial, and executive government of one pope, or one pretorian court, is no better than to proclaim such a pope or court to be public enemies and usurpers to all Christian princes and states. But yet abundance of political differences may consist with serious piety. My reason is, because God hath not made political controversies so clear as that all good Christians can resolve them. Neither the light of nature, nor the Bible, nor tradition, endeth them. Nor hath he put them into our creed, or the ten commandments, nor laid men's salvation on them, as he hath done on the essentials of religion. Nor commanded all men to be so well skilled in statute-books and common law, as to be able to know which party is in the right. And therefore I join not with those clergy or lay gentlemen, who damn all that are not of their mind and side, in differences of that nature.

I often hear some say that kings and states do all receive their authority from the body of the nation, who are the chief seat of it. So Hooker, so Laud, and indeed as aforesaid, so Heathen, Papist, and Protestant politicians ordinarily hold. I call not all these malignants, though I am fully satisfied, 1. That God is the Institutor of magistracy in general. 2. And that he hath so far specified it as to determine of its unchangeable essentials (that they shall as his officers promote obedience to the ten commandments). 3. And that he never gave this governing power to the people. 4. But that all that the people do is, 1. To specify it as to the number of persons (a monarchy, aristocracy, or mixed of these and some democracy). 2. To limit it by determining of the degrees of power, about property and liberty, and all things

which God's law hath left undetermined and mutable. 3. And to determine of the persons and families that shall receive the immutable power from God and the mutable from men.

I often hear some most magnify democracy, and some aristocracy, and some monarchy, and some a mixture; and some English clergymen are for a civil monarchy subject to a catholic clergy aristocracy. I call none malignants for any such differences.

I find some Papists and Protestants political writers saying, that when it proveth hurtful to the commonwealth, the people may retract the power given the prince, and change the government; and Hooker saith, no doubt in such a case a prince will part with it. And archbishop Laud, before cited, saith of the like, and abrogating laws, this power nobody collective, ecclesiastical or civil, can put out of itself and give away, and I find many that extol Hooker and Laud call this a principle of rebellion. It is neither of them that I call malignants.

I find most writers of politics agreed that the law of nature alloweth and commandeth kingdoms and commonwealths self-defence against any public enemies that seek to destroy them. And that no man on pretence of right to a crown hath any right to destroy the body of the people, or the 'bonum publicum' which is the essentiating end of government, nor can be 'simul rex et publicus hostis.' I hear others take this for an unchristian doctrine of rebellion, and say, that if a king would destroy all the people of a kingdom (in revenge, or in siding with another kingdom of his own or another's), they ought not to resist him, or any that he commissioneth to do it. And that if he should commission a few men to kill all the parliament as they sit, or to burn the city, it is rebellion to resist by self-defence. I hear lawyers themselves at great difference on such matters, some for more power, and some for less. I find the great defenders of monarchy, such as Barclay and Grotius de Jure Belli, naming many cases in which kings may be resisted, yea and forfeit all. And I find others among us of a contrary mind. Yea, I find the conformable and diocesan pillars quite differ in such cases. Bishop Bilson naming many cases in which resistance is no rebellion, 'To subject his kingdom to a foreign realm, or to change the form of the commonwealth from impery to tyranny, or neglect the laws established by

common consent of prince and people, to execute his own pleasure ; in these and other such cases which might be named, if the nobles and commons join together to defend their ancient and accustomed liberty, regiment, and laws, they may not well be counted rebels,' saith he, " of Obedience," page 520. But I hear many now say the contrary, and condemn such doctrine as disloyal.

I find some join with the Papists in accusing the Reformation as caused by rebellions in Germany, Geneva, France, Belgium, &c. And I find Bishop Jewel, Bilson, and other bishops defending the French defence, and Dr. Peter Moulin of Canterbury in his answer to Philanax Anglicus, contradicting their accusers, as false in point of history.

Abundance of such political controversies are now lately agitated, some charging their adversaries with rebellion, and some with tyranny. Some saying, they are guilty of treason against the king ; and others, they are traitors against the kingdom. And too ordinarily damning one another ; as if these matters were articles of our creed.

What a dismal difference is there now about those words in the declaration in the corporation act : ' There is no obligation on me or any other person, from the oath, called the Solemn League and Covenant. Some say there are none but rebels will refuse ; and that if any obligation had been granted to things lawful or necessary, some would have extended it to rebellion or schism. And therefore all obligation is to be renounced. Others say, that national perjury is a forerunner of national calamity or ruin ; and that where oaths bind not, there can be no trust ; and no trust, no commerce.' And they think as Dr. Sanderson, and Casuists, Papists, and Protestants do, that though an oath or vow be unlawfully imposed, and sinfully taken, and part of the matter of it be unlawful, and the imposers and takers are bound to repent, and no one is bound by it to the unlawful part, yet the taker is bound to that part of the matter which is lawful or necessary. And they take it to be lawful and necessary to repent of sin, to oppose profaneness, schism, heresy and popery, to defend the king, and therefore that it obligeth them to these.

I meddle not with the Romau opinion, that it is the Henrician heresy to say the kings have a power of investing bishops, and disobeying the pope's excommunication ; and of such as Cardinal Perron that dare not question or deny the

power of the pope, and councils to excommunicate and depose kings, because then they must condemn approved general councils, which are their religion itself, and (saith he) must grant that the pope is antichrist, and the church erroneous that hath so long used this.

I name all these political controversies,

1. To tell you that it is not factious and passionate enmity to each other on such accounts, which I mean by enmity to religion.

2. And to remember men, that if in so many and great points in politics and government, the learned and Christian world, have so great difference, what reason is there that we should damn or excommunicate, or hate each other about a hard opinion in religion, or a ceremony.

3. And to tell the popish church, that if it were a good argument that there must be one pretorian court or church to oblige all the world by an universal determination in what sense to expound the Scripture, because it is abused to error by men's mistake, and there must be an end of controversies; by the same reason there must be an universal pretorian court to expound all human laws, and end the controversies of lawyers; yea, and to master all men's reason; for Scripture is no more commonly controverted and abused than law itself; and not half so much as reason is, which is pleaded for almost all the falsehood and wickedness in the world.

Moreover it is not personal feuds between man and man that I mean by enmity to godliness. No; though any such be against an innocent and godly man, where it is not for his godliness, but some other difference.

I will say more, though some dislike it; it is not a Papist as such that I mean by a malignant enemy of godliness. I know that education, and temptation, and want of hearing the confutation of their errors judiciously made, may cause godly persons to think that the universal church must be united in some human head or sovereign power; and that there is no other way to end controversies and schisms, and that (as Dr. Saywell saith) there must be some over kingdoms or national churches, as well as over particular persons, that many may not escape while a few are punished. It is easy to be deceived by the pretences of unity and concord, while men see the divisions and discords of others.



And the false pretences of antiquity are so confidently uttered by their clergy, that men unacquainted with the history may verily believe them. And the plea for an uninterrupted succession of ministerial ordination, and that a superior must give power to the inferiors, deceiveth many. If there must be a Diocesan to ordain and rule all Presbyters, and a Metropolitan to ordain or rule the Diocesans, and a Patriarch to rule them, from whom shall the Patriarchs receive their power or commands, but from a Pope? The poor reasoning which the French now use with the Protestants, puzzleth unskilful persons; viz. Was there any church before your reformation? If yea, where was it? And had not you your ministerial power from it? It was Rome or none. And if it was the true church then, it is so now. We answer them, There was and is one only catholic church. Of this Christ only is the Head or universal Governor, and no man or men. Of this all lawful pastors are his official guides in their several provinces, as many justices and mayors of corporations under one king. That all these having one King (Jesus), and one law (of Christ), and one Spirit, and one faith and hope, are to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and to use synods when needful to that end, but not as a pretorian or regent aristocracy or court. That the church before Luther was all over the world where ever there were Christians. In Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria, Armenia, Georgia, Circassia, Asia, and wherever the Greek Christianity is in Muscovy, and in all Europe where there were true Christians. That the envious man having sowed tares, this church is unhappily fallen into many corruptions, diseases, and factious sects, almost all censuring one another. No part of it is perfect. That the papal part is in doctrine, worship, and government, one of the most corrupted parts! Yet so far as their diseases or errors nullify not their profession of Christianity, they are parts, though leprous. And therefore though they are the most uncharitable and schismatical part, as they cut off or unchurch all the Christian world save themselves, yet being as Christians united to the rest in the common faith, their baptism and ordinations are not nullities as they invest men in the Christian society and Christian ministry: though that part of them is a nullity which engageth men in schism and in sin. That the ministerial pow-

er is not the gift of man, but only of Christ, who by the charter of his recorded word, giveth the power and the obligation to that person who is duly chosen and called thereto. As the king's charter giveth the power to the mayor of a corporation duly qualified and chosen. That the ordainers are but partly judges of the qualification, and partly ministerial investors, and not at all the donors of the power. That ordination is for order sake needful, when it may be had, to keep men from being judges of their own sufficiency. But order being only for the thing ordered (as the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath), is not necessarily against the end. That there is no necessity that a superior must ordain. But as the College of physicians, philosophers, &c. make physicians and philosophers, as approved, so may equals in the ministry. Do not bishops make or consecrate bishops. If this were not so, who makes the pope? If he did not pretend that his power is given him immediately from Christ, he must grant that there are some men above him to give it him, and so he is not the sovereign. If they say that the power of popes (and kings) is given by the whole body (the church), he is then no pope. For it is known that three parts of the Christian world are against him. If he will say, none are the church but those that are his party, any sect or rebels may say the like, and appropriate authority to themselves.

Nothing more cheateth the ignorant, than ambiguous words and confusion. And explaining those words, and needful, plain distinction, would save the writing of many volumes, and would make truth easily meet the seeker, and unravel all the spider webs of deceivers.

Do but well use these few distinctions, and all popery vanisheth into smoke: 1. Distinguish between a catholic church as headed by Christ (this we are all members of), and a pretended catholic church, headed by the pope or any men. This is another church as to the denominating form, having another informing, unifying head. And this is it which we deny.

Distinguish visibility. Christ's church is so far visible as to have a Head who was visible on earth, is visible in heaven, and will visibly come to judgment, and visibly reign for ever. It hath visible laws, protection, and officers. The

subjects' bodies and their profession are visible; and it is not farther visible; no, not as to the souls or real faith of the subjects. The Papist's church hath an usurping, visible, human head on earth.

3. Distinguish of baptism and ordination as into Christ's catholic church, and done by Papists as Christians: and as into the pope's catholic church and done by Papists as Papists.

4. Distinguish of subjection and communion. We owe communion when we owe no subjection, and where men have no right to be our governors.

5. Distinguish between communion in Christianity, and that in essentials, integrals, or accidents; and communion in errors and corruptions, or defects. We have communion with Papists and all Christians in Christianity (if they be Christians indeed). But we renounce communion to the errors and sins of them and all others, as far as we are able to avoid them. All Christians have union and communion in the essentials of Christianity. No Christians have union and communion in all the integrals (on earth), all being imperfect. But the more such union and communion the better. No Christians have, or ought to have, communion in all the accidents. All should avoid communion in sin.

6. Distinguish between communion of hearts, communion of profession, and communion in local presence. We have heart communion in one essential faith, hope, and love, with all true Christians on earth. We profess all one faith in the essentials. We have nearer communion, or fuller with the reformed churches which are soundest in the integrals, than we have with the more faulty and corrupt. But we have local presence but in one place at once; and we ought to avoid local presence where we cannot have it without sin, though we have communion in faith, love, and profession with the same men. If a reformed church will not admit our local presence without subscribing some one untruth, we must be absent, when we may be present with a worse church which excludeth us not by any such imposition.

7. Accordingly distinguish of separation. We separate not at all from union or communion with Papists as they are Christians, or as they hold any truth. But, I. We separate from subjection and obedience to them, which we never ow-

ed them, or any other church. 2. We separate from communion with their church, as it is a policy informed by an usurping human king or head. 3. We separate from all their sins so far as we know them. 4. We deny local presence in their mass-worship, because of the sin imposed on us, both before it and in it. 5. We are incapable of communion in all accidents, or mutable indifferent things.

