

not; and therefore it may be so now. Though none of those excellent men do it, who are put into the places of the silenced Schismatical Ministers, nor none of the excellent Bishops that are over us, who are so good that one of them no doubt would do it, were it possible. But seriously I take it for a great mercy of God, that honest Christians of little learning have that experience in the *Practicals* of Religion, which the *studied* accurate plausible Orations of contradictors cannot overcome, though they are not so well skill'd at the same weapons as to answer them. Sir, pardon and accept this short and thankful acknowledgment, that I have received your Learned Treatise, till I take the leisure (if I so long live) to return you an answer suitable to your discourse and expectations. I rest,

Aug. 5. 1673.

Your Servant,

RICH. BAXTER.

Mr. *Dodwell* desiring me not to make haste in answering him, I sent him only this, intending more; but want of time, and the quality of the task, (being put but to answer a multitude of words) delayed it till he came to *London*, and then I thought we might talk it out, which we oft tried to little purpose. His great proof of large Churches, of many Altars, from the only two that swelled first, *Rome* and *Alexandria*, are so fully answered in this annexed Letter which worthy Mr. *Clerkson* wrote to me, that I think he needs no other answer; since published by me: As is a full discourse on the Subject, by Mr. *Clerkson* himself, against Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

A Copy of the Letter to Mr. *Dodwell*, March 12. 1681.

S I R,

Since your Speech with me, I have thought again of what you insisted on, and find it consist of these four Points: 1. Whether I charge you with Popery, or at least, do not vindicate you when so accused. 2. Your reasons against answering *Voetius* and me. 3. Your desire to know my terms of concord. 4. Your perswading me to give over Preaching. Left words
be

be mis-understood, or forgotten, I send you my Answer to each of these.

I. I take it to be none of my business, to tell what Religion other men are of, till I am called to it: And then I take my self bound to judg every man what he professeth to be, till I can disprove it. 2. I distinguish the Name (e. g. of Protestant, or Papist) from the Thing. Accordingly, 1. I am sure you deny your self to be a Papist, and I believe you. 2. What you mean by the word, I refer all men that talk of it to your Books, which are fitter to tell your mind than I am, that know no mans heart: *Grorius* took a Papist to be one that flattered Popes, taking all to be just which they said and did, and not one that consented to all the General Councils. 3. You shall chuse what Name I shall call you by: If it be *Protestant*, far be it from me to deny it you; But as your Book publisheth your judgment to the world, you will give me leave to tell men what is in it: And to profess my self, that I am no *such Protestant*, as takes the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church of uninterrupted succession, which gave our Bishops their Office and Power; and that all the Reformed that have, not Diocesan Bishops, are no Churches, no Ministers, have no Sacraments, no pardon of sin, or hope of salvation, by promise, and known ordinary grounds, which the *Roman* Church hath. Yea, that they sin against the Holy Ghost: Yea, and that this is the case of the Episcopal Protestants, that have not had an uninterrupted succession of Episcopal Ordination; and that the *French* Protestants were better turn Papists, than to continue such Protestants as they are. I take all this for your judgment: But I vindicate you so far as to say, that you oft contradict your self, and so possibly may yet come off. If you should say, that neither such Protestants, nor Papists, have Sacraments, and part in the Covenant of grace, pardon, and salvation, you would leave so few for Heaven, and so many for Hell, as I will not imagine you to be guilty of.

II. As to the Second, I must tell all, that I take it but for trifling, to call us to answer the same things again, which are answered so long ago, and have no reply from Papists, or any other. And I doubt not, but you know that it is the main charge which the Papists assault the Reformed Churches with, and put their chief trust in, which you also bring against them: And

we still believe, that *Jansenius* did it much stronglier than you; and much more than yours, is by *Vectius* against him fully answered; and your denial moveth us not.

III. To satisfie your Third demand, I remember a small Script, which I published 1659, or 1660, and therewith send it you; by which (with what I read to you) you may conjecture at my terms, specially if you joyn my *Preface to Cathol. Theologie*, I take it for granted, that it will not satisfie you. But pardon my freedom for saying that, while I perceive your Confidence ordinarily to go quite beyond your Proofs; and while my Principles call me to love more as brethren, than yours do, and engage me not to justifie persecution of men better than my self, I shall think never the worse of them for that.

