

love the light. If by a *visible Society with a visible Government*, you mean (as we have great reason to think), *With a visible Government over it besides Christ*, do not thus as Mr. Thorndike and others of you do, go on to beg it, and build vast structures on it, but prove it to us and we will yield; prove to me that the *Universal Church is a Society that must have one visible supreme Government under Christ*, and I here declare to you, that I will turn *Papist* presently, and will not wrangle against any man for calling me a *Papist* (though I may not own all that Popes say and do, as those do that *Grotius* called *Papists*.) I will not talk with Bishop *Gunning* of a *Collegium Pastorum*, governing all the Christian world *per literas formatas*; nor be so moderate as those *French* *Papists* that make an *Universal Council* (which never was, nor ever must be, the supreme Church-power. I will presently be for the Pope, though not *as absolute*. But why answer you not what we have said against it? particularly my Sermon in the Morning-Lectures against Popery.

2. But if by a *visible power in the Church*, you mean not *one over the Church*, the *Independents* deny it not; while every City hath its proper Mayor, (and so every Church its Pastor) it is a *visible power in the Kingdom*, but not *over it* as a Kingdom. All the *Justices of Peace* are *visible powers in the Kingdom*, but not *Supreme*, nor as one *Aristocracy* over the whole.

Seeing all my dissent from Popery, and from you, is founded in my judgment against *any one universal Supreme besides Christ*, (Monarch, Aristocracy, or Democracy, I seriously intreat you to write your strongest arguments on that subject to convince me, and answer what I have said to Mr. *Johnson*, and you may spare all the rest of your labour as to me. This will do all.

§. 50. P. 83. He adds, *How can Subjects preserve their due Subordination to their Superiors if they practice differently? and while they defend their practices, and pretend Divine authority for them?*

Ans. 1. As the three Confessors did, *Dan. 3.* and as *Daniel* did, *Dan. 6.* and as the Apostles did, *Act. 2. & 3. & 4.* And as all the Bishops and Churches did for three hundred years. And as the Orthodox did under *Valens*, *Constantine*, *Theodosius junior*, *Anastasius*, *Philippicus*, &c.

2. They may defend it by proving, that there is a God, who is supreme, and that there is no power but of him, and none against him;

him; and that man is not God, and therefore hath no power but limited; and that to disobey usurpation, is not to disobey power; and that God must be obeyed before man.

3. This is high language, and harsh to Protestant and Christian ears. What! are you serious? Must none in *Rome, Italy, Spain, France, &c.* practise contrary to their Governours? nor in *Turkey* neither? Nor in *China, Japan, &c.* Is it unlawful to read the Scripture, to pray, to worship God, to be baptized, to profess our selves Christians, to speak a good word, or do a good deed, to feed our Children, or relieve our Parents, &c. if Governours forbid us? This is far worse than to forbid the Scripture in a known tongue, if when we know it, we must not obey it if Governours forbid us, nor so much as plead *Divine Authority* for doing what Gods word commandeth us? Is Gods authority so contemptible in comparison of Prelates. Or doth it so little concern us, as that we may not so much as plead it for any practise forbidden us by superiours? This Doctrine must needs startle a Christians heart. It's far unlike *Bishops Bilsons* of subjection, and such others. If you really mean so, that whatever God commandeth us in Scripture, we must do none of it if the Governours forbid us, or else we overthrow all Governments, speak it out, and prove it; but Christians will abhor it. And yet this same man calleth the Martyrs Saints, when his argument makes them rebels. *W. Johnson* would not have talked at this rate.

§. 51. And I would fain know, whether he that first saith, that it subverteth all Government, and after nameth [supreme Church-Government] do really mean it of all, or of *Church-Government* only?

1. If of all, the man is no Papist, I will gratifie him to proclaim it; for he is no Christian. He that thinks that men must not plead Gods Authority for doing any thing different from the wills of *Turkish, Jewish, or Heathen* Governours, surely is no Christian: No, nor if he had confined this power to Christian Governours.

2. But if he mean it only of *Church-Governours*, how come they to have so absolute a power more than Civil Magistrates? May we plead Gods Authority against a King, and not against the Prelates? What proof was ever given of this? Then the Prelates is far above the Kings: Then the Prelate is an absolute Governour of the King himself.