Understand and use well these few plain distinctions, and you need little more to answer all the Papists.

And I fear not to add, that were the Papists in my power (as I never did), I never would use any inhumanity or cruelty towards them; yea, I would use no offensive, but only defensive force against them; nor hurt one of them, further than they made it necessary for the defence of the land, or those whom they would hurt.

I knew not till a book called the "Liberties of England" lately told me, how many very severe laws are against them. I am no judge of the times that they were made in, nor of their occasions. But I think that of late they have done more hurt than good. For, 1. Some of them seem too severe. 2. Some I cannot prove to be justifiable; viz. Those which would compel them to come to our sacramental communion, when many a good minister would not receive them if they came. And that which excommunicateth them that never were of our communion. And that which layeth the excommunicate as such in prison, &c. 3. It greatly tendeth to misinform foreigners, who seeing these laws, think they are all put in execution; and so believe those that tell them, that the catholics here are under constant cruelties, and frequent martyrdoms; whereas I never in all my life knew of one Papist that suffered so much for his religion, as I have done myself, within these few years past, though my sufferings are so small as to be no mete matter of very great complaint. 4. These laws being a continual danger to them (should there be governors that would execute them) doth put them on continual plotting and striving against them. Sufferings, or great dangers, put men by fear upon self-defence, and the utmost endeavours for deliverance, who would be more quiet if they found themselves in safety; and though their clergy would be still plotting the recovery of the papal power, to subject king and kingdom to the sacred

king of Rome, yet the laity would be less against the common peace, when they found that it was their own peace.

I have told you what I mean not by malignant enmity to godliness. I tell you now what I mean by it; viz.

When the blindness and ungodliness of corrupted nature, increased by practice into serpentine enmity, and turning men's hearts by unbelief and disaffection from God and heaven, doth possess them with a deep dislike of a holy, heavenly, and spiritual life; first as to their own practices, and then as it is in others; and because it is against their worldly hopes, and fleshly lusts, they hate it, and reject it themselves, and then hate and maliciously oppose it in others; yea, though law, custom, and worldly interest draw them formally to profess Christianity and obedience to God's laws, and to vow that in baptism they hate the serious performance of their own profession and vows; and would be glad to drive it out of the world, and to set up hypocrisy and ceremony, or a stage religion and mummary, or the toothless mass and formalities in its stead. And if custom or shame hinder them from persecuting or scorning truth and godliness in its proper name, they will shew their mind by these things following:

1. They will set up some worldly, fleshly interest (like the papal kingdom) which is contrary to the Christian and holy interest; and then they will persecute Christians, not as Christians, nor as godly in name, but as such indeed by pleading conscience and obedience to God, against their inconsistent interest and ways.

2. Among all that are against their carnal, false interest, they will cull out the more serious godly persons to afflict.

3. Among all the faithful, they will cull out those who do Christ more service in the world; because Christ's service is it that is their disservice, and opposite to their sin.

4. They will make a scorn of their very religious duties, and take up mimical derisions, to make them ridiculous or contemptible.

5. When they can charge them with no crimes, they will purposely make nets to catch them, as the enemies of Daniel did by him; Dan. vi. And as the spider makes her curious webs to catch and kill the flies.

6. Yea, they will make faults by slander and lies, if not by perjuries, if they can find none.

7. Yea, their virtue, piety, and innocence shall be all called hypocrisy; and when they cannot accuse their actions, they will accuse their hearts and secret thoughts, and judge them as if they had a casement into their breasts.

8. Yea, if their innocency cannot be so stained, they will hate them so much the more, because they cannot tread down their reputation.

9. They will search after, and aggravate all the failings of religious people, and turn them into crimes.

10. If any one of them, or a hypocrite that is like them, be guilty of any notable fall, they will persuade men that all the rest of their lives is like that crime: yea, and that all that profess much seriousness in godliness, are as bad as they: that all the rest of the life of Noah, Lot, David, Solomon, &c. was as bad as the criminal part; and that all the servants of Christ are Peters or Judases.

11. That it is not their sins, but their piety which they hate, you will see in that they live in far greater sin themselves, and take it to be no great harm, but hate those that reprove them.

12. And they make light of the common crimes of others. They can bear with an atheist, an infidel, a drunkard, a profane swearer, a derider of godliness; yea, a persecutor, a fornicator, a man of no religion, if he will but be for them, and serve their interest, and will not scruple communion with such. But men never so sober, just, and godly, that cross their wills and carnal ways, they cannot endure. And if they be such clergymen, as the world hath too many, such serious, godly men, for disliking their ungodliness, are made the common objects of their pulpit and discoursing scorn or accusations, and perhaps are excommunicate 'ipso facto,' for dissenting from their opinions or wills.

13. Such usually in former ages have been the chief instigators of princes and rulers, to hate men of serious religion, and to stir up persecution against them, and to render such odious to the world as heretics or intolerable villains. O what difference is there between the true narratives of the lives of Luther, Calvin, Beza, and abundance such, and the odious lies, and defamations written of them by some others. Yea, those who commend Melancthon, Bucer, and many such for learning and moderation, hate their doctrine of reformation and serious piety.

14. And you may note, that in any slander of a godly man, they will sooner believe one or two ignorant malicious drunkards against them, that never knew them, than the testimonies of hundreds of most faithful persons who praise and vindicate them, though they better knew them.

15. They seldom give the accused leave to speak for themselves before they believe accusations against them ; but conclude that they are as bad as backbiting malice reporteth them behind their backs.

16. They are glad to hear of any infamy of religious persons, and loath to hear them praised without contradiction ; and are glad to hear of any suffering that befalls them.

17. If there be any public differences in a church, city or land, they are usually against that side, which most favoureth serious godliness, be they who they will. If the king, parliament, bishops, will be for the persons and ways of soberness, justice, and serious godliness, they will be on the other side ; and they will cry up any that will cry them down, or would oppress them.

18. Lastly, The quality of the enemies may help with the rest to tell what it is that they are against ; when it is the generality of the worldlings, proud, ambitious men, sensual drunkards, gluttons, fornicators, profane and irreligious, who hate godliness so far as to drive it from themselves and families, and rather venture on hellfire, than be truly godly ; it is easy to know what these hate in others.

I have told you who I mean by malignant enemies of godliness, that the mistakers and slanderers of my words may have no excuse. Could we now but prevail against this Cainism, or devilism, it would do much to recover the peace of many nations of the earth : but Christ hath told us, that enmity between the seed of the woman and the serpent, of which Cain and Abel were the first specimen since the fall, will never cease till Christ come, as is terribly described, 2 Thess. i. 6. 10—12. and Matt. xxv. But yet some Sauls may become Pauls, and for the hope of the recovery of such, I will adjoin such reasons as should convince any that have the use of reason left

## CHAPTER III.

*Undeniable Reasons against Malignant Enmity to Serious  
Godliness.*

1. To deny that there is a God who is the Supreme Governor of man, is to be mad in despite of the whole world which proveth it: and it deposeth all kings, who claim their authority as given them by God, and as his officers; for if there be no God, there is none to give them authority: and to grant that there is a God, and yet deny him our love, honour and obedience, is to speak gross contradiction, or else profess open malice against God himself. If he be God, he is perfectly wise; and should not perfect wisdom govern us? If he be God, he is perfectly good, and man's chief benefactor; and should he not then have our chiefest love? If he be God, he is of absolute power; and should he not then be obeyed? If he be God, he made us, and still maintaineth us, and we live continually by his will, and have all that we have of his bounty, and we, and all we have are wholly his own; and are not then all our thanks and service due to him? If he be God, he is our Judge, and will be just in punishing and rewarding; and should we not then serve him with the greatest fear, and with the highest hopes? These things are undeniable.

Dare any man that believeth there is a God, say, that man can love him too much, or too much honour him or obey him? Can we return him more than his due? It is therefore no less than practical atheism, or else a rebellious defiance of God, to blame or hate men for loving, honouring and serving him to the very utmost of their power. And to deny God, or defy him, is a thousandfold more damnable sin and treason, than to deny and defy the king, or your own parents.

2. God hath himself commanded man to love him with all his heart, and soul, and might; and to obey him with his greatest fidelity and diligence, and to fear him more than any creature, and to place our chiefest hopes on his promised rewards, and to seek first his kingdom and righteousness, and not to sin wilfully to save our lives, or gain all the



world; Deut. vi. 5—7. xx. 12. xi. 12—14. Matt. xxii. 37. Heb. xi. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 58. Luke xi. 4. Heb. xii. 28, 29. Matt. x. 39. 42. xvi. 25. 16. vi. 33. Luke xiv. 26. 33. Matt. v. 19, 20. And the law of nature speaks no less. And if God command it, and you condemn it, do you not condemn God? If you command your son, or servant, or subject any thing, he that blames him for obeying you, blames you more than him. If it be a fault or folly to love and serve God with all our heart, and mind, and might, the fault or folly would be God's that requireth it, and not ours. And, is such a blasphemer fit for human society, who will accuse his Maker? If God be blameworthy, he is not perfect; and if he be not perfect, he is not God: and so to be against our utmost obedience, doth amount to no less than blasphemy or atheism.

3. Do you think that man is a creature that needs to be blamed for loving or obeying God too much? Do you not know that nature is vitiated by sin, and man is now backward to God, and all that is good and holy? You may as well blame a lame man for running too fast, as a sinful man for obeying God too much. It is more foolish than to blame a sick man for working or eating too much, that can do neither: or to hold a man in a consumption from going up the hill too fast. Do you find your own heart so forward to a holy life, as that you need pulling back or hindrance, when no exhortation or necessity will persuade you to it? And if you need no such reproof or stop, why should you think others need it? Do you not use to say that all men are sinners? And do sinners need to be blamed for obedience? Do you not daily confess that you have done the things which you ought not to have done, and left undone the things that you ought to have done, and there is no health in you; and yet will you blame men for too much obedience? It seems then, that your confessions of sin are professions of it; and while you tell what you have done, you do but tell what you mean to do, and what you would have all others do; or else you blame yourselves for sinning, and hate your neighbours for not sinning.

4. If you hate men for holiness and avoiding sin, you hate Jesus Christ most; for he was most holy, and free from all sin: and you hate the angels and all in heaven, for they are holy, and void of all transgression.

5. Have you any better master to serve than God? Or any better work to do than he commandeth, or any better thing to seek and hope for than he hath promised? If not, should not the best be preferred? What do you love and seek yourselves? Is money or fleshly pleasure better than God and heaven? Is sin and sensuality a better employment than his service? Is your flesh and lust a better master? Compare them, and we are content that the best be preferred.

6. Why do you take on you to believe in Christ, if you be against holiness, and for sin? Christ came into the world to die for sin, to shew God's hatred of it: and would you have us wilfully commit it, and to despise his blood? He came to destroy the works of the devil; and will you plead for them? He came by his doctrine, example and grace, to bring man to holy obedience; and do you hate men for the same, and yet call yourselves Christians?

7. How dangerously do you draw towards the sin against the Holy Ghost, if you hate or blame men for being holy, or seeking to be such; when it is all the work of the Holy Ghost on men's souls to make them holy? It is a dangerous thing to hate the work of the Holy Ghost, and as it were defy him, and do despite to him.

8. Are you not yourselves in your baptism vowed and devoted to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, renouncing the world, the flesh and the devil? And do you hate men for being such as you vowed to be yourselves? And do you think that God will not severely reckon with you for such perjury and base perfidiousness?

9. Do you not in your daily hypocritical devotions condemn yourselves by your own tongues? Do you not pray that the rest of your lives may be pure and holy? And at the same time hate purity and holiness? Do you not pray that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven? And can we have a higher, purer pattern? Do you know any that doth God's will better than it is done in heaven? Or is it not damnable hypocrisy to pray for that which you hate, and hate all men that desire and endeavour it? When you say or hear all the ten commandments, you pray, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law:" and do you hate men for endeavouring to keep it? If you come to the Lord's table, you confess your sins, and bind

yourselves in covenant to forsake them, and to live a holy life, and you take the sacrament upon it; and the liturgy warneth you to take heed that you dissemble not, nor be hinderers of God's holy word, lest the devil enter into you as he did into Judas, and fill you with all unrighteousness. And if you hate or oppose that holy obedience to God which you profess, after all this, what must be the portion of such hypocrites? And in your creed you profess to believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and to hold a holy catholic church, and the communion of saints; and yet do you hate saints that obey the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and hate their communion?

