

to Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, to make Laws for all the Church on Earth, and to be the governing judg of all.

But he seems to be of a larger Communion, when pag. 344, 345. he saith, *We are in Charity, and hold Communion with all good Christians (excepting, as above excepted, the fundamental corruptions of the Jesuited part of the Roman and other Churches) throughout the world.*

But 1. The doubt is, whom you will take for *good Christians* in your degree of Charity. 2. And whether the Church of *Rome*, excepting the Jesuited part, be certainly more worthy of your Charity and Communion than the Reformed Churches?

It is evident, that you take none to be in your Communion, 1. Who take not a thing, called *the Universal Church*, to have a Legislative and Judicial supremacy over all Christians. 2. And who profess not subjection to that supremacy and obedience to its Universal Laws. 3. And that must be, at least, to the six first General Councils. Now 1. You know, I suppose, that most of the Christian parties disown some of those Councils, and the power that made them. 2. That most of the Christian world confine their government and obedience to their several Sects, and profess no obedience to the Colledg, or majority of Bishops in the world. The *Greeks* confine their obedience to their party; and the *Armenians* to their Catholick Bishop, and the *Georgians* to theirs, and the *Nestorians* and *Jacobites* to their several pretended Patriarchs, as aforesaid. So that you renounce Communion with these, as no good Christians. 3. And you know, I suppose, that the Protestant Churches of *England* (till your party took that name), of *Scotland*, *Ireland*, *France*, *Belgia*, *Germany*, *Transylvania*, *Hungary*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, own no such Church at all as you talk of, viz. One supreme universal governing Colledg or Council. Read *Luther de Conciliis*, and it will tell you, how far he was from it. If Mr. *Morrice* will read it, perhaps it may find him more such work as he finds against me.

4. And do you not make your selves Schismatics, in holding Communion with Schismatics? Mr. *Dodwell* and others of you say, that he is a Schismatick who communicateth with Schismatics. The Church of *Rome* (before ever there was a Jesuit in

in the world, and since) condemn all Christs Church on Earth, except the Pope and his Subjects; and separate from them. Is not this Schism, and so you Schismaticks?

5. And you deny Communion with them that have not Diocesan Ordination by uninterrupted succession: And I suppose you know, that none of the Reformed Churches (except those of the *Bohemian* profession, who derive from the *Waldenses*, condemned by General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*) do pretend to such an uninterrupted Diocesan Ordination. Some have no Diocesans (*French* Protestants, *Belgia*, the *Palatinate*, *Helvetia*, &c.) And those that have some kind of Bishops, had them made by Presbyters, or by no such Succession.

Seeing then, that your Communion is only with the Church of *Rome* (except the Jesuited party) and those of your own mind at home, why do you not speak this out freely, but pretend *Charity* and *Communion with all good Christians*? How prove you, that the Protestant Churches be not as good Christians as the Papists?

6. Yea, I would understand, whether you renounce not Communion with the Church of *England*, and most of the present Conformists, as Schismaticks, as well as with the Nonconformists? Consider 1. The Church of *England* owneth not *One Regent supreme power, Monarchical or Aristocratical, for Legislation and Judgment over all Christians on Earth*. Prove that they do it, if you affirm it. Yea, the contrary is plain in the Articles, Canons, the Injunctions, the Apology, and *Jewell's Defence, Deus & Rex*; all approved by the Church. The Church of *England* owneth no *forreign Government over this Kingdom*; yea, swear-eth the Subjects against it in the Oath of *Supremacy*, and forbids Appeals to any above the King. The first Canon and second confirm the same: Yea, the very Canons of 1640. make it the right of all *Christian Kings*, to call and dissolve Councils in their territories; and that Prelates therefore only first used this, because they had no *Christian Kings*. (How then shall General Councils be called out of all the world to rule us)? Yea, they add, *For any persons to set up, maintain or avow, in any their Realms or Territories respectively, under any pretence whatsoever, any independent coactive power, Papal or Popular, is treasonable against God and the King.*

The Articles of Religion say, *Art. 6. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. But you make it requisite to salvation, to believe all the Oaths, Covenants, Declarations, Professions and Practices imposed on Ministers to be lawful: Else they are Schismatics, and cannot have communion or salvation.*