Let

Let Kings and Parliaments but understand these men, and we fear not their deceits. Are they willing to give over all worship of God, and confessing Christ, and all duties of Religion, Justice, or Charity, if the *supreme Clergy* will but forbid them? See I beseech you, worthy Country-men, what sort of men and Doctrine you have to do with.

§. 52. And why doth the man talk only against *different practice*? Doth he not know, that Government *commandeth duty, as well as forbiddeth the contrary*? Is not *Omission* against Government as well as *Commission*? If the King command Taxes, Military service, &c. may we disobey, and call it *Passive obedience*? What if the Bishops only forbid us to confess Christ, to come to Church, to Pray, to give Alms, to do any good? May we forbear, sobeit we do not the contrary? Doubtless if Gods Word and Authority may not be pleaded for any duty which God commandeth, and the Prelates forbid, neither may it be pleaded for the Omission of any Villany commanded by Prelates (no, not Inquisition, Torments, or Massacres), which God forbids. But this man hath the Gramatical skill to call *Omissive obedience* by the name of *Passive*.

§. 53. It's like he will next say, that *I make odious suppositions, That the supreme Church-power may command any Villanies, and forbid Christian duties.*

Ans. 1. I despair of getting any of these designers to tell me, which is the Supreme Universal Church-power, so as to be well understood. I never heard of any pretenders but Pope, and General Councils, and as Bishop *Guning* holds, the Colledg of all the Bishops in the world. And certainly Pope and Councils have set up Heresies, and decreed even the exterminating of all that will not dis-believe all their senses, and deny Bread to be Bread, and Wine to be Wine. They have decreed deposing Kings, absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, adoring Images, &c. And what is it that yet they may not do? If they say with *Peter*, *If all men deny thee, I will not*; how shall I know that they say true? Doth not the Church of *England* tell us, that Councils have erred, &c?

§. 54. And be not these very honest Sons of the Church of England, that affirm it *irreconcilable to Government, to alledg Divine Authority of any different practices*, without exception, and at the same time to Subscribe to Art. 21. 19. 6. 18. of the *Sufficiency of Scripture. That the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, have erred in matters of Faith; That the Church may not Ordain any thing contrary to Gods Written Word: That General Councils may err, and have erred; and that things Ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength, nor Authority, unless it may be declared, that they are taken out of the holy Scripture: And those are accursed that presume to say, that every man may be saved by the Law, or Sect which he professeth. And why not, if he must do all that the Governours require, or nothing divers to them?*

§. 55. My Reason forbids me to trace such a Writer as this any further. To tell men of every vain Harangue, and confident discourse, that's full of gross error, or false report, is work unworthy of time and labour; but I will a little more open the Coar of his deceit.

C H A P. V.

Wherein Mr. Dodwell's deceits, and the danger of them do consist.

§. 1. **A**S to his Method of disputing, that you may detect his fallacies, he hath got this absurd pterence, p. 90. *That there is but one sense of all Terms, which Causes oblige men so mean; and that every one ought to know, who pretends to have skill in Causes.*

Ans. Would you have thought that ever a man should publickly use such a *Cothurnus* among the Learned? What a man is obliged to mean, is one thing, and what he doth mean is another. And is there any one that knoweth what humane Language is, that knoweth not that almost all words have various signi-

significations? Doth he not know by how good reason the Schools oblige Disputants, first to explain their Terms? And what need there is of Definition to explain them? He instanceth in the words *Bishops, and the Church of England*; And might have added, *the Catholick Church*. And doth he not know that it is the *species* of Bishops that we differ about? and will the general name here explain each parties sense? When we are for one sort of Bishops, and against another? And is it not such fraud as souls should not be abused by, to refuse wilfully to *define* the Episcopacy that he meaneth, and then plead that all should understand him? And why is it not as much ignorance in him not to understand me, as in me not to understand him, when I use distinct explication, which he obstinately refuseth?

And doth not Dr. *Stillingsfleet*'s case shame what he saith of the *Church of England*, who was hardly brought to explain it, and at last denieth the very being of the Church in Mr. *Dodwell*'s sense? which of you was to blame to meddle with the Word till you had *skill in Causes*, to understand it without a Definition?