10. Hath not God printed on man's nature such a sense of the difference between good and evil, as that all laws and government are founded in that sense? And no man loveth to be counted or called a bad, or ungodly, or unconscionable man; a liar, a knave, a perjured man, or a wicked man; and yet do you hate men for avoiding wickedness?

11. Do not you use to accuse religious men of some sin or other (truly or falsely), and think by that to make them odious? And yet do you accuse them, and hate them most for not sinning? To be sober, just and godly, is but to avoid sins of omission and commission; and do you at once accuse them as sinners, and hate them for obeying God, and sinning no more?

12. Doth it never affright you to find the devil's nature in you, as hating the divine or holy nature which is in faithful, godly men, and to think how openly you serve the devil, and do his work? No man that believeth there are devils, can doubt, but that the hatred of God as holy, and the hatred of his holy word, and work, and servants, is the devil's malignity, and the opposing of them his work. If he were to write you his commandments, they would be contrary to God's, and the chief of them should be, 'Thou shalt not love God, nor serve him with all thy heart, and soul, and might, nor love them that do so; but hate, deride, oppose, and persecute them.' And is it honourable openly to serve the devil? Christ tells such men, John viii., that the devil is their father, because they have his nature, and that his work they do, for he was from the beginning a liar, and a malignant murderer, and turned man from obeying God;

and can you think that he loveth you, or that his service against God is better than God's; or his reward better?

13. Doth it never touch your consciences to consider that you are the children and followers of cursed Cain; and how punctually his case against Abel, and yours against God's servants is the same? By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead, yet speaketh; Heb. xi. 4. Cain hated him because God more accepted him and his offering. "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whoever doth not righteousness is not of God, nor he that loveth not his brother: for this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another: not as Cain, who was that wicked one, and slew his brother: and wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous;" 1 John iii. 10—12.

14. Is it possible that any man can unfeignedly believe a heaven as the reward of holy obedience, and yet think we can do too much to obtain it, or be too careful to make it sure? Is not everlasting glory worth the cost of a holy life, or can it be too dearly bought?

15. Or is it possible to believe God's judgment, and hell's punishment, and yet to hate those that do their best according to God's own counsel to escape it?

16. What monstrous cruelty is it in you to wish poor souls to do that which God hath told us they shall be damned for! God saith, "Without holiness none shall see God;" Heb. xii. 14. "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven;" Matt. v. 20. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;" Matt. v. 8. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die, but if by the Spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live;" Rom. viii. 7, 8. 13. "What manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" 2 Pet. iii. 11. "We receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear, for our God is a consuming fire;" Heb. xii. 28, 29. "Be stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as you know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord:" 1 Cor. xv. 58. This is the very tenor of the Gospel: and

would you wish men to damn their souls for nothing? To lose heaven, and suffer in hell for ever, and all to avoid a pure and holy life? What a bloody motion is this; worse than if you entreated us all to cut our own throats! Let us try first whether you will do far less at our request. Will you give the poor all your lands and estates? Will you run into fire or water, or set your houses on fire, when any will but desire it? It is like you have heard of the woman who being tempted to adultery, desired the tempter first to hold his finger in the fire for her; which, when he refused, she told him it was less reason she should burn in hell to satisfy his lust. If you will not part with your life or estate when another desires you, why should we part with heaven for ever, and choose hell at your desire?

Yea, we see that you will not leave an ill-gotten gain, or a sport, or a whore, or a drunken cup, for all the love of God, the blood of Christ, and the hope of heaven; and shall we part with God, and heaven, and Christ, to humour you?

And what is it that you offer us instead of all that we must part with, and to ease the pain that we must undergo? Nothing, or worse than nothing. If we should renounce God and our hope of heaven, you cannot give us health or wealth for it; much less can you secure these or life to us till to-morrow. And will any thing that you can give us, be better than heaven to us, or will it make hell tolerable?

Will you undertake to answer for it at the bar of God, if we are charged with an ungodly, fleshly life, or omitting our necessary duty? You cannot answer for yourselves but by trembling confession: you cannot save yourselves; nor will all your wealth and honour get you one drop of water to cool your tongues. And shall we trust that you can answer for us, or save us? When you would have any man wilfully to neglect that holy life which God enjoineth, you would have him to be madder than one that would burn his house, and kill himself, if you did but require it: and what horrid cruelty is this! You are worse than man-eating cannibals! But the best is, you cannot force us to it; and if you think to hire or flatter us into hell, you must have somewhat more to say and to offer us than we yet ever heard of; much less are we so much below bedlams, as to forsake our salvation, lest you should call us Precisians, or Puritans, or any such nickname or word of scorn, as doth but shew the folly and

misery of the speaker. You will not be laughed or mocked out of your estates or lives ; nor we out of our salvation. In short, nature is not willing to lie in hell, and grace maketh us desire heaven ; and we never yet found that any thing else was more desirable.

17. And what is there amiss in the word or work of God, and in a serious, godly life, that should make us be against it? Doth God make bad laws? Are your wills, and lusts, and appetites a better law? Or could you have taught God to amend the Bible, or to govern better? God needs us not: his laws are all made for our good. All his ways are pleasantness, and all his paths are peace. Speak true reason. Is it a better life to love a whore, or to please lust and appetite, than to love God? What is there in love and obedience to God that should make it detestable, or make us miserable? Is it a greater trouble to live in hope of heavenly glory, than to live in the despair either of a Sadducee or a rebel? You may more wisely tempt us to fall out with our food, or friends, or health. We know that faith and godliness, are not only man's duty, but his interest, much more than health is to our bodies, food to our natures, and the converse of dearest friends to our delight.

18. We have had experience of both ways, and would you have us mad against our experience? We tried the world and sin too long, and found nothing in it but brutish pleasure and luscious poison: nothing that will save soul, life or health: and some trial God in mercy hath given us of his love, and the life of obedience, faith and hope: and the more we try it, the better we find it: only we can reach to so small a degree as doth but tell us how good it is, and make us long for more. And whether the devil would persuade, scorn or affright us from it, by his own mouth or by yours, we hope it shall be all in vain.

19. And who or what are you that would reason, mock or affright us from a life of obedience to God? Are you wiser than God, and dare you give him the lie, that we should believe you before him? Or are you better than God, that you can make a better choice for yourselves and us? Are you more merciful than God, and would save us from some hurt that he would do us? Are you truer than God, and more to be believed? Are you greater than God, and more to be feared? Or are you not the most foolish, igno-

rant and damnably yourselves deluded by the devil? And shall the words or mocks of such, drive us to forsake our souls and God? Should we obey you and lie in hell for it for ever, it would be no small part of the torment of our consciences, to think that we came thither by regarding the threats or scorns of worms and fools before all the word and love of God and our Redeemer.

20. And before we change our obedience to God for another course, let us know what we shall change it for, and whether it be for something better: hath your course made you better or happier than the faithful are? Do we not see and feel with sorrow, that the worldly, fleshly, ungodly sort, are in all nations the plagues of the earth, and worse to mankind than wolves and serpents? They will not let the world live in peace; striving and fighting for dominion and mastery, and more of the world, they are like dogs about their carrion, worrying and tearing one another: they turn man into a more odious creature than swine or toads, by filthy lusts, and horrid profaneness: they make their countries worse than Bedlam, raving against that which the God of heaven hath commanded and made necessary to salvation. And are these such good and pleasant fruits as should entice us to change our master, work and hopes, for this, and worse that followeth it?

And who shall be our rule, if we forsake God and his word? If princes, how many minds are they of through the world; and are they all in the right? or how shall we know which is right but by the word of God? or must all men be for the God and religion of his king? If it were prelates, of how many minds are they through the world, and how bitter in condemning one another! If it must be the major part, how shall obscure men know who those be that can have no just cognizance of the state of the earth, whether Papists, Greeks, Jacobites, Nestorians, &c. be the major part? And how shall we know that the major part of the clergy are the best and soundest, when we see that the major part of the laity is usually the worst; or is it certain that the Papist bishops are sounder than our Protestant bishops, because they are more? If we forsake our concord in God and his word, we can have none.

What mean you to do with conscience, your own, and ours, and other men's? Conscience is God's offi-

cer in us, and judgeth of men and actions as they stand subject to God and his judgment. To drive conscience out of the world, and to drive all reverence and obedience to God out of the world, is all one. To subject conscience to lust or man, is to subject God to lust or man in our estimation and practice. And is God so easily deposed? and will he give up his sceptre to a scorner, a drunkard, or a persecutor?

And what shift will you make at home to quiet conscience in yourselves? You little know how deep it biteth, and how hardly it is quieted, when it is awaked, as shortly and certainly it will be: then Judas will bring back his price, and say, "I have sinned in betraying innocent blood;" and all the comfort his companions will give him is, "See thou to that: what is that to us?" And hanging or precipitating himself is the next. It is like he before thought as you do, that he could have better mastered his conscience: but you may as wisely think to conquer pain and death.

But whatever you do with your own, if we should leave our obedience to God, to obey you or any men, we know not what we should do with our own consciences, nor how to quiet them. God hath brought us out of the darkness and lethargy which quieted them in sin heretofore: and we cannot now be ignorant of that duty to God, that self-interest, that danger to wilful sinners, and that evil of sin, which would begin hell in us here: and are not your scorns and threatenings easier than this?

22. Do not most men at death see the madness not only of enmity, but of neglect of a holy life, and wish that they might die the death of the righteous, and that their last end might be like his? Had you rather die a Dives or a Herod, or a Lazarus or a Paul? Is it not a shame to your devilish cause and you, to see men live in one mind and die in another? And scorn, hate and persecute serious godliness till the sentence of death is past upon them, and then to wish they were such themselves? Or if you be more hardened to the last, you are the more hopeful; but how quickly did such another change his note, and cry, "Father Abraham, send one to my five brethren to warn them, that they come not to the place of torment!" If you mock at these words, you mock at Christ that spake them, and sure you look not to be saved by a derided Christ. And it is base hypocrisy



to deride him, and yet call yourselves Christians, and go to church as if you served him. Live as you would die and be judged, for you shall be judged as you live and die. Either hold to the mind that you will never change, or change it quickly before it be too late.

23. If you know what a man is, you know that his soul is better than his corruptible flesh; and if you think your throats, and guts, and fancies worth all the cost, and care, and labour, which you bestow on them in the world, shall not we think our souls worth more? What godly man that you think makes too much ado for heaven, doth bestow more time, and words, and labour for it, than you do for the flesh and world? Do we not see how men will labour at land, and venture through dangerous seas, and fight in wars, and plot against all that stand in their way; and this is all day, from year to year, and all for provision for flesh and fancy. And do those that you accuse do more for their salvation? If you know not now, you will shortly know, which makes the better choice and bargain.

24. What harm doth godliness and conscience do you in other men? Had you not rather have a son that takes disobedience, whoredom, gaming and drunkenness for sin, than one that makes no conscience of them? Had you not rather have a wife whose conscience restrains her from scolding and adultery, and a servant that makes conscience of robbing or deceiving you, than one that doth not? Sure unconscionable servants and debtors are more troublesome than they that fear God and believe that injustice is a damning sin. But the truth is, most wicked men are for so much conscience and religion in others, as restrains them from wronging or hurting them, but no more, nor for that much in themselves which may restrain them from hurting others.

But if you resolve rather to be damned than to be sober, just and godly, and obey God against the flesh; why cannot you bear with other men that make a wiser choice? What hurt doth their praying do you, or their preaching, while they are responsible for any ill doctrine? What if they be reading the Scripture, or hearing directions for a holy life, while you are drinking, or gaming, or reading a romance, or railing libel, doth their piety hurt you? What if they dare not swear and drink as you do, doth this do you any

harm ? What is it but the serpentine enmity that maketh you hate those that never hurt you ?