IV. As to your judgment for my ceasing to Preach, I dare not obey it: I think if I say, these men forbid me, God will not take it for an excuse, after such charges as Scripture layeth down, and such promises as in Ordination I made, and such necessity of souls as I am sure of, and such encouragements as God hath given me. I fear hearing, *Thou slothful servant, &c.* as much as the guilt of other heinous sins: I have not lived idly; and if I silence my self, I invite God by death to silence me, and judg me, as obeying man against him. I am past doubt, that Satan and my flesh give me the same counsel as you do. I have abundant arguments for my Preaching, which I never heard a rational answer of, and which such a poor Objection as, *Then there will be no Order*, will not confute, especially when *all the Ministers of England are bound to be Nonconformists, and consequently to cease Preaching, if I am so bound*. And why not next, *all Christians to cease hearing, and praying, if so forbidden?* If it be only Christs Gospel that I Preach, I cannot but suspect the voice that saith, *Give over Preaching*. Accept this account of the sense of

Your Friend,

Rich. Baxter.

To

To Mr. Dodwell, Nov. 15th 1680.

S I R,

Yours of Oct. 16th I received, Nov. 11th, which intimateth the Second Edition of your Letters, which I hear not of; your last Letter to me, signifying your purpose to publish your long Letter from *Ireland* to me, caused me to Print an old Treatise of Episcopacy, which I had cast by, and now send you as an answer to that Letter. I thank you for your admonition, and desire of my repentance: It shall make me, if I can, search yet more diligently; but I find no probability of being able; the like lamentations of my sin, and wrong to the Church, I have long had from *Papists*, *Antinomians*, *Anabaptists*, and *Separatists*, and some *Quakers*, and *Seekers*; and I despair of satisfying them; nor can I be of all their minds: and I find here but one Argument to draw me to yours, (*viz*) my taking the Oath of Canonical obedience. And 1. You know not that I took it: Many Ordained men did not. To tell you the truth, I entered so rawly, that though I well remember my Subscription, I remember not that I took that Oath: I remember I took it not for my Ordination, but at the same time taking a License for a School, some Oath the Register suddenly thrust on me, and I remember not what it was (which was, and is my sin). 2. If I took it, surely I never intended to bind my self to any but my true Ordinary. And when he is dead and the very Order for near Twenty years publickly (though culpably) put down, and none existent where I lived, I never saw it proved, that I am sworn to all that after are set up over others, by the King, without the Clergies, or Peoples choice, or consent, contrary to the Judgment of the Church for One thousand years, and that without, and against my own consent: And that he that swear-eth obedience to his present Ordinary, is thereby sworn, though he never dream't of it to all that ever shall succeed him, what changes soever be made, and though judging them Usurpers, I renounce them. If it be said, that I virtually consent by the Convocation; I deny it, nor did the City of *London* consent;

for

for they had not one chosen Clerk there. They chose Mr. *Calamy* and me, and we were both refused by the Bishop, and only the Dignitaries of the City admitted. What if I had sworn obedience in 1639. to the Presbytery in *Scotland*, or 1649. in *England*; and after they are put down, and I find them to be an unlawful power, and they are restored again, doth my first Oath bind me to the latter stock against my consent? 3. The *English Ecclesiastical Law-Books*, which I have read, do tell me, that the Chancellor, Official, Commissary, Archdeacons, and every *Judex Ordinarius* is my Ordinary (whatever you say against it): And some Bishops themselves have judged the Lay-Chancellors Judgment, by the use of the Keys, to be a great sin. *Quest.* Whether then an ignorant Oath to obey such Usurpers, repented of, do bind to obey them still? What if in *France* I had sworn obedience to their Bishops, and after see that it was an unlawful Oath, *quod materiam*, am I bound by it till death? 4. I swore to obey them but in *licitis & honestis*. And I do not know that ever I therein disobeyed those that I swore to; no, nor the latter reduced stock: Either I have proved the degenerate sort, described in this Treatise, to be a heinously sinful depravation of the Church, and its Government, and an injury against Christ, by deposing his Church Form, Discipline, and Officers, or not: if not, evince it, and I will thank you; if yea, to comply with such sin, or in any calling to forbear detecting it by writing, is an Omission which is not *licitum vel honestum*. An unlawful Oath against a thing indifferent, will not bind me, if the King do but command that indifferent thing; much less will an ignorant Oath to obey Church-Usurpers, and corrupters, oblige me against Christs commands. Nor do I think it *licitum vel honestum*, to renounce my Ministry, sacrilegiously, and perfidiously break my Ordination-Vow to God, and forbear Preaching Christs Gospel to needy souls, because they forbid me.