And doth not Dr. *Stillingsfleet* take it as the Introduction of Popery, to hold a Constitutive Regent Church-Government, National, or Catholick? and so he, and Mr. *Dodwell* mean not the same thing by the *Church Catholick* (nor Bishop *Guning*, Mr. *Thorndike*, or the Church of *Rome*, who are all for an Universal humane Supreme power). And who is he that hath read Dr. *Challoners Credo Eccles. Cathol.* *Chillingworth*, Bishop *Mortons Grand Imposture*, Bishop *Bilson*, Dr. *White*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Sutcliffe*, Bishop *Andrews*, Bishop *Carlton*, &c. *Chamier*, *Sadeel*, *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, &c. who knoweth not that the Papists and Protestants, by the name of the *Catholick Church*, do mean several things, and that we deny the very being of any such Church as they call the *Catholick*? And is this the bold and happy Disputant, that will save the Schools and World the labour of *explaining Terms*, and *foreagreeing of the sense*, and put men on disputing, where the Subject is denied, and fill a Book with tedious confident Harangues, and then hide all the fraud by saying, that *there is but one sense of all Terms, which Causes oblige m. n to mean*; and that every one ought to know, who pretend to have *skill in Causes*? When the Cause disputed is only managed by words, as they signifie the minds of the Speakers about the real matters.

§. 2. And as to the material fundamental difference between Mr. *Dodwell's* party and us, it lyeth in these following things :

I. We totally differ about the nature of Gods Government of man.

II. And about the use of the Holy Scripture, and Gods Laws.

III. About the nature and extent of all humane Government.

IV. About the form of moral good and evil.

V. About the essential form of the Catholick Church.

VI. About Gods ordinary means of saving Grace.

VII. About the use of Preaching.

VIII. About the duty of worshipping God in Sacred Assemblies, or the Communion of Saints.

IX. About the difference of Apostles, and the office of the Bishops.

X. About the office of a Presbyter or Parish-Pastor.

XI. About the Necessaries to Ministry, Churches, Christianity, and ordinary *title* to Salvation.

XII. And about the final Judgment. If all these be little toller-able differences, why may not we be tollerated ? If not, judg Reader who they be that are intollerable, when you hear them plead against tolleration.

§. 3. I. For the first, we judg that there is a God, who is the Governour of the World by an universal Law, which is above all humane Laws or will, and that he is the fountain of all power, and there is none but what he giveth and limiteth, and that no man is above him, nor hath true authority against his Laws.

But Mr. *Dodwell* saith, *That it is irreconcilable to Government in this life, or to due subordination of subjects to superiours, to practice differently, and defend it by pretending Divine authority, and appealing to writings, (Scriptures is our word by excellency so called).* And so God shall be God, and be obeyed, if the Clergy please.

§. 4. II. As to the second, we suppose that the Holy Scriptures are Gods Laws, indited and recorded by the Holy Ghost to be the first obliging Rule of Faith, and holy living, which all men are to be obedient to, before and against all contrary Laws of men. But Mr. *Dodwell* as aforesaid, alloweth no such prime obligation as will warrant an appeal to the Word of God, from the visible Church-Governours that contradict it.

§. 5. III. And for the third, we suppose that all humane Powers are derived from God, and have no authority but what he giveth them, and are more under him and his Laws, than the Justices are under the King and his Laws, and can oblige no man against the Laws of God. But how far Mr. *Dodwell* thinks otherwise, you have heard. He saith not indeed that *we must break Gods Laws, but we must not pretend them, or appeal to them against our Governours.* In charity I hope he meaneth no worse, but that we must take our Rulers word or exposition, and judg nothing to be in the Scripture, contrary to their commands. And whether he give them the same dominion also over the Law of Nature, let him tell you. *Paul* disclaimed dominion over mens faith, and the written Law of God.

§. 6. IV. And for the fourth, *We take moral good to be a conformity to Gods Law, and moral evil or sin to be a breach of it.* But Mr. *Dodwell* is for measuring them by the Clergies or Governours will, though Gods Law be against theirs.

§. 7. V. And for the fifth, we take the Catholick Church to have no Supreme Government but God, and our Glorified Redeemer God and man; and that there is no such thing as a Catholick Church of Gods making under any other Supreme Rulers. But that as God is the invisible King of this visible world, and Kings are subordinate Supremes in their Kingdom, but neither one of them, or many conjunct in an Aristocracy, Supreme over all the earth; so Christ is the partly visible, and partly invisible supreme Ruler of the visible Church of Christians, and each Pastor is under him over his proper flock (bound to keep concord and peace); but none under him Supreme over all, whether Monarch (as the Pope) or Aristocracy, as Councils, Cardinals, or others. But Mr. *Dodwell* is for a visible Society, with a visible humane Supreme. But who the Supreme is, I despair of getting him to acquaint us.