The 8th *Art.* makes it therefore necessary to receive the three Creeds, because they may be proved by Scripture. And of Councils it saith, *General Councils may not be gathered together without the command and will of Princes. And will all the Princes in the world ever agree to gather one, or did they ever do it? And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed of the Spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of holy Scripture.*

And of the Church, *Art. 19.* it gives us this only definition, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered, according to Christs ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. Is an essential governing supremacy left out in a definition?*

The 36th *Art.* saith, *That the book of Consecration containeth all things necessary thereto—and whoever is consecrated or ordered according to the rites of the book, are rightly, lawfully and orderly consecrated. But that book saith nothing for the necessity of an uninterrupted succession of Diocesan Ordination.*

And *Art. 23.* saith, *that those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard.*

Saith Compton to King James in *Pref. to Consins Tables*, *Ecclesiastica jurisdictio plane Regia est; Corona & dignitatis vestra Regia prima, precipua, indivisibilis pars: Ecclesiasticae Leges Regiae sunt; neq; alibi oriuntur, aut aliunde sustentantur aut fulciuntur.*

unthr. Penes Ecclesiasticos Judices per Archiepiscopos & Episcopos derivata a Rege potestate Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica consistit. But

1. You set up a foreign power, as supreme, above the King.
2. And you utterly disable King, or Bishop, or Convocation from choosing a Bishop or Priest that shall have any power; For, by you, neither King, nor Patron, nor Clergy, nor People, can call any man with power to the ministerial work, that hath not an uninterrupted succession of Diocesan Ordination: Which no King, Bishop or People can know; but in most places may know the contrary. Say not, that I accuse you of treasonable destroying all the Kings Ecclesiastical power, by this *subjecting and disabling* him. It is not my words, but your defenders, that I give you.

Mr. Lobb hath said so much of Mr. Hooker's and Dr. Field's, that I shall not recite any thing of theirs. That which I now note is, that you judg the true former Church of England Schismatics, and separate from them, as none of your Communion, because they believed not any such thing as a supreme humane Governor, Monarchical or Aristocratical, under Christ, of the whole Church on Earth. If any yet doubt of this sense of the Church of England in the days of Archbishop Abbot, Archbishop Grindal, and so to the first Reformation, let them read the Writings of Jewel, Reynolds, Wotton, Whitaker, Hall, Crakenthorpe, Slater, Willet, Humfrey, Sutcliffe, Bilson, Chillingworth, and other such.

How narrow a Society then is your *Catholick Church*, and how great *Schismatics* are you, if you separate both from all the Christian world, who own no visible supreme *Legislative* or *Executive* power under Christ, and from all the Reformed Churches, and even from the Church of England it self, except your own faction, and can condemn *Hen. 8—Edw. 6.* as much as Heylin doth.

If you go to Mr. Dadwell's *Presumptive right and succession*, and that God is bound to own that; You will harden all those that you would convince, and do condemn; If men be true Ministers, a true Church, have true Sacraments and Covenant-right to salvation, when those Ministers have no Orders but counterfeit, or the Bishops that Ordained them had none at all, or no such succession, so be it the Receiver be blameless, and could not know it: then sure they that thought a Bishop and Pres-

byter had been all one, or that, as Dr. *Hammond* held, Bishops in Scripture-times had but single Churches or Congregations; and that the chief Pastor of a City or Church, is a Bishop; and that the Ordination of such an Assembly as that at *Westminster*, &c. is valid, and do their best to know the truth, are as blameless in their Error as the other.

I have elsewhere named seven or eight drunken Readers, that I was bred under, and some that were at last discovered to have forged Orders; the people constantly communicated with all these: On the other hand, I have lived with many zealous, godly, charitable, excellent Preachers, who were presented by the Patrons, chosen or desired by the people, Ordained by many Learned, Godly Pastors, of whom divers were Doctors of Divinity, and City-Pastors, ordained by Bishops, and they had the sealed Approbation of the *Westminster* Assembly, (to which the Parliament called many Bishops, though they came not:) which of these were like to be more excusable, if they erred? And which had the better presumptive Title? And why then is an uninterrupted Succession falsely feigned to be necessary, even to men that are zealous for Episcopacy, and Ordained by Bishops?