In a word, Sir, I unfeignedly thank you for your desire to save me from dying in sin. I have great reason to make it my greatest care. Constant pain and languor, call to me, neither to dissemble, nor delay: When I cannot know my own heart so well as you do, I may come to believe you, that it is unru-ly Pride. Till then I am past doubt, that could any abasement, any labour, any cost, help me to know that you are in the right,

right, and I in the wrong, I would most joyfully undertake it: But such warnings as your's awaken my Conscience, so that I dare not die in the guilt of active, or omisive compliance with those men, 1. Whose degenerate state I confidently judg to be the dangerous Malady of the Church, and destructive to a right Church-state, Church-Officers and Government. 2. Whose Canons of Government are such as they are. 3. Who have since I had any understanding, done that against serious godliness in *England* which they did, and these (near) Twenty years, done what they have done, procuring the silencing, and outward ruin of about Two thousand such Ministers of Christ, as I know to have been the most pious, faithful, and successful in true Ministerial work, of any that ever I could know; and such as I am fully perswaded no Nation under Heaven have Two thousand better. And yours, or other mens accusations, or contrary judgment, cannot make me ignorant of this, which experience, and great acquaintance have told me. 4. And Church-History, which tells me what such have done in former Ages, increase my fear of dying in the guilt of participating of their sin. I know of no other Motives that I have. The sum of my request to you is, That instead of telling me what the Pope, or any Usurper may say, that I should *be humble and obedient*, you will but tell me what means I should use, which I have omitted, to get my judgment informed, if I err, and to become of your mind, and as wise as you. I again intreat you to tell me the way, and I shall give you most hearty thanks. Did I not know your judgment and mine to be so distant, as puts me out of hope of attaining my end, I would have sent you Nine or Ten Proposals, for the meer reducing of the Parish-Churches to their necessary state, without altering any thing of the Diocesans power or grandure, save only their power of the Sword, which yet as they are Magistrates we submit to. That your former Letters brought me not to your judgment, you may see, by the book which I send you, cometh not to pass by hasty judging, nor without that which seemeth Reason to me after my long and best consideration. I am fully assured, not byassed hereto by worldly interest, which hath long lain on the other side. Accept this Account from

Nov. 15. 1680.

Your unfeigned, though dissenting Friend,

Ri. Baxter.

For

July 9. 1677.

For my much honoured Friend Mr. Henry Dodwell.

SIR,

SINCE the writing of my last to you, your own words have acquainted me, 1. That you take my Principles to have some inconsistency or contradiction. 2. That you think I have not yet told you what Church-Government it is that I would have, or how it can attain its end. 3. That you suppose that *denying men the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* is a coercive power sufficient to force unwilling men to obey Church-Governours. 4. That you hold that all Religious Assemblies not allowed by the Bishops, are unlawful, and therefore that we must rather use none than such.

I. As to the first, no reason obligeth me to believe you till you prove it; which must be by citing the inconsistent words: How easie is it to tell you or any man, that you speak contradictions? Is accusing, proving? And you have told me by experience that mistaking Hearers and Readers understand not mens words so well as the Speakers or Writers do. When you so widely mistook a speech of mine, when I had told you that as far as I could learn by my own acquaintance, and the report of the Members themselves, there was but one known *Presbyterian* in the House of Commons when the Wars began, (I named you a credible witness yet living), and you report that I said, there was but one *Presbyterian* in the Assembly of Divines? May not my writing be as much mistaken by you? Prove your Charge, and I will confess my contradictions, and give you thanks.

II. As to the second I was afraid I had used more words than needs; if all that I have said tell you not what I mean, you may excuse me from adding more, which are like to be no more significant; you must name me the particulars that you are unsatisfied in, before I can know what is needful to be added.

ed: One particular you did name, *viz.* whether I hold a power in the Church to deny men the Sacrament that would have it? I left you no reason to make a doubt of it. If this be it, pardon the repetitions which you make me guilty of, and I shall renew my account.