§. 8. VI. And for the sixth, we suppose that God sent forth Preachers to convert the world, and turn them from darkness to light, and the power of Satan to God, and that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word preached, and that whoever believeth shall be saved, and the word of God is powerful to this end, and sufficient to make us wise to salvation. But Mr. *Dodwell* thinks that

that it is not Preaching, but the delivering men the Sacraments, that giveth them the first true saving grace and title to Salvation. And that none in the world have this Sacrament or Covenant-title to life, but those that receive it from a hand that had an Ordination by Bishops in his sense, of uninterrupted succession from the Apostles by the like Ordination.

§. 8. VII. Accordingly we hold that Preaching is for the converting of souls, and the means of saving faith and holiness. But what he thinks it is good for, I know not well; nor whether he would send the *Indians* the Sacraments instead of Preachers.

§. 10. VIII. We take it to be our duty, though men forbid us, to confess Christ, and assemble for Gods worship, to read and hear the Scripture, and to praise God: But he thinks we must not practice differently from the ruling Clergies will, if they forbid us, nor alledg Divine authority for it.

§. 11. IX. We suppose that the *office of a Prophetical Ministry bringing new Doctrines or Laws from God*, and the office of the *Teachers and Rulers* by these Laws, are greatly different, and must necessarily be distinguished. *Moses* was a *Prophetical Mediator in Legislation*, and he confirmed his Mediation by uncontrouled Miracles. The Prophets afterward came but on particular applicatory messages. But the Priests and Levites as such were no Prophets, nor had power to make any new additions or alterations of the Law, but only to teach it the people, and as guides apply it to their several cases; so Christ and his Apostles commissioned to deliver and record all his Doctrines and Commands to the following ages, did by the Holy Ghost Prophetically deliver to the world that body of Doctrine and Law, which must rule them to the end, and judg them; and thus sealed and confirmed all by a multitude of uncontrouled Miracles; but all following Bishops and Pastors are not to do the like, nor add or alter, nor are such Legislators, being not Prophets nor workers of Miracles, but only to teach and apply the Laws already recorded in Scripture, and guide their Congregations in variable circumstances (time, place, translations, &c.) according to the general rules of Gods Law. This is the truth.

But how much *Mr. Dodwell* equals the Bishops and Apostles, and sets their words above the Scripture as to obligation, you have seen before.

§. 12. X. And as he giveth Bishops power to silence Presbyters, and forbid the Preaching of the Gospel, and Gods worship, so how little *knowledge* or *godliness*, or *common sobriety* or *honesty*, he requireth to a saving Sacramenting Priest, who must not be separated from, you heard before, contrary to *Cyprian*, and many a Councils Canons. But we know that *Paul* had no power to destruction, but only to edification. And they have no more.

§. 13. XI. We suppose that we must love, honour, and communicate with all such as true Ministers or Churches, who have true faith and repentance, and sincere obedience to Christs Laws, and are able, godly, willing Pastors, chosen or consented to by the flocks, approved and ordained by senior Pastors, (especially in Synods where City-Pastors preside), and especially if also authorized by the Christian Magistrate.) But he thinks if they have not also successive Ordination from the Apostles by Bishops of his *species*, they are no Ministers, or Churches, and have no Sacrament, and Covenant title to Salvation, but are Schismatics, and by their Ministry sin against the Holy Ghost. And so destroyeth all certainty of title to Salvation, and of Church-communion, Ministry and Sacraments, to all the Christian World.

§. 14. XII. Lastly, we think that men shall be judged by their keeping or breaking Gods Law, and according to what they did in the body. But he would have us obey the Supreme Clergy, and not plead Scripture or Divine authority for our different practice; because the *Government that lasteth but for this life, ought not to admit of disputes more lasting than its practice.*

§. 15. I conclude with a request to him to resolve me these doubts.

1. Whether Prophets having immediate messages from Heaven, were not differenced from the teaching Priests and Pastors.

2. Whether false Prophets were not grievously threatened among the *Jews*; and whether Christ did not command us to beware of false Prophets?