25. If you will believe God, it is for the sake of godly men that God preserves the world from ruin ; he would have saved Sodom had there been but ten such persons in it ; he will not destroy the world, till he hath gathered all his chosen out of it ; and do they deserve to be most hated ?

26. How exceeding dear a love hath God and our Redeemer expressed, to all holy, obedient believers ! God calls them his jewels, his treasure, in whom he delighteth ; he gave Christ especially for them. He sealeth them to salvation by his Spirit. He justifieth them, and will glorify them in heaven. Christ calls them flesh of his flesh, his friends, his spouse, they are united to him, he washeth them in his blood, and feedeth them with his flesh, and will make them equal to the angels, which will condemn their enemies. And are not you devilish enemies to God and Christ, who cull out those for your malice and enmity, whom God chooseth out to magnify the wonders of his love on them for ever ?

27. The angels of heaven rejoice at the conversion of a sinner ; Luke xv. 10. And rejoice to be Christ's servants for their defence continually : and is it not devils then and their servants and soldiers that are against them ? Take heed ; God's angels that smote a Herod, may do execution on you ere long.

28. The Holy Ghost saith, (1 Cor. vi.) that the saints shall judge the world, and even the angels, that is, the evil ones. Did you believe this, you would be afraid to hate and persecute them now.

29. Even heathens are for much honouring and worshipping their gods ; yea many offer them too costly sacrifice. What praises doth Julian give to the sun, and what strictness of life doth he command his priests ! What great contempt of the body and the world did the Platonists, the Stoics and the Cynics profess ! And shall professed Christians hate those that are obedient to the true God ? Yea, to shew that the war between good and evil goeth on in all the world ; even among heathens those that were for true virtue were despised and hated by the sensual.

30. And is it not a self-condemning thing in those that accuse God's servants as making too much ado in obeying the law of God, and yet make (as the church of Rome doth)

abundance more laws or canons of their own, and require precise obedience to them all? Yea, will burn men at a stake for breaking their laws? Doth God make too much work in the judgment of them that think it not enough without much more, as if God's law were too narrow and insufficient? Yea, learn by the church of England, whose canons (5—8.) ' ipso facto,' excommunicate them that do but affirm any thing to be repugnant to God's word in their liturgy, ceremonies or church-governing offices. And can you think that obeying God deserveth hatred, when disobeying men deserveth excommunication? Learn of our late laws, which account all the ministers of England worthy to be cast out and silenced if they dare not take the imposed declarations, oaths and subscriptions, and do what the act of uniformity imposeth; and do you think it worthy of reproach to be as strict in obeying God's known laws, as is required to the act of uniformity and the canons?

31. Even the church of Rome applaudeth great rigor and strictness of life, in such as will obey the pope; and they have allowed orders of friars whose rulers tie them to great abstinencē, to much praying, and some to much preaching, so that religion is all their calling. And shall the strict obeying of God's known laws render men odious among professed Protestants? Yea, the Papists honour the very bones and relics of their dead saints. And you yourselves keep holydays for many saints: and will you at the same time hate and hurt those that endeavour to imitate them? Will you imitate those Pharisees whom Christ pronounceth woe against, who at once honoured the dead prophets with building monuments or tombs, and murdered the living that succeeded them?

32. You can never come to heaven, or be saved from hell yourselves, without serious holiness, justice and sobriety: and will you hate that without which you cannot be saved?

33. Scarce any sin doth more certainly prove you to be ungodly, than hating godliness: whatever hope there may be of those that sin against conscience, and wish to be better, and purpose repentance, that man cannot be a truly godly man, that is an enemy to godliness, so that this is a dreadful death's mark on you.

34. You would extirpate the principle of self-love, which God hath made inseparable from us. There is somewhat in

our nature which we cannot lay by, which makes us unwilling to be damned. If you that believe no hell, dare venture into it, we cannot do so who do believe it. If you say that it is our folly to believe that none shall be saved without holiness, and mortifying the deeds of the body by the Spirit, bear with that folly which doth you no harm : it is not men or devils that we had it from, but the Holy Ghost in Scripture. If it be your wisdom to give God the lie, and believe a drunken sot, or the devil, before him, it shall be none of ours. Speed as you choose, and let us speed as we choose. We shall meet your souls shortly in another mind and tune. Strive not to make us choose damnation now our eyes are open : we were once too easily befooled ; but cannot now so hate ourselves.

35. Moreover, he that would not have a man live a life of holy obedience to God, would have him lay by that which he was made for, and that which God continueth his life for, and that which he hath his reason and all his daily mercies for. What else have we to do in the world? Have men going to the grave and eternity nothing to do but eat and drink, and laugh, and play, and run up and down like ants with sticks and straws, and then die, and call all vanity and vexation too late? If we may not spend our time in making sure of a better world, we had rather we had never been born, or had died in infancy, or that we had a dose of opium that would make us sleep out the rest of our lives in quietness, rather than spend it as you do, and then give a sad account of all. We had rather we had been birds or beasts, dogs or swine than men, were it not for that life which you hate, and the hopes which depend on it. It had been a greater kindness to us to have murdered us at the birth, than to tempt us to live for our damnation.

36. What do you think it is that is God's image on man's soul, you know that it is said in Scripture that God made man at first in his own image, and that Christ by his Spirit reneweth them to that image. What is it think you? God hath not hands, and feet, and bodily parts as we have : it is the soul that hath his image. And do you think it is the love of money, and lust, and sport, or gluttony, or drunkenness that is his image? Scripture saith, (Ephes. iv. 23,24. Col. iii. 10.) it is holiness ; and this is called the Divine nature, as coming from God, and inclining nature unto God. Either holiness, wisdom and righteousness are God's image,

or else there is none such on man ; and then you make God's word to be false. And if this be it, and this it which you hate, are not you haters of God? And is not that to be devilish and hated by God?

37. While you are angry at them that say few are saved, or that none but saints or serious, godly, obedient men are saved, you would sink all the world into utter despair, and make none or next to none to be saved. One part of the haters of godliness believe no life to come ; and these would have all men despair. For if there be none, there is none to be hoped for : and they that think men die but as dogs and swine do, must be expected to live like dogs and swine. The other part of you, labour by all means to make themselves and others believe that the profession of more godliness than worldly, carnal men have, is but hypocrisy, and that such are at the heart as bad as others ; and if this be so, what is the consequence, but that none are saved? For unless you will give God the lie, or be saved in spite of him, you must believe that none are saved that are not sanctified by the Spirit of Christ, and live not after the Spirit, mortifying the flesh ; John iii. 3. 5. Heb. xii. 14. Rom. viii. 6—9. 13. 2 Cor. v. 17. And that no man can be saved that loveth the world more than God and heaven, and fleshly pleasure more than holiness. And therefore if there be none such, then none are saved. Hypocrisy will not save men : God tells us that drunkards, fornicators, covetous, thieves, extortioners, revilers, effeminate, idolaters, cannot enter into the kingdom of God ; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Ephes. v. 5. " And if any man love the world (best) the love of the Father is not in him ;" 1 John ii. 5. And if all that pretend to be better are hypocrites, then none at all are saved.

It may be you have the kindness to except some few. But if those few be all that be not either carnal men, (described Rom. viii. 5—7. 9.) or hypocrites, how few then do you make to be saved, if God be true?

38. Who do you think it is that Christ meaneth, when he saith, " I send you as lambs among wolves? Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. Blessed are they that suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. When they say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. The world will hate you as it hated me, because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world. Marvel

not if the world hate you. As many as will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," &c. Who do you think all this is spoken of? It is not of you that are fleshly worldly, ungodly men. Who persecuteth you for righteousness' sake? Who hateth, revileth, or imprisoneth, or fineth you, for living godly in Christ Jesus? Do you suffer as much for reviling preachers, as we have done for preaching? What suffer you for all the oaths that be sworn daily in the streets and taverns, and the horrid profaneness, atheism, Sadduceeism, infidelity, that men are guilty of? If you did suffer for whoredom, drunkenness, or blasphemy is that for Christ or righteousness? When the Holy Ghost saith, "as he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now;" it is such as you that he meaneth. When Peter saith, "They speak evil of you, and falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ;" (1 Pet. iii. 16.) whom meaneth he? When he saith, (1 Pet. iv.) "they think it strange that you run not with them to all excess of riot, lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatry," who do you think he meaneth? And when he saith, (1 Pet. ii. 9.) "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of him that hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light;" who is it that he meaneth? You will say, it is Christians: true: but is it hypocrites? Is it those that will say at last, Lord we have prophesied in thy name, and eat and drunk in thy presence, to whom Christ will say, Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity, I know you not? Sure false Christians are worse than heathens.

39. The way which you take against religious persons doth shew who it is that sets you on work, and what it is that is the root of your enmity. As God's image is in the understanding, will, and executive power of man, so is satan's; and he is accordingly described by Christ to be 1. A liar and deceiver. 2. A malignant, hater of goodness or holiness, and a cause of sin. 3. A hurtful murderer or destroyer. And these are the three ways by which godly people are prosecuted in the world. 1. Belying them is grown so common with their enemies, that there is nothing scarcely so notoriously false which they will not affirm of them, and it is well if some will not preach it, print it, or swear it:

and they make one another easily believe it. Till experience proved it, I did not think that human nature had been liable to such impudent, monstrous lying.

2. The daily business of many is, by wit and diligence to draw men to hate religious men on false pretences. As plainly as Christ preacheth and urgeth love, as his great commandment; so plainly do these press and urge men to hatred: but of this before.

3. And hatred tends to hurtfulness. What plotting and labouring is there in the world, to ruin and destroy each other! The malignant spirit is bloodthirsty. It is strange how the unclean devils thirst to draw or suck some blood from witches. Nothing more alienates me from the papal kingdom, than that it lives like leeches upon blood. To read over the history of the inquisition, and of their massacres, would make men take toads, and adders, and mad dogs, and wolves, for harmless things in comparison of some men. If any would requite them (or others) with the like, I hate it in Protestant or Papist. The Turks conquered the Greek empire, partly by the mutinous divisions of the Christians, and partly by promising them liberty of religion. And then the Christians thought they should have that, they yielded up the empire with the less resistance. And that which was so advantageous to the infidels, might, well used and limited, be more advantageous to the Christian truth and church.

But though good things may be used in an ill cause, it is a sign of a bad cause which needeth bad means. That cause which is carried on by lying, perjury, and deceit, by malignant, love-killing endeavours, and by cruelty, and hurtfulness, and blood, is thereby made suspicious to all wise men. It is a wonder of impudence in Baronius, Binnius, and other Papists, to justify Martin, a canonized saint, for renouncing communion to the death with the synods and bishops who persuaded the emperor to draw the sword against the Gnostic Priscillianists; and themselves to defend a thousandfold greater cruelties and murders in their own church on the account of religion. But sin is mad self-contradiction.

4. I conclude with this great truth: they that hate and oppose godly men's obedience to God, do seek to silence the chief witness of Christ, and to cast out Christianity from the earth. Christianity cannot be proved to be true, but by the Spirit, which is its seal and witness. This witness of

the Spirit was not only extraordinary in languages and numerous miracles, but also ordinary in the work of sanctification. This seal is set on all that shall be saved in all times and places. The Lord knoweth who are his. "And let him that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." "He redeemed us to purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works; teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world: looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" Tit. ii. 12—14. By this healing work Christ is known to be indeed our Physician, the real Saviour that saveth his people from their sins. As man generateth man, and the father is known by the similitude of the child; and as he is known to be a good artist that can make others such. This is Christ's standing witness in all times and places. And when you would turn this into scorn, and cloud it with slanders, or the charge of hypocrisy, and would have judged an odious people, and have them driven out of the world, what do you in effect but spit in the face of Christ, and crown him with thorns, and call him a deceiver, and crucify him afresh, and seek to expel Christianity from the earth? What reasonable man could believe Christ to be Christ, the Saviour of the world, if he did not sanctify men, and make them much better and fitter for heaven than other men?