1. I believe that Christ hath instituted the office of the Sacred Ministry (which the Ancients called *Sacerdotium*), as subordinate to his *Teaching, Ruling, and Sacerdotal* office; and that being obliged to Disciple and baptize the Nations, and to teach them Christs commands, and to guide them in holy Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, they are *authorized* to all that they are *obliged to*; and that it is their office-work to administer Baptism and the Lords Supper, and that they have the Church-Keys to judg whom to take in by Baptism, what food to feed the children of the Church with, and whom to cast out of its Communion.

2. I believe that this power is limited and regulated by Christs own universal Laws, and that they are not lawless or arbitrary; but he hath bound them by a just description, whom to *take in, what food* to give them, and whom to *cast out*. And that he hath given them no power to cross or violate these his Laws. And if they do it notoriously, it is null and worse, and no act of authority but of sin. *e.g.* If Bishops baptize unconverted Infidels, or give the other Sacrament to such, or to notorious wicked impenitent persons,

3. I believe that if one or many Bishops or Priests do disobey these Laws of Christ, their sin doth not oblige all other persons to rebel or sin with them, or disoblige them from their duty. *e.g.* If some Bishops should refuse to receive penitent believers and their seed into the Church by Baptism, others are nevertheless bound to receive them, and not all the Bishops in the world to keep them out because some do it sinfully? so if some Bishops would feed them with unsound Doctrine, or corrupt Gods Worship, (*e.g.* with Image-worship, or language unintelligible, &c.) others must not follow them, but do better. And if some Bishops turn Christs sheep out of his fold and pasture unjustly, denying them Communion, others must not do wickedly with them, but must receive such; else one tyrant might oblige all the Churches to tyranny.

4. But while the power of the Keys is lawfully used, he that is justly cast out of the Communion of one Church, should not be received to Communion with any other that hath just notice of his Exclusion, till the cause be removed.

5. But the notice of it concerneth not those that living out of reach, are incapable of Communion with that person. If a woman in this Parish be Excommunicated as a Scold, or a man as a Drunkard, &c. the Bishop is not bound to send notice of their names and case to *Ethiopia* or *Armenia*, nor to all the Christian World; no nor to all *England*. Nor do they use to do it to all the Parishes in the Diocess, but only to that one where the person liveth. But I doubt not but all *that Church should know of it*, of which he was a Communicating member, (by the way, why is not all the Diocess told of it, but that men are conscious that he hath not Personal communion with them; and therefore need not be so Excommunicated?)

6. Therefore mens limited capacity allowing them *Personal Communion* but in a narrow compass, there needs no Confederacy of all the Christian World for the rejecting of those that one of them hath first rejected.

7. But in well-ordered agreeing Churches none should be received presently into the Communion of another Church, without due notice of his aptitude or capacity; which regularly should be by the Certificates of the Church whence he came, called *Communicatory Letters*; or if he was never before admitted to the Sacrament because not at age, his own Personal profession giveth him right; and so it doth in the Countries where through neglect such Certificates or Testimonies are not in use, sobeit there come in no proof against him, that he stands Excommunicate, or deserveth it. A professing Christian hath right to Communion if he travel through all the Churches in the World, till his profession be disproved, or his claim disabled by just testimony. If a man be Excommunicate in, *e. g. Lincoln-Diocess* in one Parish-Church, above a thousand Parishes more of the same Church-Diocesan, may receive him for want of notice, unless they are bound to receive no stranger of another Parish; and that is a kind of Excommunicating of all Christians from the Communion of all the Christian World, except one Parish.

8. The Legal Excommunication, which is only a general pronouncement that such or such sinners *in specie* shall be *actually* excommunicate, is done already by God himself in his Universal Laws. And no man ought to make Laws to Excommunicate any that Gods Laws do not decree to be Excommunicate, save that when there is a difficulty in discerning whether this or that *Doctrine* or *practice* be indeed the sin so condemned in Gods Laws, mens Laws may expound it, to remove that difficulty. If all were excommunicate that Gods own Laws do require to be excommunicate, alas! how great would the number be? So little need is there, that Voluminous Councils should excommunicate many more; and that Councils should be added to Councils to the end of the world, to make new Laws for excommunicating men.