3. Whether he be not a false Prophet (worse than a false teacher) that falsely pretendeth to that which is proper to a Prophet?

4. Whether it be not proper to a Prophet to deliver as immediately

diately from God, new Laws to the universal Church, yea or to any Church, which are not in the Scripture, nor are revealed by it as Gods means, (besides the determination of circumstances left to humane prudence variable *pro re nata*) if *Moses* and the *Apostles* in Legislation acted as Prophets, do not they so that pretend to do the like?

5. Whether the General Councils of Bishops and the Pope have not done the work proper to the Prophetical office, when they have made Laws for the universal Church, and this as by Divine authority, and undertaken to give all the Church the sense of Scripture, which only shall be obligatory to them thereby? For it is the maker of the sense that is the maker of the Law; especially when they pretend to Infallibility, or to be secured from erring in faith, by Divine inspiration, how ignorant or bad soever they be singly. Is not this pretended *authority* and *inspiration* that of Prophets, as different from meer Teachers and Guides by Gods Law already made?

6. If it be so, how many such Papal Councils, arrogating such power, have been false Prophets?

7. But if they pretend not Inspiration, nor Prophetical authority from God, nor yet authority given them by the Scriptures, or Laws of God already made, (or falsely pretend such) then is not this to usurp *Christs own authority*, and so instead of being false Prophets, to be partly *Vice-Christ*s, (or Law-givers to his universal Church) called commonly *Antichrist*s? I would willingly have things so cleared, that men may be freed from all such suspicions.

But if you are still confident that the universal Church hath a visible supreme Government besides *Christ*s, I should be glad, 1. To see it proved. 2. To know whose it is, and how we may know them. 3. And to know its true extent. If you intend no fraud, you cannot refuse me this, when I promise you, if performed, I will let fall the suit, and no more trouble you with lesser Controversies.

I have no Copy of my first Letter to Mr. *Dodwell* upon a Book which he sent me. This is his Answer.

Reverend and Worthy Sir,

I Have received your very kind Letter, wherein I hardly know whether I should be more thankful for your approbation or your reproof, both of them being in their kind so useful, and both of them being by you performed with so great civility. I am confident that if our modern disputes had been moderated with that candor, men would certainly have been more peaceful, and very Orthodox than now we find them. I could very heartily have wished that the opinions wherein we differ, had not been of that nature as to separate Communion, (for this I look upon as the only circumstance that can make such differences grievous to a pious person; for as for those others which exasperate many, that Dissenters are not so wise to discern the truth, or so fortunate in avoiding prejudices, or lighting on faithful informations in a time when they are capable of receiving them; or that they are not so submissive as themselves expect to that Pope which *Luther* has long since observed in every mans heart, &c. are reasons either sinful, or at least insufficient to excuse the sin of uncharitableness upon such an account) but as they are, considering them as tempered with that piety and moderation which may expiate their other malignities, that they are rather alledged as Apologies for your selves, than as obligations on others, rather to excuse your deformity in assisting at our Altars, than erecting others in opposition to them; that you are still inquisitive and desirous of further information, and ready to lay down your mistakes where you are convinced that they are such; that still you preserve a peaceable mind, and embrace our Communion it self in *voto*, though perhaps not actually; these are so valuable considerations, even before God as well as man, for excusing from the guilt of error, as that whatever I may think of your opinions, I hope it shall not hinder me from a cordial respect and veneration for your person.

As I do very much esteem the good opinion of so great a lover of peace and piety as your self, and should have been sorry to have given any just occasion of offence to you; so I am not a little glad that upon a review of the particulars mentioned in your Letter, I find my self so very innocent. For as for my Preface, the main parts
of