7. And I hope you are willing that we should understand, that by *Communion* you mean a communion of subjection to the Supreme Church-power, and that the Church of *Rome* are all subjected to the Pope: And if you have communion with all of them, *save the Jesuited party*, and yet none with us or any other Reformed Protestant Churches, who renounce that sort of Communion, I beseech you satisfy the world, Why you are any less Papists than the Church of *Rome* is? I suppose you know, that Jesuits have never been Popes, and that very few of them, if any, are Cardinals. (But I must note, that it is but *their corruptions* that you renounce.)

68. VI. Bishop *Sparrow* in his Preface before his *Collection of Canons*, doth not only assert the Legislative Power of a National Church, but of the Universal, as one Body or Church.

69. VII. Dr. *Sherlocke* (if he be Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defender) saith and unsaith, and would verifie contradictions: He must write us a new Dictionary, to tell us in what sense he takes common words, before he can be understood: He defendeth Dr. *Stilling-*

Stillingfleets denial of any Political constitutive Supreme Power, and yet maintaineth that the whole Church hath one Regent part, which all must obey that will be Members.

But he will not grant, That every Political Body must have a constitutive Regent Head: And yet he doth but say, [If we deny this] as if he could not or durst not tell what he grants or denies. Yet he grants, that [Every Political Body consists of a pars imperans and subdita:] And that [Church-Governours united and governing by consent, are the pars imperans, and Christian people the pars subdita.] But saith he [All this is true without a constitutive Regent Head.] Can you tell how his asserted and his denied Propositions differ? 1. It is not a Regent Part that he denieth. 2. It is not that this Regent part is one to the whole Body, the Church. For if it were that, he would not so zealously contradict and condemn us, that say the same as he: Nor call it Singularly the *Pars imperans* to the Universal Church. What should an ordinary Reader conjecture of this man? As *Cesar* said of a young man, that was so earnest in his Petition, that he gaped and stutered, and could scarce speak, *Nescio quid vult hic juvenis, sed quicquid vult vehementer vult.* So I only understand that this man is an Adversary to such as I, and would fain have us accounted intollerable Schismatics; but what his more excellent knowledg herein is, that deserveth preferment, while we deserve Silencing and a Jail, it must be a *Daniel*, and not an ordinary Interpreter of words that must make known.

It must be either the word [Head], or the word [constitutive] which he denieth.

1. If it be the word [Head] of a Political Body, 1. Either he knows that Politicks commonly take it for Synonimal with *Summa Potestas*, and the *Pars Regens* in chief, or he doth not. If he do not, why would he meddle (and so flamingly meddle) with what he understands not, and in his confident Ignorance blow up the common fire of hatred, contention and prosecution? If he know it, his business is to shew himself so much wiser than the Writers of Politicks, as to prove we should be ruined for understanding words as they do, even this word *Head*? And yet the man never tells us how he understands it, as differing from them!

But 2. this yet will not excuse him: Either he knows that King *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, after King *Henry* the Eighth, used the word *Head* for the *Summa Potestas*, or not:

If not, he is a great stranger in England: The Title of King Edward's Injunctions, the first in Bishop Sparrow is, [*Injunctions given by—Edw. 6.—on earth under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland the Supreme Head; which Queen Elizabeth and the Canons expound, Supreme Governour.*] But if he know this, doth he allow it in them, or not?

3. Yet further, Doth this burning-hot Disputant know, or not, that I use the word *Pars Imperans*; or least that should be mistaken for coactive Power, *Pars regens*, far other than the word *Head*; yea ever expound the word *Head* by it, and seldom use the word *Head* at all? If he know not this, let who will honour him for speaking evil (and so evil) of the things he knows not: If he know it and dissemble it, — name him as you see cause.

§ 10. II. But if it be not the word [*Head*] that he would not have a General Council, a Primate, or Metropolitan called by, there is nothing but the word [*Constitutive*] left for him to deny. This then must be it.

And 1. I dare not teach him like a School-boy, but only tell the unlearned Reader, that a *Constitutive Cause* in the common sense of Logicians, signifieth the *Essentiating Cause* as distinct from the Efficient and Final, that is, it signifieth the *Essentiating Matter and Form*: A Political Society either hath *Matter and Form*, or not. If yea, what is the *Form*, if not the *Regent pars* in relation to the body? Its *species* is the *specifying Form, quæ dat esse & nomen*: And in existence it is the *Unifying or Individuating Form*. But if it have no *Form*, it is *nothing*, and hath no name.