So that in this you directly militate for the devil, the world and the flesh, against God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, against the holy catholic church, and the communion of saints, and the hope of resurrection and life everlasting; which if you did openly under the name of infidels or heathens, or rather as the professed soldiers of the devil, it were less disingenuous and hypocritical, than to do it in the church, and under Christ's colours, and in the Christian name.

And you must be sure that you are stronger than God and our Saviour, if you will prevail to the last. God hath undertaken the defence of the just: Christ hath undertaken to present them triumphant before his Father, and cast their enemies into hell. Are you sure you can overcome him? Vile worms that cannot fetch a breath without him! When began you to be stronger than God? Was it in the womb? Or in infancy when you could not go? Or was it when the devil and the flesh made you mad or drunken in ignorant



malice? If so, the drunken fit will soon be over, and God will awake a tormenting wit. If you can conquer God, try your strength first on his works: stop the sun; change night and day; turn the tide of the sea; live without meat or air; resolve that you will never die; save all your friends from death. Can you do none of this, and yet will you venture a war against God? Or do you think to fight against his servants, and bribe him to be on your side, and forsake them to your rage? Did Christ take man's nature, and die to save them, and will he now turn on satan's side against them? He overcame the devil's temptation on earth; yea, called Peter satan; Matt. xvi. When he would have tempted him not to die for his chosen. Let men or devils go try him in his glory, whether he will change his mind, and take your part against his own holy truth and servants.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### *Objections and false accusations answered.*

BUT I know that as Christ and his apostles were not hated, nor killed without pretended cause and reason, nor the martyrs murdered without accusation; so none will now justify the scorning or persecuting an innocent person, or a saint as such, but they will first make them odious, and seem worthy of all that is done against them. They will say, it is not godly men, but wicked hypocrites that we hate and persecute; a false and odious sort of persons, who are unruly, and set up their own wit and will against the laws and governors of the several kingdoms where they live: they are the very worst of men.

*Answ.* If they are so indeed, they are none of the men that I am pleading for, nor you the men that I reprove. But before we come to particular accusations, it is your wisdom to answer these few questions.

1. Have you particular matter against them to make good this charge? Or is it only a general malicious accusation?
2. Is it individual persons that you mean, by whom it is proved? Or do you thus accuse whole companies of men? What if one said of Papists, Jews, or Turks, they are mur-

derers, adulterers, perjured, &c. do you think he were not an odious slanderer, to speak that of all or most, or the whole party, which he can prove but by some few?

3. Do you know all the persons whom you accuse? And have you heard it proved? Or do you not say this of the whole congregations assembled to worship God, of whom you know not one of many? If this be so, it is inhuman calumny.

4. Have the particular persons been heard speak for themselves, and give the reason of their actions? And were they proved insufficient? Or were they condemned unheard? Or was God's word derided, and taken for no reason?

5. Do you not know that the devil is the great accuser of the brethren? And that he hath malice and craft enough to say as bad as you can say, by the best of men? And must he be believed?

6. Are you sure you can make God believe you, that these men are as bad as you affirm? If not, and if he find a man in prison for obeying his word, and ask who laid him there, will you undertake to prove that he was laid there for some crime? If God own him, and say, he is my servant, will you confute him, and say, No; but he is a schismatic? God knoweth a saint from a schismatic better than you do. Sheep-stealers use to shear the sheep, and cut out the mark. But they have to do with men. God's mark is where man cannot take it away; and the foundation of God standeth sure. The Lord knoweth who are his.

7. Know you not that Christ, and his apostles, and all the martyrs were as deeply charged, and put to death as malefactors? We must then have better proof than accusation.

8. If they prove faithful Christians whom you thus accuse, Christ hath undertaken their justification: it is his office. And do you think to baffle him? Can he not answer you? Rom. viii. 32, 33, 35. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: who is he that will condemn them?

9. Have you not greater sins yourselves than those whom you accuse? If so, you condemn yourselves. Would you have God judge of them as you do? If so, do you not tell him how to judge of you, and even crave him to condemn you?

10. Doubtless you know that you are sinners: and how think you to be justified at the bar of God? Is there any but Christ to judge and justify you? And do you think he

will justify his enemies, that hated, accused and condemned his servants?

11. Those that dwell near godly Christians and should know them, are more inexcusable for their malice and slanders than foreigners and strangers are. Men of another land or age may be deceived by lying fame or history; but you that are their neighbours are without excuse. I speak for none but persons fearing and obeying God: and you might easily have known that they are neither fornicators, drunkards, perjured, swearers, liars, oppressors, thieves, nor suffer for any such crimes as these.

12. And if they are as wicked as you say, why do you not prosecute them for such wickedness? What are the French Protestants now prosecuted and ruined for? Have any judicatures proved them guilty of any such crimes against God or man? Or is it not, only for worshipping God contrary to the king's and prelate's laws? And how is that? As Christ's apostles did: they refuse nothing in God's worship which God commanded, or any of Christ's apostles used, or any churches in their days, or long after. And did the apostles offer God so odious a worship as deserved hatred and destruction? When Daniel's enemies designed his ruin, they said, "We shall find no matter against this Daniel except it be concerning the law of his God," Dan. vi.; and so they got a law made against praying to any God but the king for a certain time. Daniel must be cast to the lions for breaking the king's law. The poor flies deserve death for coming into the spider's web: but did not the venomous worm spin it of purpose out of her own bowels, or condensate air, to take and kill the flies by craft? In England there are many that worship God as the French Protestants do, and no better than Christ's apostles did: if this be their horrid wickedness that makes them unworthy to live out of prison, say so, and pretend no other. But if it be heresy, false doctrine, perjury, fornication, robbing, treason, sedition or any other crime, why are they not accused of these before the judges? And why are those charged with them that never were so accused and proved guilty? Will not all wise men take those persons for malicious liars, who by their published accusations thus odiously charge multitudes, and never offer to prove it against them at the judicatures? Their accusations shew they want not will, therefore their not pro-

secuting them for any such sort of crimes, shews that it is truth that is wanting.

13. And if they be such wicked persons, whence is it, that they are charged merely with hypocrisy, by such as say, that they live soberly, and justly, and demurely, but they are at the heart as bad as others. Their accusers commonly confess that they are most free from all immoralities, and have an outward show of righteousness, but these heart-searchers see that their hearts are bad. And do they not by this confute their own accusations?

14. And why is it that they that know them best can see none of the wickedness which you accuse them of, (beyond those human infirmities of which they most accuse themselves). As I have oft done, I again solemnly profess, as one that cannot be far from my account before the Judge of all the world, that having now lived to the sixty-eighth year of my age, and been most familiar since the age of sixteen or seventeen, with that sort of men whom the vulgar then called Puritans (described by Mr. Bolton and such other Conformists) though I have met with many that had their mistakes, and frailties, and troublesome differences in lesser things, and some hypocrites intruded among them, yet I never knew any other sort of men comparable to them in Christian knowledge, faith, obedience to God, hatred of sin, care of their duty to God and man, sobriety, temperance, chastity, truth, heavenly desires, endeavours and hopes: and that they so far excelled the rest of my acquaintance, as made their grace amiable to me, and confirmed my belief of the sacred Scriptures: yea, more, if I had not had the happiness of knowing such a sort of men that in holiness, justice and love excelled the rest of my acquaintance, or at least, credibly heard of such, I could not have believed in Christ, as a Saviour of men whom he made no better than Turks and infidels; nor could I have believed a heaven for men no better prepared for it. And that now near my end, I see so great a difference in holiness, justice and charity, between those commonly reviled for worshipping God but as the apostles did, and those that hate and persecute them, as greatly helps me in believing that there is a Saviour, and Sanctifier, and heaven for the faithful, and a devil that deceives the rest, and a hell that will receive them, which is even visibly begun on earth.

*Accus.* 'But (say they) it is not for their godliness or sobriety that we accuse them, but for their sin and wickedness.'

*Answ.* Still this is but general, and signifieth nothing. But, 1. What is that odious sin? 2. It is God's merciful providence that keeps sin in general under such shame, as that the actors of it speak against it, even in their slanders. 3. But if this be the true cause, why do you cull out those that have least sin, to fasten your accusations of sin upon? If there be a conformable minister that is more holy, charitable, and zealous against sin than the rest, he is one of those that is called a Puritan, and accused of sin. Why do we hear none of your furious charges against the common drunkards, revellers, gamesters, whoremongers, persecutors, profane blasphemers, liars, and the families that call not upon God, shew no serious regard of any religion at all? You can live among these, and swear, and drink, and play with them, and never cry out against them as bad men.

*Accus.* 'But religion being the best thing, the corrupters of that are worse than drunkards, and swearers, and adulterers.'

*Answ.* Such corrupters there may be, as are worse indeed: but what is it that they corrupt religion in? They subscribe to all the Bible, and the ancient creeds; and if need be, to the English Articles of Religion. Is not all that enough? Their many large published writings tell the world their judgment in religion: such as Mr. Arthur Hildersham's, Mr. Perkins', Mr. Greenham's, Dod's, Anthony Burgess's, Richard Alleine's, and abundance such. What errors are in these?

2. Why are they not these twenty years accused of preaching false doctrine, and proved guilty, and punished for it, if they are such?

3. If it be not in doctrine, what is it?

*Accus.* 'They worship God contrary to the law, in not using the Common Prayer Book.'

*Answ.* 1. Those that constantly join in the parish churches in the Common Prayer are as much hated, reviled and persecuted as the rest. Therefore this charge is but hypocrisy.

2. What do they that for matter or manner is positively contrary to law in God's worship? They read Scripture, pray, preach, praise God with psalms, communicate in the Lord's supper: doth the law forbid any of this?

3. Not using the rest of the liturgy is a negation, and no

act at all, and therefore no act of worship, and therefore no unlawful act, no more than silence is : he that is silent, and he that omits the rest of the liturgy, worships not God by using it ; but he doth nothing contrary to it, or forbidden by it.

4. If Peter and Paul were unknown in England, and worshipped God but as they did on earth, would you therefore call them rogues or rebels, or lay them in gaol? Did they worship God in an odious or intolerable manner? Did the Holy Ghost by them write an infallible rule for all things necessary in religion ; and yet are they insufferable rogues that worship God but according to that rule?

5. Are they wiser men than they that have made us another rule or worship : or have they more of God's Spirit, and more authority in religion ?

6. Do the imposers say, that all which they add is no part of religion, but things indifferent? And are they odious corrupters of religion, who omit no part of religion, but only human indifferent things ?

7. Do you not reverence the church for some hundred years after Christ, which imposed no liturgies, but left every pastor to use his own prayers ?

8. Do you not harden the Papists that call our religion new, and ask where it was two hundred years ago, if you make the liturgy as now formed and imposed, our religion, when it is not two hundred years old.

9. The godly bishops of England have ever owned the other Protestant churches, and their communion, who have none of our liturgies, nor any like it.

10. If this be odious crime, why do you never revile or prosecute the atheists, infidels, Sadducees, Hobbists, and those many thousands that seldom, if ever, go to any church, or worship God publicly at all? Is the worship that Peter and Paul used worse than irreligiousness and infidelity?

11. Who can believe that you are sincerely zealous against mis-worshipping God, when you can ordinarily yourselves be in a drinking house or playhouse, at the time of public worship? And when so few of you never so much as worship God in your families, by prayer, or read the Scripture, or catechise your families?

Is it not a strange thing to hear men accuse others for not using the liturgy in God's worship, and at the same time would have them that refuse it, to be forbidden all public

worshipping of God at all? Doth this signify any dislike of their omitting God's worship? Which is the more ungodly omission? To omit all worship of God, and live like atheists, or to omit only so much of the liturgy as the apostles used not? I have known many that could not eat cheese, as is said before, (nor scarce smell it without danger of death). If you would have a law made that such shall eat no other meat, few wise men will believe that it is their health and life that you desire. If a man fail in paying his landlord some odd act of service, will you make a law that he shall pay nothing at all? If a subject neglect paying some excise, or using bow and arrows, will you forbid him paying any thing, or serving the king at all? Sure they that forbid men all public worship, be offended at somewhat else than that men do not rightly worship God, unless they think that not to worship him at all is better than doing it without their book.