of it wherein the disrespect of the Clergy is shewn to have been an Introductory to the Atheism of the age we live in ; and that the Conformable Clergy, that is, such as would answer the design of the Church not only as to their exterior demeanor in publick solemn Assemblies, but also as to the qualifications of their persons, and the conduct of their whole lives, could not prove either trifling in their Preaching or scandalous in their examples, and therefore that the Church is not responsible for their misdemeanors where they prove otherwise ; and that the Laity are in their proportion obliged to the same duties with the Clergy, and therefore may make use of the advices there prescribed ; or where the errors of our modern School-Divinity are touched, and some Proposals made for their reformation ; in these things, I say, I can see no occasion of offence, but rather some preservatives against it. The only thing I suppose you aim at is my taxing some opinions of Nonconformists, and that with as little personal reflection as I was able, which I conceived prejudicial to Church-authority ; which because you seem to disown, I do not see why you should apprehend your self as particularly concerned, especially there being nothing in the discourse whereby you could conclude either your self or any of your moderate temper to have been intended. I will assure you I intended none but such as were guilty, and with being so, I charged none particularly. But that not only the old Puritans and Separatists of Queen *Elizabeths* times, &c. but also very many of ours now are guilty of them, is too notorious to suppose you ignorant of it. I could heartily wish that the number of better principled and more peaceable dissenters were greater than I fear it is. Nor do I see that what is there said can make it unuseful even to the persons truly concerned, that value truth more than any, however beloved party ; seeing it may either let them see the ill consequence of their Principles, and their influence on that Atheism and Prophaneness which I am confident themselves do most cordially detest, which I conceive to be more likely to prevail with them than other arguments, as being more suited to their pious dispositions ; or supposing that my fears were indeed groundless of the introduction of prophaneness by the contempt of Government, or of contempt of Government by their disobedience to it, yet might it at least warn them from confining on such dangerous consequences, or from coming to them unawares by an abuse of Principles generally true, but obnoxious to particular inconveniences

when

when unwarily managed. I mean it may put them in mind of the greater momentousness of good Government and peace than many of their differences, and consequently of the great engagements incumbent on them for their preservation; and that they would therefore so take care to oppose the particular abusive Constitutions of Government, as not to bring their Government into contempt, nor to suggest unanswerable Apologies to factious persons for the future, when they are unwilling to be obedient. These are abuses which I believe your self would wish redressed in the Causes of our Church-divisions. But if it could not be useful to them, yet could it not be prejudicial to them, nothing being urged, either invidiously, or imperiously, and therefore no harm being done if I should prove utterly mistaken.

That you should marvel how Reviving Discipline could by me be expected from the constitution of our present Ecclesiastical Government, does seem no less marvellous to me, especially as to the exception you make against it; for if it were impossible to maintain Discipline under a Government so far Monarchical, as to appropriate the Decretory power of the Government of many to a single person, though the execution be intrusted to many; then it would follow, that the secular Discipline under a secular Monarch of any extent, were impossible also to be observed, seeing it is as impossible for any such Prince to have a particular cognizance of every particular Cause, much more of every particular person in his Dominions, as for a Bishop in his Diocese. As there it appears by experience (I shall instance in a Scripture-example, because I know that will be liable to least exception), that *David* in an extent more vast, and a people more numerous than that of the largest Diocesses, 120. Miles in length, and 60. Miles in breadth, and rather better in *David's* days, where were accounted 1300000 men fit for War, besides *Artificers*, and such others, not coming under that account, was yet able to give a good account of his Government, without particular inspection into all Causes, or Communication of his power to numerous co-ordinate Presbyteries; so I do not see, why it may not as well hold for a possibility of Discipline, under an Ecclesiastical Monarch of a much narrower extent; for the reason produced by you, seems to proceed from the nature of Government in general, and therefore must proceed with the same force in seculars as Ecclesiasticals, there being no ingredi-

ent

ent peculiarly relating to Religion, much less to Christianity, which might alter the case, or argue a disparity; for certainly Princes, as well as Bishops, are responsible for the miscarriage of their particular Subjects; for they may be prevented by moral diligence, and yet you will not thence conclude that every particular must come under his immediate personal care and cognizance; nor is it proved, that the Bishop is otherwise obliged to such a care upon peculiar respects. Besides, that it is plainly against experience, even in Ecclesiasticals; for as it has fallen out in some places, where there were many Cities, the Bishops were proportionally multiplied, as in *Affrica* and *Ireland*; so that it was not upon account of the impossibility of managing the charge of much greater multitudes than the Inhabitants of those small Cities, appears, in that even in the very same places the greatness of no City was thought sufficient for multiplying the Bishops, though it was for the Inferior Clergy. I need not tell you how great *Rome* was, and how full of Christians, even in *Decius's* time, under *Cornelius*, which required the united endeavours of above a Thousand Clergies, as appears from the said *Cornelius's* Epistle to *Fabius*, of *Antioch*, in *Enseb.* yet was one Bishop thought sufficient for all; nay, the erecting another in the same See, was thought to be formal Schism, as appears from the controversies of those Ages, betwixt *Cornelius*, and *Novatian*, and *St. Cyprian*, and *Felicissimus*. The same also might have been shewn in several other Cities, exceeding numerous, and abounding with Christians, as *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, and *Carthage*, &c. which even in those early Ages, when Discipline was at the greatest Rigour, were yet Governed by single Bishops: Nay, whole Nations were sometimes Governed only by one, as the *Goths* by *Ulpian*, and the *Indians* by *Aedesius*, and the *Arabians* by *Moses*, which is an Argument insisted on by some Presbyterians, for shewing the probability of Ordinations by bare Presbyters. Yet are there no complaints of dissolution of Discipline in such places, upon account of the greatness of their charge, which to me seem sufficient convictions, that the multitude of persons governed, is not the reason of our present neglects in that particular.