9. Where God hath commanded all Christians in his Laws, to avoid any sort of wicked men, and with such not to eat, the fact being once notorious, the person is so far, *ipso jure*, excommunicate, as that all are bound to avoid familiarity with that person, though no Bishop sentence him: But the Pastors, having the Church Keys, we must not go out of the Church, because such a man is there; for who shall be in the Church, is at his Judgment; but who shall be at my Table, is at mine.

10. But if the Church it self be *essentiated* of such as God thus commandeth all to avoid, and this be *notorious*, every Christian must avoid that Church. The Essentials of a Church are the *pars regens* & *pars subdita*, the Pastors, and the Body of the flock. If either be so far corrupt, the Church is corrupt: When any one essential part is wanting, or depraved, then the *Essence* is wanting, or depraved: Therefore where many Pastors make up the *pars regens* of a particular Church, it is not the heresie, or wickedness of some one only that will warrant a separation; because one is but an *integral*, and not an essential part: But where one Bishop only is the *essential regent constitutive* part, there that one mans heresie, or notorious wickedness (such as we are commanded to have no Communion with) will allow us to avoid that Church, as a Church, though not each Member of it, who are parts still of the Universal Church.

If I knew what further explication of my thoughts it is that you desire, I should be ready to give it you.

III. As to the *coercive power* which you talk of, it is strange if we can differ about the nature of it; but we greatly differ, I suppose, about the extent of it. Pardon me, if to avoid confusion, I first speak of the *Name*, and then of the *Thing*. 1. Though our ordinary use of the words, *coactive* and *coercive*, be to signify that which worketh either on the *Body*, and its provision only, or on the *Mind* by force upon the *Body*, or *Estate*; yet if you will but tell me what you mean by it, so distinctly that we may not be entangled with Logomachy, take it in what sense you will. The words which you use are the signification of your mind: I desire but to understand, and to be understood: I follow Bishop *Bilson* (of *Christ. Obed.*), and others commonly, that distinguish the power of *Magistrates* and *Pastors*, by the Names of the power of the *Sword*, and of the *Word*. By the first, they mean all power of corporal mulcts and penalties, *directly* such (for he that grieveth the mind, consequently troubleth the body). By the latter, they mean all that Official power of *Gods Word* and *Sacraments* which worketh by the senses of hearing, seeing and tasting, upon the *Conscience*, that is, on the Understanding and Will, and by these reformeth practice. The word is thus delivered, either *Generally*, by *common Doctrine*, which is historical, assertive, precepts, prohibitions, promises or threatnings, or by personal application of these.

1. By meer words, as in personal instruction, precept, threatening, &c. and by declaration, that *this person proved and judged guilty of impenitency, in such and such sin, is incapable of Church-communion, therefore by authority from Christ I command him to forbear, and you to avoid him.* And such a one being proved innocent or penitent, hath by Gods Law right to Communion with his Church, therefore I absolve him, invite him, receive him, and command you in Christs name to hold loving Communion with him.

2. Or it is the application of words and *Sacramental signs* together, by solemn tradition and investiture; or the denying of such Sacraments. Briefly, *Magistrates* by mulcts, prisons, exile, stripes, &c. work on the body; *Pastors* have no such power, but by *General Doctrine* and personal application by words and *Sacraments* (given or denied) work on the mind or conscience; all which some call a *Perswasive power*; distinguishing (as *Camero* clearly) between private *perswasion* of an equal, &c. and *Doctrinal, Pastoral,*

Pastoral, Official, Perswasion, whose force is by the *Divine authority of the perswader*, used in *Teaching, Disciplinary judging, and Sacraments*. If you will call this last *coercive*, or by any other name, you have your liberty. I will do my part that you may understand me, if I may not understand you.

2. Now *ad rem*, can we *disagree* how far *this constraineth* the unwilling? Not without some great neglect or culpable defect. I may suppose then that we are agreed of all these particulars:

1. That Gods Laws have told us who must or must not have Sacramental Communion, which we must obey, whatever be the effects.

2. That Excommunication is not *only*, nor alway *chiefly*, to bring the person Excommunicated to obedience (no more than hanging) but to keep the purity and reputation of the Church, and the safety of the members, and to warn others.

3. That the way by which it is to affect the offender, is,
1. By *shaming him*; 2. By striking his Conscience with the sense of Gods displeasure declared thus by his Ministers.