*Object.* 'But he shall be compelled to better worship.'

*Answ.* How? When he lieth in gaol he cannot publicly worship God at all. Is that better worship? I know it is banishment that some would have executed. And will men worship God any better among heathens or infidels, or others? Or why should other countries endure them, if they be not to be endured in their own?

Are not Englishmen that worship God only by their own book, as much Nonconformists when they are in other lands, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Holland, &c. as those are here that do not use it. And are they there intolerable and worthy of ruin?

Did the apostles or first churches banish any on such accounts? Will Christ banish them from his kingdom? Hath he made any such laws? And is not he the absolute Sovereign? Hath he left his servants to the will of man, to use them how they will, or cast out of his church whom they will? Are you sure these are none of the number of whom Christ saith, "I was hungry and ye fed me not," &c. "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it not to me;" Matt. xxv.

*Accus.* 'But they are schismatics, and separate from the church; and is not that a damnable sin?'

*Answ.* 1. Being speaking only to malignant enemies of serious godliness, I say, It is not only separatists that you

hate, but godly conformists, yea perhaps most of all, because you are more restrained from hurting them. How oft hear we curses and revilings against conforming Puritans, or as some call them, Church Whigs. If they are not haters of their brethren, but friends to love and peace, you nickname them Trimmers. And cursing those whom Christ blesseth, when he saith, "Blessed be the peacemakers, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," you say, 'Cursed be the Trimmers, and would the kingdom were rid of them.' It is any that are for a holy life, and obedience to God, that you abhor.

2. As I said before, you spare those that come to the parish churches no more than others. The old Nonconformists wrote more against separation than any else in England did. And yet were hated as intolerable. The reconcilers who are since made Nonconformists, did publicly offer to be subject to archbishops and bishops, to use the liturgy themselves if reformed, and if it were not, yet never pleaded for separation. And yet are never the more endured.

But who is it that they separate from? Do they not profess union and communion with the whole catholic church on earth? What separation do you mean? Is it their local absence? And are not you such separatists from all the world, saving the assembly where you meet? One cannot be in two places at once.

Or is it that they dislike somewhat in your forms of worship? So they may in other forms, with whom yet they profess communion. And in what is it that they shew dislike or separation? They hold communion with you as Christians, and as reformed from popery. They separate not from Papists as Christians. And from you it is only for that which you say is no part of your worship or religion, but things indifferent, which they think to be sin. And are those Separatists from your church, who only separate from that which is no part of your church or worship?

3. Are the French and Dutch churches in London schismatics or Separatists, who profess communion with our churches, though they use not our oaths, subscriptions, or liturgy? Liking their own mode better, and preferring it is no separation. If I like your liturgy better than any in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, is that separating from all churches that use the rest?

4. Who are the schismatics in France, Italy, Poland, &c.



Those that are called so, and persecuted as such; or those that impose on them the things which they judge sinful?

What if you were in a Presbyterian land, where the liturgy and prelacy are forbidden, and another form set up by law; and you should contrary to that law use the liturgy and ceremonies; or at least refuse subscribing against prelacy, and for lay elders? If they excommunicated or ruined you for this, who do you think were guilty of the schism?

5. Do they forsake the assemblies before they are excommunicated? Or is it not an odd thing for to excommunicate men first, and then accuse them for not coming to church? I have known ministers stop in the midst of public worship, and refuse to go on till an excommunicate person went out. The whole representative Church of England do, in their fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth canons, 'ipso facto,' without trial or sentence, excommunicate all in England, who affirm any thing to be sinful or repugnant to God's word in the church-governing offices whatsoever, in the liturgy, ceremonies, or articles. And shall they after this be called separatists for not coming in? Doth not the canon shew that the church would not have them come in, when they cast them out?

*Object.* 'But the church and canon bid them repent of that their wicked error, and publicly confess it, and so come in.'

*Answ.* 1. Is a man's judgment absolutely in his power? Can a man believe a thing to be a wicked error merely because the canon saith so? He that can believe what is list, believeth nothing truly. If this belief be necessary to church communion, and to escape damning schism, it is necessary to salvation. Why then is it not in the creed, ten commandments, or Bible? Do you call them the things indifferent, and then call it a wicked error to hold them sinful? Is not this to make it necessary to salvation or communion, to have so much learning or knowledge, as to know all indifferent words and things in the world to be indifferent which men will impose? I would all church members with yours and others knew all necessary things. Do you believe in your heart that all, or half the parishioners do know these things

to be lawful, or understand any more of them than those that think otherwise? When thousands cannot answer a necessary question of the creed or catechism, nor know who Christ is, and how he saveth us?

Why is there not a catechism made containing the sound proof that lay chancellor's power of the keys, and diocesan bishops that have no bishops under them, and our present court-church discipline, and all the rubric, ceremonies, and forms are lawful, if all must be excommunicate with the church.

*Object.* 'If they are so ignorant that they cannot know church orders to be lawful, they are not fit to communicate with the church.'

*Ans.* Make no church orders necessary to communion, but what Christ and his apostles have made necessary to it; and then cast out and spare not all as ignorant that refuse them.

2. But again, do you believe that most, or all that you keep in, are wiser and more knowing than those that you cast out? How shall such as I believe you, who know that in all the parishes which my cohabitation alloweth me to know, it is the most knowing and religious part that most dissent, and the generality of the grossly ignorant that understand few articles of the creed, do conform. As ignorant as I am, and hundreds of my calling and mind, I would I were not only silenced and imprisoned, but put to death, on condition that all that you now receive as members of the church, had no more ignorance than we have. But it is our lot to tire ourselves with teaching poor people to understand their baptism, Christianity, creed, Lord's prayer, and ten commandments, and leave most ignorant when all is done, and yet ourselves after our hardest and longest study, to be judged so ignorant about some indifferent things, as to be unfit for ministry or communion.

*Accus.* If men will not obey church governors and laws, they are rebels, and unfit for Christian society. If every man shall follow his own fancy, what order will there be? Do not all churches require obedience to their orders?

*Ans.* 1. The church hath one universal King, who hath made universal laws for all; which must be first obeyed, and against which no man hath power. And yet his own laws have things necessary to all, in which they must unite, and

integrals and accidents which all know not, in which they must bear with one another. No man understandeth all the Bible. And are many laws and books more necessary than God's?

2. Whoever depraveth the necessary points of religion by his own fancies, should be rejected. But all men living err in many lesser things.

3. In what countries is it that your rule holds, that rulers must be thus far obeyed in religion? Is it in China, or Pegu, or Hindostan, or Turkey? Or is it in Italy, Spain, Poland, Silesia, Bavaria, or France? Or is it at Geneva, Holland, or the Presbyterian countries? Or is it only in England, Scotland, and Ireland? And was it so here before Henry the Eighth, or only since? And how shall any know where it is, unless he try and judge his ruler's commands by the laws of God? Will you follow this rule in France or Spain? Or shall all subjects judge of kings' capacities?

*Accus.* 'But they hold unlawful assemblies of their own, and worship God contrary to law, and yield not so much as passive obedience.'

*Answ.* 1. You know the ministers are forbidden their office, unless they will take those oaths, subscriptions, professions, and practices, which they dare not take, for fear of sin and damnation. And they would be thankful if their reasons may be heard, and if any will instruct them better. And they are confirmed in their opinion by the answers, or no answers rather, made to the reasons already given in. And they are devoted or vowed to the sacred ministry in their ordination. And if there be such a sin as sacrilege in the world, they are confident it were sacrilege in them to alienate themselves from the office which they have undertaken. As it is apostacy from Christianity to violate our baptismal vow, though men should command it, they doubt not but it is perfidious apostacy from the sacred ministry, to violate the ordination vow, though bishops silence them. As it is adultery to violate the conjugal contract, though a bishop should require it; seeing he that married them hath no power to unmarry them, unless they do it first themselves, and prove deserters or adulterers.

2. And the people that are excommunicate, or forbidden

to worship God publicly, unless they will do that which they think is sin, are still under God's command to worship him, and not to forsake church-assembling for his worship. What would you have these ministers and people do? They study and pray to God to convince them, if they take these oaths, subscriptions, professions, and practices to be sin, and they be no sin. They resolve to be ruled by God's word. They are willing to hear any thing that may better inform them. They wonder that men accuse them that have no more to say to change them. If they desert the ministry, they fear God's vengeance. If these poor people give over all God's public worship, and live like atheists, conscience living or dying will torment them. If they do that which they are persuaded is sin, when the imposers call it but indifferent, Paul hath antedated their sentence; "He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith. For whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" Rom. xiv. Change their judgment they cannot. Sin they dare not. To give over worshipping God is to renounce salvation. Change the law or canon men will not. It seems to me a strange penalty to forbid men to worship God at all, because they think some subscriptions or forms to be sin. More strange than to say, all that will not wear crape shall go naked. Or all that will not eat anchovies shall eat nothing. If a man think the use of a crucifix in worship sinful, sure to give over all worship is more sinful. But men have their ways.

3. What worship is it that they offer God contrary to law? They are willing to do all required in Scripture by Christ and his apostles. And were they rebels and rogues? Or is their worship intolerable?

4. What harm will it do their neighbours, or any, if they only read the Scripture, and praise God with psalms, and preach and pray as God prescribeth, without subscriptions or ceremonies? Are any hurt by this? Doth the same liberty to the Dutch here hurt any body, or break peace? Doth the difference of cathedral and parish worship break peace? or of those churches that have organs and altars, and those that have none?

The Papists are the greatest pretenders to unity, and most cry down schism; and yet if all will but be servants to

the pope, he will license multitudes of orders that more differ from one another than we from you. Jesuits, Benedictines, Dominicans, Carthusians, and abundance more.

5. Dare any man of self-knowledge and conscience say, that all your worship is not more faulty than is the omission of a form or ceremony? Will not all the world be forbidden to worship God, if all as bad as this be forbidden? And how many worshippers of God, think you, will be left in England, if all must give over that have greater faults than the omission of a thing called but indifferent?

6. As to what you talk of passive obedience, though the phrase be a contradiction, yet the thing meant is a mere cheat of one that hath devised that absurd phrase: and calls omissive obedience by the name of passive; omitting an action is not suffering. Daniel was forbid to pray, and the apostles to preach. They would not yield this omissive obedience, but they yielded that which is commonly called passive. They patiently suffered.

7. Do you not know that about two hundred thousand in and near London cannot come within the doors of the parish churches (nor hundreds hear that can croud in); shall all these be made atheists, or taken for rebels if they will not forbear to worship God?

8. I suppose you know that many thousands stay at home in their houses, shops, taverns, in sin or idleness. Are these thought worthy of a gaol or banishment? or is their course better than to worship God as Peter and Paul did? O the difference between God's judgment and some men's! But God's judgment shall determine all.

9. Are there no unfaithful and unskilful ministers? Will no patrons choose such? Is not the minister's skill and faithfulness of great importance to men's salvation? What if bishops or laws imposed an unskilful or untrusty physician on you, and forbade you to choose a better, would you die obediently, or rather say, No one hath power so to betray my life? No nor your soul neither.

10. If you have the hearts of Christians, consider this undeniable consequence. If you will have no union or concord among Christians till they agree in all things that are of no greater weight and evidence, than your forms and ceremonies are, you would have no concord in the world, no not between any two persons. And you may as well say,

none shall be endured that are not just of the same visage and complexion. And then all the doubt will be, who is the man that will be the strongest and longest liver, or possess all England himself alone.

*Accus.* 'But they shew that they are perjured, false, unconscionable rogues, that took on them to scruple oaths and our church communion till now, and now can do all rather than be out of places of trust.