When I said, that *Ignatius's* Epistles were questioned by the Presbyterians, I never said, nor intended it concerning all (for I knew of *Vedelius's* Apology for them), much less did I lay it

particularly to your charge; so that if you had here forbore assuming to your self what was spoken of others, many of whose Opinions I am confident you will not undertake to justify, there had been no occasion of this exception. That other Presbyterians, and those by far the greatest number, have denied them, cannot be questioned.

As for the Reasons for Nonconformity alledged by you, and your Brethren, of the *Savoy*-Conference in 1660. if I might without offence, presume to interpose my own thoughts, they are as followeth: 1. For the approving, not only submitting to such things as you disliked, and that by an Oath, I am sure there are many Conformists themselves, that understand no more to have been intended by the Church, but only an Exterior submission, not an Internal Approbation of the Particulars. And particularly, I have been informed by a Letter from a very worthy credible person, who pretends to have had it from the Bishop himself, that Bishop *Sanderson*, who was a Member of your Conference, interposed those words in the Act of Parliament, where it is required, that Ministers declare their *unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things* in the Book of Common-Prayer, &c. designedly that this Objection might be prevented. The new Article of Faith, inserted in the Rubrick, I do not know, nor can I now get the Books that past betwixt you at the Conference, to find what you mean. That Lay-Chancellors were put down, and that the Bishops did more consult their Presbyteries, I could for my own part heartily wish. But I cannot think abuses momentous enough to warrant a Schism; and I know your self are for bearing with some things that are not so well liked of, rather than that the Church of God should be divided for them. In brief, I do not understand any of the Six Particulars mentioned as the Reasons that keep you off, though indeed you disapprove them, both because you do not undertake to determine what they might be to others, but only what they are to persons of your mind (though I confess, this may be understood as a modest declining to judge of others); and because you conceive piety the most likely means to unite us, which could not be if we imposed any thing on you against your Consciences. So that the only one may be presumed to have been thought sufficient by you to this purpose, seems to have been another, which because you intimate somewhat obscurely, I do not know whether you would
be

be willing that it should be taken notice of. But however I suppose that it self does I suppose only deprive us of your Clerical, not your Laical Communion. God give us all to discern the things that belong to peace. As for other Questions, we may patiently await our Lords leisure, who when he comes shall tell us all things; and in the mean time preserve Charity, and be wise unto sobriety. I hope, Sir, you will excuse my freedom, and let me know whether I may in any thing be serviceable to you; and above all things reserve a portion in your Prayers for

Trin. Col. near Dublin,
Decemb. 14. 1672.

Your unfeigned Well-wisher,

HENRY DODWELL.

For the Worthy and much Honour'd Mr. Henry Dodwell,
at Trinity Colledg near Dublin in Ireland.

Worthy Sir,

I Heartily thank you for your patience with my free expressions, and for your grave and kind reply. As to the main cause of the *Nonconformists*, should I enter upon that which I cannot prosecute, I should greatly injure it, my self and you: I must again crave your patience with my freedom. The sins which they fear (whether justly is the question) are so heinous, that they dare not mention them, lest their condemners and afflictors cannot bear it; and so many, that to open them justly, will require a great Volume, and therefore not by me to be done in a Letter. Only to what you have said, let me mind you in transitu.