4. So far as the Sacrament is a means of *conveying grace*, to deny it, is not to reform but to destroy. But when the person hath made himself *uncapable* of the *benefit* of the Sacrament, and apt to receive it abusively to his hurt, then it may possibly humble him to be denied it.

5. If the denial of the Sacrament work not on a mans Conscience morally (as threatnings do) it no way compelleth him to his duty, nor saveth him from sin.

6. *De facto* many hundred thousands of ignorant wicked members of Episcopal Churches are so far from being constrained to goodness by being without the Sacrament, that they are content to be without it, and loth to be forced to it.

7. The more sin and wickedness any man hath, the less true conscience; and the less conscience, the less doth he regard a due Excommunication.

8. The Bishops themselves are conscious of the insufficiency of their Excommunications alone to compel any to obedience, while they confess that without the Secular power of the sword to back it, they would be but laught at, and despised by the most. Nor durst they ever try to govern by their Church Keys alone among us without the enforcement of the sword. And at the same time while they Excommunicate them from the Sacra-

ment, they have a Law to lay them in Gaol, and utterly ruin them if they will not receive it. How loth are the Bishops to lose this compelling Law.

9. I think few of my acquaintance in *England* do believe that any great number are brought to holy reformation, no nor to Episcopal obedience, by the fear of being kept from the Sacrament, but that which they fear is the Corporal penalty that followeth; lay by that, and you may try.

10. If you will trust to that spiritual power alone, & *valeat quantum valere potest*, without corporal force, few that I know of will resist you, (but many thousands will despise you, as the Bishops well foresee) bring as many to obedience by it as you can. But if you mean that you must needs have the Magistrate to second you, as your Lictor or Executioner, and to imprison, fine, banish, burn, &c. it would be too gross hypocrisie to call the effects of this coercive power, the effects of Excommunication, and to call it *coercive* power to deny a man the Sacrament, because he feareth the sword.

11. *De facto*, there are supposed to be in the Parish that you dwell in, above 60000 souls, suppose 10000 of these yearly receive the Sacrament (though some say it is not 5000.) Are the other 40000 compelled to obedience by not communicating.

12. All those forbear your Sacrament without any sense of coercion or loss, 1. Who believe (as you do) that Sacramental Communion is a sin, where it cannot lawfully be had (that is, say you, where the Bishops forbid it; say they, where Gods Laws forbid it, by reason of adherent sin. 2. And that, take the Bishops who forbid it them to be Usurpers, that have no true calling (as all the *Papists* do of our Bishops, and many others.) 3. Who take it to be more eligible, yea a necessary duty to hold Communion with purer societies. 4. Besides all those Sectaries that make light of Sacraments in general. What *Papists*, *Quakers*, *Anabaptist*, Separatists, &c. are compelled to any good by the Bishops denying them the Sacrament?

13. Nothing but *Ignorance* or *Impudence* can deny that the difficulty of knowing whose Excommunication it is that is to be dreaded as owned by God, hath encouraged professed Christians so confusedly to Excommunicate one another, as that this Excommunication hath been so far from constraining most to repentance, that it hath made Christianity a horrid scandal to Infidels and Heathens, by

by setting the Christian World in the odious confusion of Excommunicating one another. To give some instances how far Excommunication is not coercive.

1. Who but the Devil was the gainer of Pope *Victor's* Excommunicating the *Asians* about *Easter-day*? Did it compel them to obedience?

2. When the Orthodox Excommunicated the *Arrians*, did it force them to obey? When they got almost all the Bishops for them, and Excommunicated and destroyed their Excommunicators?

3. When the *Cecilians* (or Orthodox) and the *Donatists* for so many ages Excommunicated one another, merely upon the difference which party had the true Ordained Bishops, did Excommunications force them to obedience?

4. (To pass forty other Sects) when *Rome* Excommunicated, yea and prosecuted the *Novatians*, did it compel them to obey? And did not *Atticus*, *Sisinnius* and *Proclus* win more by allowing them their own Communion, and living with them in love and peace? *Chrysostome* since threatned the *Novatian* Bishop that he would silence him; but he quickly recalled his word before they parted, and durst not do it.

5. Did *Cyril's* Counsel against the *Joannites* win them, or harden them? Was it not *Atticus* and *Proclus* love and lenity that ended that division?