*Answ.* 1. As to your church communion, can you blind men's eyes, that they shall not read what the old nonconformists have written to persuade men to it? See Messrs. Hildersham, Bradshaw, Gifford, Paget, Ball, and abundance more. And did not the present nonconformists shew the same judgment, in 1660, and 1661, in their treaty? And do not many come to your assemblies? And would they not all that are ministers preach there if they could have leave? And have you not, as is afore proved, excommunicated them by your canons, 5—8. And is the Oxford act (which imprisoneth them all six months if they be seen within five miles of a corporation or any place where they have preached within twenty years) an invisible thing? Do you lay men in gaol by it, and yet think it must be unknown? And he that knows it, knows that it sentences all such to gaol if they be seen in your churches? And it is the course of human converse to say, If you come into any church within five miles, &c. you shall lie in gaol six months; and if you do not, you are rogues, and shall lie in gaol for not coming. Just when the ministers agreed to come more frequently than before, this act came out, and drove them back. You will say, they can appear in their own assemblies. *Answ.* 1. His majesty encouraged them by granting them liberty by his declaration. 2. They have more hope there of escaping out of your hands, than they have in your own churches.

And do you not see in print what Mr. Tombes the Anabaptist wrote long ago to persuade his followers to your communion? And what Mr. Nye wrote to persuade the independents to come to your churches? What great change is here of their judgments?

*Object.* 'But why did not the people do so all this while?'

*Answ.* Because their own teachers did, as they thought, more profit them. Many a man thinks it lawful to wear rags

that yet had rather wear whole and comely clothes; and lawful to eat brown bread, and drink water, that will fare better when they can, and yet take these when they cannot. The people that had good houses before the fire, did without any chance of their judgments get into any poor rooms or cottages after it.

2. But suppose they lately change their judgments (as many no doubt have), you that think it is for the better are strange Christians that reproach men for repenting and amending. Do you call them to church and reproach them for not coming, and seek to ruin them for it, and now accuse them for coming? Doth not this shew that some men desired the present impositions, not for concord of all, but to drive some away, lest they should come in, and the land have concord? And doth not this shew what men we have to do with; and that it is somewhat else than nonconformity which such men hate? Your justice is, 'Come to church, or lie in gaol as schismatics. And if you come you are perfidious rogues.' Whether they do or do not, all is one to such judges, who have some other hateful matter in their eye.

*Object.* 'But their doing it just now to keep their charter, and keep from suffering, proveth that they are perfidious rogues.'

*Ans.* 1. I pray tell men of brains and sense, for what it is that you would have men excommunicated, and laid in gaol or fined, if they conform not. Do you do all this without any purpose or hope to drive them to conformity? And do you do it only to make them perfidious rogues. If suffering may not alter them, why do you use it on them?

2. But who knows not that some things are lawful to avoid suffering which else would not be lawful. It is lawful to cast your goods into the sea to save the ship and men's lives; which else were a sin. It is lawful to give a thief your purse to save your life, which else were unlawful. It is lawful to blow up neighbour's houses to stop a fire. Christ proved it lawful to break the sabbath in cases of necessity; he withdrew into the wilderness and far from Jerusalem, to avoid the Pharisees' persecution. And Paul was let down by the wall in a basket; and which without danger of suffering, had not been lawful. Though no sin must be done to avoid suffering, yet that may and must be done, which

self-preservation makes no sin, but a duty; to kill a man that assaults you in your own defence is not the same crime as unnecessarily to kill him.

But as to the other case of taking the corporation oath and declaration, if you know the case (as you should do before you accuse men), you know that it is the true sense of them that is all the controversy. Nobody scruples swearing loyalty, and renouncing rebellion and sedition, and all unlawful means of reformation. That which makes it difficult is that on one side, the proper universal sense of the words seem to them unlawful, and oaths must be taken in the usual sense, unless our rulers give another, yet on the other side, learned sober conformists profess that they take such words in the limited sense, or else they would not take them; and they argue subtly to prove that to be the true sense; and our lawmakers to whom it belongs will not end the controversy by an exposition. And can you wonder here if men fluctuate in uncertainty? And a late writer having given subtler arguments for the limited sense than were published before, did persuade many. And in that limited sense twenty non-conformist ministers took the oath long ago in London at one time.

But I justify none that mistake in so great a matter. And doubtless if they sinned God will not bless it to their good; it will prove their snare. And I am glad that we are agreed that perjury is a heinous sin. I beseech you then to consider, 1. Whether those men are fit to accuse them who drive them to it, and say to ministers, Swear or lie in gaol. 2. Or those who are of the mind of Grotius, Bishop Taylor, and such others, that lying is lawful when it saves ourselves, and wrongs no other; and of those divines that say, it is as lawful to defend myself from pernicious imposers with my tongue as with my hands.

3. Let us all with fear (who believe there is a God) avoid the dreadful crime of perjuring the whole land. This whole kingdom is sworn against all foreign jurisdiction in the oath of supremacy; and against all endeavours to alter the government of church or state, by, 1. The corporation act. 2. The vestry act. 3. The militia act. 4. The Oxford act of confinement. 5. And obliged by the act of uniformity. Is it not perjury then to endeavour any alteration of it? 1. What shall we then think of them that would bring in pope-



ry? Would they not perjure the kingdom? 2. What shall we say of them that write for a foreign church jurisdiction, under the name of General Councils, or a college of bishops, or of foreign patriarchs, or of whom the pope is chief, and the 'principium unitatis' to the universal church. Is it no change of our church government to bring us under a foreign jurisdiction? Is it no change of state government to make the king and kingdom subject to that foreign jurisdiction, who may excommunicate him, and so bring on him all the evil that excommunication inferreth? And what man in his wits knoweth not that prelates and priests are much at the will and power of the princes under whom they live? Doth not our king expect that his bishops obey him? And those that must have this universal jurisdiction over our king and us, are the subjects of other princes, of which the far greatest part are Papists, Mahometans, Infidels, Heathens, or such as are called heretics; and if our king and we be made subject to the subjects of the Turk, the pope, the kings of Spain, France, Poland, the emperor, the Muscovite, the dukes of Bavaria, Tuscany, and such like, is he not made a subject to their lords and masters, and much worse? Will not this project perjure England?

3. Whether it be any alteration of government by them that would change the power and use of parliaments, I leave to lawyers.

4. But I would fain be satisfied of another case. These kingdoms of England and Scotland took a covenant and vow, some voluntarily, some at their compositions, who had been sequestered for the king. This vow contained divers matters, of which some are notorious duties, as to repent of their sins, to oppose popery, schism, and profaneness, to defend the king, &c. It is not denied by most that I meet with, that this oath or vow was unlawfully imposed, and unlawfully taken, and many think some of the matter was unlawful, viz. to oppose prelacy, &c. But seeing casuists are agreed, that an oath unlawfully both imposed and taken, bindeth to that part of the matter which is lawful and necessary, notwithstanding the conjunction of the rest. And the corporations of England are all formed by a declaration taken by all in power and trust, that 'There is no obligation (without the least exception) on me or any other person from the oath called the Solemn League and Covenant; the doubt

is, whether every man may declare that, of all the thousands of three kingdoms (whom he never knew) no one is bound by that oath, or vow, to repent of his sins, or in his place and calling to oppose schism, popery, or profaneness, or to defend the king. And whether all may declare that the Londoners and ministers, and the restored old parliament, and General Monk's army who restored the king, as supposing they were bound to it by that oath, were all deceived, and were under no such obligation thence. And whether I am not bound in charity to think that the sequestered royalists put a good sense on it when they took it. And so whether all the corporations of England are free from — And for what it is that God hath singled them out for judgment.

If you be agreed with us (and with mankind) against so great a sin as perjury, especially national, let us help one another with love and patience to resolve such doubts.

*Accus.* 'But they have been guilty of rebellion in a civil war, and therefore are justly suspected to preach or hold rebellious doctrine.'

*Answ.* 1. Are those men lovers of love and concord who purposely make use of pardoned acts to keep the kingdom's wounds still open? Did not the king tell you in his declarations and act of oblivion, that the putting up all (save to the excepted persons), and closing for the future in mutual love, was the only way to the nation's peace? You would tempt men to think that you desire to see such days again, by trying whether destroying men will tempt nature to a self-defence.

2. But you have oft had it proved (by Henry Fowles, Bishop Barlow, and abundance more), that no Protestants come near the principles and practices of the Papists, as to king-killing and rebellion. And if yet you know not that the war began between two parties of episcopal conformists here among the English, you are unfit to judge of that which you know not. And by reading Rushworth, Whitlock, or any true histories of such times and matters, you may be better informed. As you may of their different principles if you read Jewel, Bishop Bilson, and Richard Hooker on one side, and Mainwaring and Sibthorp on the other.

3. But how few men are alive that had any hand in those miserable wars? You have oft been offered a thousand thanks if you will silence and hunt no other that are as inno-

cent as you, and more than many of their accusers. And shall thousands suffer for other men's deeds? 3. What will wise men think of such a sort of men, as charge multitudes in general with rebellious and seditious doctrine, and have accused so few of any such these twenty years, that I know not of one publicly accused, tried and proved guilty, of all called Presbyterians in all this land? If they are guilty prove it, and let the guilty suffer, and not the innocent; only had I my wish I would bar perjury, and condemning men unheard.

*Accus.* 'They are an unpeaceable sort of people.'

*Ans.* That is soon said. Who hath these twenty-two years manifested most desires of peace? They that have begged for it again and again; pleaded and written for it; offered their oaths that they would obey any lawful commands for it, and do any thing which they did not believe that God forbids? Or those bishops that would not have one form or ceremony, or needless subscription forborn, to save thousands of ministers from being silenced and laid in common gaols, nor to save many thousands of the people from suffering, and to heal the divisions of the church. One would think this should be as easy a controversy, as when soldiers are plundering the country, and the people on their knees entreating for their goods and lives, to determine which of them is most against war.

*Accus.* 'But what need they make such a stir with their religion. What need they any more than go to church and live obediently and be quiet? Why will they be righteous overmuch; will not less ado bring men to heaven? Why do they differ from their neighbours, and judge all carnal that be not as scrupulous as they? God is merciful; and will he save none but Puritans, or precise zealots?'

*Ans.* Now you come to the real matter of your distaste. I did not meddle with the case of nonconformity as it is a controversy between godly men, but only as you make a pretence of it to exercise your enmity against serious godliness, and a handle to lay hold on many whom Christ will justify and save. To all beforesaid I add,

1. If you think they do too much, search the Scriptures, and see whether it be not less than God commandeth? And if so, is it not God whom you accuse and reproach?

2. If they do too much in obeying God, why do canon-

makers impose such abundance on them, as if God had not imposed enough ?

3. Why do you never find fault with men for being too strong, too healthful, too rich, too great, but only for being too obedient to God ? When Christ saith ; if we did all that God commandeth we must say, we are unprofitable servants, we have done no more than was our duty, and the best on earth came short of duty. But this, which is the core, I answered before : and conclude, that all that be in their right wits can more easily bear all your accusations and persecutions of us, as if we did too much in obedience to God, than the accusation of conscience and the displeasure of God for doing too little : which, alas ! when we have done our best would sink us into despair, had we not the merits of Christ's suffering and perfect righteousness to trust to.

---

## CHAPTER V.

*A humble Expostulation with the English Papists who by Information and Prosecution seek our Ruin.*

THOUGH it be not Popery as such that I am here reasoning against, the course that many Papists take in seeking our destruction, giveth me cause of this humble expostulation : and I speak now of no other, but of them. I mean, 1. Those that write so hotly and ragingly to provoke superiors to ruin us. 2. Those that make a trade of being delators against us for worshipping God as we do. 3. Those of them that break in upon us with greatest haughtiness and fury, to take away all our goods, and seek our imprisonment. 4. Those that seek to ruin us by those laws which were made against themselves. 5. Those that would make superiors believe that our doctrine is more rebellious than theirs. To these I offer a few modest questions.