1. If the *Summa Potestas* of the Church be not the constitutive *Form*, then the Church is not a Society univocally so called, as all other Political Societies are; but is equivocally called a *Policie*: A King, a Master of a Family, a Schoolmaster, a General or chief Commander, are all *Constitutive parts*.

2. Then a Bishop is no constitutive part of a Diocesan Church, nor a Metropolitan of a Metropolitan Church, nor a Patriarch of a Patriarchal Church, nor any *Summa Potestas* of any Church: or else the Catholick and these are not univocally called Churches.

3. If the *Summa Potestas* be not a *Constitutive part* of the Church Catholick, it is no *Essential part*: And if so, the Church must be defined without it. And why do they not give such a Definition, and tell us what is the constitutive *Form* of it, if this be not?

4. And

4. And then he that denieth this *Summa Potestas*, and separateth from it, denieth or separateth from nothing essential to the Church; Why then do they make obedience essential to a Member?

I must intreat Lawyers, and men acquainted with the common terms of Laws and Politicks, to pity us, and not make us Clergy-Disputants a common scorn for such Disputes, as they might do, if they heard us furiously disputing, whether a King be the constitutive Head of the Kingdom? Or whether twice two be four?

§. 11. But saith this Doctor, *Its original Constitution differs from Secular Forms of Government, by that ancient Church-canon of our Saviours own decreeing, It shall not be so among you*

Ans. There's some hope in this citation. It seems then, he thinks that by these words, Christ forbade any constitutive supremacy under him in his Church; why then doth the man so fiercely dispute for it? If there be none, we are agreed. And alas! young Dr. ! why must we all be silenced, or lie in Goal for agreeing with you?

If he should mean, that Christ speaketh only against a Policy that hath the power of the Sword, he would be an immodest deceiver by intimating, that this is the Policy in question: I will therefore rather conclude, that if he know what he saith, I am incapable of knowing, rather than impute this to him; or else that he takes it to be no Policy that hath not the power of the Sword.

§. 12. But his satisfying answer is, p. 565. *Governing by consent without superiority, is Government.*

Ans. Who would think these men were for things ancient or common, that talk in a new singular language of their own at such a rate? 1. What is the meaning of *Governing without superiority*, as put in opposition to *One constitutive supremacy*? Is it *governing without superiority over the pars subdita*? It is so really, whatever he mean. We have hit of the matter: It is governing *sine jure regendi*. But then I hope we break not the 5th Commandment by disobeying them.

But I rather think the Dr. meant *without superiority over one another*.

Ans. And verily doth the Church of England think, that an *Aristocracy* is no constitutive head, or *summa potestas*, or form of

of policy? Had the Senators at *Rome* power over one another, as such? Or hath the *Venetian* Senate? or the *Polonian* Parliament men? Doth this novelty and singularity deserve no word of proof, but *ipse dixit*? See how all Politicks are damn'd with the Nonconformists, for making Aristocracy a *species* of Policy? But I pray you use them not all for it as hardly as you do us. But really thus much of the world is governed.

¶ 13. 3. But yet his stress may possibly lie on the word [*Consent*]. *It is not a constitutive supremacy, but a supremacy by consent.*

Ans. Far be it from me to pretend to so much Learning as to understand him. If this be the difference, 1. Cannot *Consent* make a supreme constitutive power. See here Mr. *Dodwell*, how you were mistaken, and Dr. *Stillingsfleet* too, that say so much for *consent*, as *Causal* to this effect. I thought all Government in the world had been by consent, except as to the *Genus* (that there be a Government) and so much of the *species* as God hath determined by his Universal Laws: But as to the *rest*, and the *family* or *persons*, I supposed it's all by consent. Sure the King is not King without his consent, and the people consented when they chose his family, and swear Allegiance to him. Sure General and Soldiers *consent*; Husband and Wife; Master and Servants; School-Master and Scholars: And I think the States of *Belgia*, the Parliament of *Poland*, the Senate of *Venice* and *Rome*, had all a constitutive power by *consent*.

Readers, you see all that I can bring this Dr's damning differing accusation of us to. He granteth, that the *Catholick Church* (and the *National*) is a *Political Society or body, consisting of a governing and governed part*; but he denieth, that this governing part is a *constitutive part, or supreme*; but saith, it is a *pars imperans, governing by consent without superiority*. I think he means it is not a *Monarchy, but an Aristocracy* (and govern not against their wills): *Ergo* they are not a *constitutive* (that is, an *essential* and *unifying* supreme part. Alas! that the Church must have such work, and that to our common shame, and to the utter frustration of all hopes and endeavours of brotherly peace with the sacred Clergy!