6. Did the Excommunicating of the *Nestorians* by *Cyril*, compel them to obedience, when so much of the East are *Nestorians* to this day, and requite the Orthodox with their Excommunications?

7. Did the Excommunicating of those that rejected the Council of *Calcedon*, (the *Eutychians*, and *Acephali*) compel them to obedience, when many Emperours took their part, and the greater number of Bishops joined with them, and they equally damned those that received the Council for many Princes reigns. And when so great a part of Christians as are the *Jacobites*, *Abassines*, &c. own *Dioscorus*, and condemn that Council to this day?

8. Did the Excommunicating of the old Hereticks, *Gnosticks*, *Basiliadians*, *Valentinians*, *Paulinists*, *Apollinarians*, *Eunomians*, *Arians*, *Pharisiens*, *Macedonians*, *Priscillians*, &c. compel them to obedience at all? or did they regard it?

9. Did the Excommunicating of the parties that were for silence

lence (the *Acacians* as to the *Quodas*, and those that were for *Zeno's Henoticon*) compel them to obedience?

10. Did the mutual damnations of the *Phantasticks*, *Fustinian's* and *Gamas* party, and the *Corrupticola*, force either to obedience?

11. Did the Excommunications of the *Monothelites* compel them to obedience? when in the days of *Philippicus* they had a Council, saith *Binnius*, of *Innumerable Bishops*? And he saith, that the General Council at *Trul.* called *Quinisextum* was of the same men that were in the approved sixth General Council, and that they were *Monothelites*.

12. Did the several Excommunications of the *Constantinopolitan Bishops* by the *Roman*, and of the *Roman* again by them, and the *Alexandrian*, &c. compel either party to obedience?

13. Had the Pope Excommunicated the *Africans* in the long fraction in the days of *Anselmus* and *Austin*, would it have compelled them to obedience?

14. When the Pope (at last) joined with *Fustinians* General Council against the *Tria Capitula*, and condemned the refusers of it, did it compel his own neighbour-Bishops to obedience, when they so generally forsook him, that there were not three Bishops to Consecrate the Pope, but he was fain to use a Presbyter; and when they set up a Patriarch at *Aquileia* as their chief, and condemned or forsook the Pope for near an hundred years?

15. Did the Popes Excommunicating of the *Goths* in *Spain* and other parts, compel them to obey him?

16. Did *Augustines* rejection of the *Britains*, and the *Britains* and *Scots* long refusing Communion with the *Romanists*, compel either party to obey?

17. Did the Excommunicating of *Leo Isaurus*, *Constantine*, and the rest of the *Iconoclasts*, compel them to obey?

18. Did the Excommunicating of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, bring them to obedience? Or was it not (say some Historians) the murder of about two Millions, that *solitudinem fecit, quam vocarunt pacem*?

19. Did the Excommunications of the Emperours, *Frederick*, *Henry*, &c. and their adherents, as the *Venetian Interdict*, compel them to obedience?

20. Did the Excommunicating of the *German Protestants*, and *Queen Elizabeth*, and the *English Protestants*, bring them to obedience? How many such instances may I give you?

If

If you say, To what purpose is all this? I shall say, No doubt so knowing a man can tell. It is to tell you why I expect no more *coercive power* from meer Excommunication than experience and reason will allow me to expect. And no such perfect obedience and universal concord by it, as your words import.

And some questions I here crave your Answer of.

Qu. 1. The same that you so much urge on me: Seeing this matter of fact is undeniable, and Excommunication hath done no more than it hath done, Is all Church-Government therefore vain? Or what is your own way of remedy?

Qu. 2. Seeing it is Bishops themselves, that for so many hundred years excommunicated one another as Hereticks and Schismatics, how shall they, or their flocks be certain which Bishops they be, whose excommunications they must take, as Gods act, and which not? I pray answer it plainly. 1. If any say, *It must be the Majority, or greater number*, then so were the *Arians* too long, so were the *Eutychians*, so were the *Monothelites*, so were the *Iconoclasts*; so the *Papists* say they are now. If you say, *The Bishops in a General Council*, that's almost all one. What Wars were there between many General Councils; and how long was it the Religion of one side, to be for one, and curse the other; and of the other side, to curse all that did not receive that? How shall we know which Council to obey? If you say as *Binnius*, that all Councils have just so much power as the Pope giveth them, how shall we know that this is true? But I suppose that will not be your answer. If you say, we must obey that which is Orthodox, who is the Judge? If every man, then they that judg the excommunicating Bishops, or Councils, not Orthodox, will not obey them. Truly I know not what answer to expect from you.