1. That you mistake me if you think that I excepted against your Preface as meddling with me, any otherwise than as I am one of those *Nonconformists* with whom I am acquainted, who are mostly of my mind. (And I suppose you would take it for no honour to be thought to be better acquainted with the most of them in *England*, than I am.)

2. That your intimations about the old *Nonconformists* are not to our business, seeing the name of *Nonconformists* maketh

not, nor proveth all or many so named to be of the same mind. Nor is your mention of our Treaty or Papers of 1660, more pertinent, it being the old Cause only that we had to do with, the new Laws of Conformity being not then existent, which have made it quite another thing. Only I assure you, if my superiours would not take it for a crime and injury to do what *Justin, Tertullian, &c.* did to Heathens, even Apologize for their mistaken Cause), and if the Press were open to divulge it, I would endeavour to shew another face of Conformity, and Nonconformity, than is commonly taken notice of; and also to give you (who so well understand Antiquity) most full and palpable evidence of our Conformity to the ancient Churches, at least for 300, and mostly for 600 years after Christ. But (that I may not say nothing to you) I shall only employ these lines about your suggestions concerning the possibility of true Discipline by *Diocesans as they are with us*. And still you must pardon my freedom of speech. I must say, that it is the calamity of Churches, when their Prelates and Pastors are men that never were acquainted with the flocks, but spend one half of their days in Schools and Colledges, and the other in Noblemens or Gentlemens houses, and then talk confidently of the poor people whom they know not, and the *Discipline* which they never tried. Even you whom I honour as a person of extraordinary worth, constrain me by this your Letter to think that I dispute as about war with one that never stormed a Garison, nor fought a battel; or as about Navigation with one that was never one month at Sea.

I. Our first question is, *What the Pastoral Office is*, and especially *Discipline*?

II. Our next is, Whether it may be delegated to, or done by one that is not of Gods Institution for the doing of it.

III. And then we shall soon see whether it be possible for our Diocesans to do it, or any considerable part of it?

I. If the *Erastians* be in the right, that none of our Discipline is necessary besides that by the Sword, (and our Preaching) then we may put up the Controversie on both sides. But if that be the work of Bishops now, which was so in Scripture-times, the matter will hold no long dispute. To shorten that work, I desire you to peruse (its like you have done) Dr. *Hammonds* Paraphrase on all the Texts that mention Bishops and Pres.

Presbyters, with his Treatise of the Keys, where he will tell you, that it was the Bishops Office to be the ordinary Preacher, to Pray, to celebrate the Eucharist, to visit the Sick, to keep and distribute the alms and offerings of the Church, as Curators for the Poor, with much more work. And that every single Congregation had such a Bishop, that ever met to celebrate Gods publick Worship; and that there was not a meeting of a Christian Church without such (for the said Worship in Scripture-times) for he saith that there is no proof that there were any other Presbyters in Scripture-times.

And for *Discipline*, it is past doubt: 1. That as to the matter of it, it must consist of a personal watch over each member of the flock; that every one in it that liveth in gross sin, or Infidel, or Heathenish, or Heretical error and ignorance, be orderly admonished, first more privately, afterward more openly, and lastly most publickly; and that he be by convincing reasons and exhortations perswaded to repentance. That the penitent must be comforted and confirmed, the obstinately impenitent rejected, as unmeet for the Communion of the Church. And for the manner, it is agreed that it must be done with condescending tenderness, patience, plain evidence, earnest exhortations, no means left untried to reduce a sinful miserable soul. And all this with the time and patience which so great a work requireth. (And sure if the Congregation must avoid the sinner, they should know why.) One such person will hold the Pastor work from first to last many an hour and day.

Next, let us think how many such as by Christs Law must be thus dealt with, are in a Diocess. I had the most reformed people (as to sins of commission and omission) that ever I knew in *England*. Our custom being to have each family come by turns to us to be personally Catechised and instructed. I had full opportunity to know them all. Many score of them that came daily to Church, knew not the Essentials of Christianity and Baptism. When I came first to them, I suppose some thousands lived in gross ignorance, open impiety and prophaneness. And even at last some scores I fear lived in gross sin. Some were notorious drunkards, raging weekly twice or thrice in the open streets. Some quieter drunkards. Many profane Swearers. Too many railers, fighters, slanderers, &c. Three or four Apostate-Infidels. The Parishes about me were far worse. A great part of
the