*Quest.* 1. There are some among you that profess great spirituality and strictness in religion. Serenus Cressy wrote to me (commending Baker's book which he published,) that he forsook the church of England because he found no spiritual contemplation and devotion among us. Such as Nerius, Sales, Kempis, Gerson Borromæus, Renti, &c. are really the chief honour of your church. Much of that for

which I am hated by the enemies of serious godliness, I acknowledge to God's praise, I was first chiefly awakened to a book written by one whom Watson and others of your party grievously accuse, I mean Parson's book of Resolution corrected by Bunny. True Christianity and godliness is the same thing in all that have it. Your priest, Mr. Hutchinson, alias Berry, writeth that the most of serious godliness among Protestants is found among those called Puritans: so that I was fain to defend the Conformists against his charge. All this being so, is it the Spirit of God that engageth and enrageth you with the most destructive bitterness against those men whom you confess to be the most religious, merely because they are stiffest against your church-government and way of worship? And do you not know that it tendeth more sensibly than disputes, to persuade the people whom you thus hate and prosecute, that your religion is malignity, and enmity to real godliness?

*Quest. 2.* Do you think it is prudent for you as soon as ever you get up, and and before you dare openly own your name and cause, to begin with malice, rage and cruelty, and that against the most religious (as you say)? Will not this persuade the people that all is true that is said of your intended cruelty, and make them fear you, as so many leopards or wolves? Will they not say, if the young serpents can so easily sting, what will the old ones do? And if your infancy here begin with such destructive zeal, what will you do when you are at full growth?

*Quest. 3.* You cannot be ignorant what cause to accuse your church with cruelty and blood, hath been given the world by your church-laws and practices: by the council at the Lateran under Innocent III. the council for damning Henrician heretics, even kings that claim investiture of bishops, and those that decree the burning of all that you call heretics: by the murder of so many thousand Albigeneses, Waldenses, Bohemians, &c. By the inquisitions more inhuman cruelties in Belgium, and Spain, &c.: by the massacres in France, and the murder of Henry III. and IV. By Queen Mary's flames: by the two hundred thousand murdered in Ireland. And there be many among you who disown all this, and say it is not from the principles of your religion (when yet general councils approved are your religion itself). This being copiously opened (as I said before

by Henry Fowlis, Bishop Barlow, &c.), had it not been more prudent for you to have begun with lenity and love, to have drawn men to think that you are better minded, than to persuade them that you are of your ruler's and forefather's mind, and mean to imitate them?

*Quest. 4.* Have you not observed that all parties have fallen by forcing multitudes to be their enemies by seeking to destroy or hurt them? Most men love quietness, and will live in peace, if others will give them leave; but when they see they must offend others, or not defend themselves, it sets all their wit and power to work against their intolerable enemies. There are few creatures in the world that have not some power and inclination to hurt others for their own defence. The bee hath a sting to defend her hive and honey. And do you not remember that your sufferings in England came most by Queen Mary's flames, and the Spanish invasion, and the many treasons against Queen Elizabeth, and by the Powder Plot? And how the French massacre and murders of kings, and the horrid Inquisition set all our parliaments against you? And how the murder of 200,000 in Ireland drove many thousands into the Parliament's army that else would not have gone? And will you yet stir up the land to fear and hate you?

*Quest. 5.* Is it not both imprudent and unrighteous for you of all men to turn those laws against us, which were made against you, and have so much slept, and little troubled you? You will by this call people to take notice of them that did not before. For my own part, as I never hurt any of you, so I know not that any of the ministers did, whose ruin you endeavour. We hear of none of your sufferings by any such: indeed these late years many have died as for the plot so much talked of; but by whom did they die? Was it not by the accusation and witness of Papists? Were not Oats, Bedlow, Dugdale, Turberville, Prance, Dangerfield, Jenison, Smith, alias Barry, the Yorkshire witnesses, and the rest, besides the Irish, all men of yourselves, that came out of your own bosoms? Whether the men died justly or unjustly I leave to God; but sure it was men of your own selves that did it. And will you be revenged for this on such Protestants that meddled not in it?

And you should remember that you and we have a Protestant king, who hath sworn all his kingdom against all fo-

reign jurisdiction, and all endeavour of any alteration of government in church or state, and so much abhors Popery that he hath made a law severely to punish all that shall but raise any suspicion that he is a Papist. And you must in reason take heed of dishonouring and defaming him, by defaming Protestants in general.

And sure since Queen Elizabeth's days we have had no kings whom you can justly accuse of cruelty towards you. No not King James when the Powder-plot had provoked him, if half be true that the bishop of Ambrun saith of his conference with him, or that Rushforth and others say of the oath of the king, prince and council for toleration, you are disingenuous if you accuse them of cruelty or rigorous severity.

If your Philanax Anglicus (as formerly in the image of both churches) you make all called Protestants of sincerity, to be of rebellious principles, and their religion introduced by it; and yet profess that you honour the king, as if you would have men doubt whether he be a Protestant of sincerity or else were as bad as you describe. Had the severe laws been executed against you, especially for mere religion, no one could wonder if you desired relief; but while you live quietly, and words and paper hurt you not (that I hear of) to begin with so much hurtfulness to them that meddled not with you, will disserve your cause.

*Quest. 6.* And is it consistent with reasonable modesty to go about to make the world believe that the Protestant doctrine is less loyal than yours? Do you think your books are invisible, and all your practices forgotten. It is none of the business of this writing to accuse you herein, of any thing but falsely accusing others, and seeking to destroy us on such accusation. Though you may thus deceive the ignorant that know no more of you than what you tell them, that will but turn to your dishonour at last. Are not your foresaid council canons, which are your religion, visible? Have not the forecited writers truly cited them and multitudes of your doctrines which may better inform men? Are all the wars of Italy, Germany, &c. against princes and emperors, for the pope, forgotten? Was it not a council of your bishops that decreed that all the carcasses of those bishops that were for the Henrician heresy (that is, for the emperor's power of investing bishops and his exemption from being excommunicated and deposed by the pope) should be digged

out of their graves, and burnt? Was it not a council that deposed Ludovicus Pius? How many more such acts have they done? And are not your most learned doctors allowed to publish the justification of the pope's power to excommunicate and depose kings if they deserve it (in his judgment)? Do not your public writers, casuists, and divines ordinarily hold that the people give kings their power, and may take it away when they forfeit it, and that tyranny is such a forfeiture? And that the people should not suffer a heretic to reign? And that subjects may be absolved from their oaths of allegiance, according to the foresaid Lateran and Greg. 7. Roman councils? But too much is said of this by many, and the case is past a modest denial.

Even those Protestants that were in arms for the parliament, and restored the king, were so far from thinking that their oaths of allegiance may be dispensed with, that if I knew any thing of those men and times, it was principally the conscience of two oaths (the oath of allegiance, and the oath called the covenant) that by them overcame the opposition of the other army, and brought home the king. It was this that engaged the ministers of England against both Cromwell and a commonwealth: and the ministers were followed by most of the religious people of the land, which broke the adversary's strength. It was this that engaged the excluded members of the (then) long parliament. It was this that engaged the city of London. It seems it was this that engaged General Monk's army, when they say in their address to him (see it in England's Triumph for King Charles II. p. 85.), 'We hope to evince to his majesty and all the world, that we and all those that have been engaged in the parliament's cause, are his majesty's best and most real subjects, and that your excellency and the armies under your command, have complied with the obligations for which they were first raised, for the preservation of the true Protestant religion, the honour and dignity of the king, the privileges of parliament, the liberty and property of the subjects, and the fundamental laws of the land.'

I am not justifying all that I recite. I doubt not but they were much mistaken. But if they had then been told that shortly all the corporation offices and trusts in England shall be constituted by a personal declaration of every one, that 'There] is no obligation on any person from the oath called



the Solemn Covenant,' to restore the king oppose schism, or any thing whatever, the effect would have been such, as makes me wonder that the royalists (as then called) should be very eager to make all such declare, that all these soldiers, ministers, parliament, and citizens that restored the king as bound to it by that oath, were therein mistaken, and no such obligation thence was on them.

*Quest. 7.* I need not name to you the sorry fellows out of the gaols, where they lay for inhuman villanies that have been our zealous, ranting, tearing, prosecutors? And do you think such actions are in honour to your cause? If it be good, use good men in it.

*Quest. 8.* Why do you play your game under board, and behind the curtain? If you are not ashamed of your cause, openly own it. Is falsehood, lying, and dissembling beseeching them that say they are of a church out of which none can be saved? I remember when Terret, alias Johnson, had seduced the eldest daughter of the Countess of Balcarras (whom they stole away and made a nun in France), and she was afterwards asked, why she did so long go to our churches, join in family worship, read Protestant books, and talk against the Papists, and deride them after she was a Papist herself, she answered that they had leave to do all that as long as they did not openly profess their religion, and were not detected. But when once they were discovered and openly professed themselves Roman Catholics, they must then suffer any thing rather than conform to us.

God's cause needeth not such juggling and lying.

*Quest. 9.* Why do you not ingeniously plead your cause against us, so as may satisfy an understanding conscience, before you seek our destruction? 1. Your arguings are commonly fitted only to cheat the ignorant by ambiguities, and confusion, and equivocal terms; your queries or methods to the French sufferers, are only a formed cheat, by confounding, 1. Subjection to governors, and communion with neighbour churches. 2. Communion with your church in Christianity and communion with its sins. 3. A Catholic church informed only by the sovereignty of Christ, and a pretended universal church informed by the sovereignty of man (a monarch of a church parliament). 4. The office of keeping, delivering and teaching men God's laws, and an absolute power

to judge of their sense, and to make more as a supplement to their defects, obliging all the world on pain of excommunication and death, and more such.

2. Any writings which undeniably open your frauds, you take no notice of, nor vouchsafe to answer upon the importunity of Mr. Johnson, and divers others. I have lately written, 1. A reply to Johnson. 2. A small book in answer to one of your papers, to prove that we have a certainty of Christianity without popery.

3. In answer to another, a small book called, "Full and Easy Satisfaction which is the true Religion." None of them will you answer, nor those before written. But instead of a sober investigation of the truth, some of you raise odious slanders of my life, and threaten and seek my destruction. I never hurt any of you, as I said before, nor ever persuaded any to severity against you. I have long ago publicly proposed terms on which we might live together as neighbours in peace. But destruction and misery are in your way (that I have observed), and the way of peace you have not known.

There are three things which alienate common Christians from you more than all other disputes. 1. That you can go so openly against the plainest words of God, (as in blotting out the second commandment, in notoriously contradicting 1 Cor. xii. Rom. xiv: and xv. about the terms of church union and communion; about Latin prayers and worship to the ignorant, denying the cup to the laity, denying sense in transubstantiation).

2. That you befriend ignorance so much, by the said Latin worship, forbidding most to read the Scripture translated, and accuse God's Spirit of writing obscurely, to cover this.

3. That your religion liveth by cruelty and blood, and cannot stand without it. Which at least in prudence you should hide as long as you can; or at least not design to make the ignorant and vicious Protestants, your proselytes and agents conjunctly to ruin those whom your consciences know to be the most conscientious and seriously religious.

By which already the flock of Christ do (under your sheep's clothing) so judge of you by your fruits, that if any man that is called a Protestant clergyman, do but write and preach for cruelty and ruin towards serious conscionable

Christians, people by this very mark do presently suspect that he is either a Papist or so near them as that he is ready to pass over to them, whom he so assisteth in destructive work.

*Quest.* 'What must be the cure of malignity?'

*Answ.* When the heel of the holy seed is sufficiently bruised, the serpent's head must be broken. 1. The war in heaven which formerly cast down the dragon, must break the supreme serpentine head. 2. Then his heads military on earth will be broken. 1. The usurping universal head called ecclesiastical. 2. The national serpentine heads. 1. Exterior; Mahometan and heathen. 2. Interior; called falsely Christian. 1. Serpentine monarchs, that war against Christ. 2. Serpentine prelates and their patrons, that fight against Christ as in his own name, and by his pretended commission.

And all this by Christ, and not by sinful means.

Reformation is begun 'à minoritis' at the lowest, for personal salvation of the elect. But 'à majoritis,' at the heads for public welfare. And God must raise reforming princes and pastors to that end.

END OF THE TENTH VOLUME.