Qu. 3. Can that man expect, that excommunicating should set all right, and bring men to obedience now in the end of the world, who is constrained (against his will) to be certain, that abused excommunications have been the great means of setting the Christian world into pernicious Schisms and Confusions?

Qu. 4. At this day, when the Papal Church unchurches all the Christian Churches that are not Subjects to the Pope; and when the *Greek* Church excommunicateth the Papal, and most continue damning one another, can you think, that even excommunicating is the remedy to cure these Schisms, and set all right?

Qu. 5. If denying men the Sacrament, will constrain men to obedience, why do not the Episcopal Churches through the world, cure the Peoples sins by keeping them from the Sacrament, when so great numbers are prophane, and sensual, and worldlings, and wicked, how easie a means of Conversion were it to forbid them all the Sacrament?

Qu. 6. Is it no contradiction to say, that the Sacrament is Gods means of giving Sanctification? and yet that keeping men from it is the means?

Qu. 7. But if you mean not *constraining* to obey God, but only to obey the Bishop, and not God, what good will such obedience do the mans soul, that will not save him? I confess the Magistrate that hath the Sword, may compel men to the use of the *necessary suitable means* of Conversion and Grace; and those means may further Sanctification.

IV. As to the Fourth Point, I have said enough of it to you heretofore.

1. If no Religious Assemblies for Preaching, Praying, and Sacraments, be lawful, but what the Bishops allow, then God hath put it into the Bishops power, whether he shall have any such publick worship, or any shall be obliged so to worship him, or not. But the *Consequent* is false; *Ergo*, So is the *Antecedent*. True Pastors have but the power to *promote*, and *order Gods worship*, but not to exclude, or forbid it to any (much less to all, or 1000.) without necessary cause.

2. And then if Preaching, and Hearing, and Sacraments, be ordinarily necessary to mens salvation, then God hath left it to the will, or power of the Bishops, whether any of the people shall be (ordinarily) saved. But that is not so.

2. And

3. And then if the King should license, or command us to Preach, Pray, and Communicate, and the Bishop forbid it, it were sin. But that I will not believe, unless the *Cause*, more than the *Authority*, make the difference.

To conclude, I hold, that *just use of the Keys* is very necessary, and that it is the great sin of *England* to reject it: But that a *false usurped use of excommunication* hath been the incendiary of the Christian world, which hath broken it to pieces, caused horrid Schisms, Rebellions, Treasons, Murders, and bloody Wars.

I. The just use is, 1. When a scandalous or great sinner is with convincing evidence told of his error, and with seriousness, yet with love and compassion, intreated to repent, and either prevailed with, and so absolved, or after due patience, Authoritatively pronounced incapable of Church-Communion, and bound over to answer it at the Bar of Christ, in terror if he repent not, and this by the Pastor of that particular Church, which either stately, or *pro tempore*, he belongeth to.

2. And when this is duly notified to such Neighbour-Pastors as he may seek Communion with, and they agree not to receive any justly cast out by others, but to receive and relieve the injured and falsely condemned.

3. And when the King and his Justices, permit not the ejected violently to intrude, and take the Sacrament, or joyn with the Church by force, but preserveth forcibly the Peace and Privileges of the Churches.

II. The excommunication that hath turned the Church into Factions, and undone almost *East* and *West*, is, 1. When a Bishop, because of his humane Superiory, as Patriark, Primate, or Pope, claimeth the power of excommunicating *other Bishops*, as his Subjects, whose Sentence must stand because of his Regent power.

2. Or at least, gathering a Council where he shall preside, and that Council shall take themselves to have a Governing power of the Keys over the particular Bishop, not only to renounce Communion with them themselves, but to oblige all others to stand to their judicial Sentence. 3. When Bishops shall meddle cautelessly in other Bishops Churches, and make themselves Judges either of distant, unknown persons, and cases, or of such as they have nothing to do to try. Yea, judg men of other

Coun-