CHAP. VI.

What is the Union of the Catholick Church, and the necessary Communion, according to this accusing Defender.

§. 1. **W**Hen we have found out (were we so happy) what their Catholick Church is; we are yet to seek, how any man may know that he is a member of it, or who is. For to that end, we must first know, 1. What Union of and with the Church is. 2. And who are qualified for it, and have it: And such dullards as I, can learn none of this of these Drs.

§. 2. I. This Dr. takes it for granted, that *Union* here, is *nothing but Communion*. Still we are intolerable Schismaticks, for not differing from Christians and Mankind. But he maketh us know, that it is a Political Union which he speaketh of. Dr. Barrow hath told him of seven sorts of Union acknowledged by us all, who deny with him a Political Unity in one humane supreme Aristocracy. But this singular man must have a Political unifying supreme power, which is no Constitutive Head: that is, *it is* and *is not* the *summa potestas humana, visibilis*. Of this more fully elsewhere.

Raymundus Lullius, Paracelsus, Jacob Behmen, and all such Fanaticks, who have thought fit (like Gipsies) to invent new words, to make themselves seem Masters of a new *Pansophie*, have yet left us some clue to guide us through their labyrinth; and their own Context is their Dictionary. But this Dr. who will use old words in his new and contrary sense, and tell us no reason for them, becometh to us unintelligible. Hitherto all Political *Union* hath been supposed to be antecedent to *Communion*. And if the sound of the *Latin* word seem to countenance the confounder, *noſſoria* doth not so. And he shews, that by *Communion* he meaneth what the Church hath usually meant by it when it's taken for a Political *Communion*; that is, *joyning in the exercises named by him under Ecclesiastical Governours*.

But

But 1. This is contrary to the common course of *Nature*, in which the union of all *compound beings* maketh them what they are, and goeth before their Operation and Effects: The Union of Soul and Body goeth before Sensation, Imagination, Intellection, or Volition.

2. It is contrary to all *Artificial* beings: In a clock, a watch, a coach, &c. the Union of their parts is the Relative Form, and goeth before the exercise, and uses, and the effects.

3. It is contrary to all *Political* beings, or Societies: The Union of King and Subjects is the constitutive Form of the Kingdom, and goeth before the Administration or regiment; by Legislation and Judgment; and the Allegiance, or Subjection, before Obedience.

The Union of Husband and Wife goeth before their Conjugal communion: And so doth the union of Master and Servants, of Captain and Soldiers, of Schoolmaster and Scholars, as the constitution of the relation go before their communion in the exercise of relation. Now if this Doctor be of his Brother *Dodwell's* mind, and think *all words have but one sense*, which men skill'd in Arts and Sciences should know, judge whether he practice according to that Supposition.

4. If *Union* and *Communion* be all one, then a man is new made a Christian at every act of Communion: For *Union* is the constitution, and makes us Christians: But the consequence is not true.

5. If *Union* and *Communion* be all one, then Baptism doth no more make us Christians and unite us to Christ and his Church, than after communion in Prayer and Sacraments do: But this is singular and false.

This accusing Dr. then grounds his Accusation on such Dissents of ours from his Judgment, in which we speak with all Christians and Mankind, (as to their common sense of words) and deserve to be accounted Schismaticks and criminals, for not saying, as he, against them all: As if he would commence an Action against all *Grammarians* that will not say, *That Letters are nothing but Words and Sentences*, and cast out all School-Masters that deny it. But let us see what his Communion is which constituteth the Churches Unity.

¶ 2. To prepare his way, he saith, *That I make the Unity of this Church to consist only in their union to Christ as Head of the Church, not in the union of Churches as Members of the same Body.* Answ. I must

must take heed how I deny any thing that he saith, lest he presently say, *I give him the lie, or rail.* But I may answer his next request, (pag. 595.) *I would desire Mr. B. and his Brethren, to tell us, How the whole Catholick Church is united into one Body? I assert this is done by one Communion: If he can tell any better way, I would gladly learn it, &c.* *Ans.* This is a sudden humiliation. But did he not before desire me to give over stating Cases? And yet now he would learn of me! If so, I must desire him first preparatorily to learn of some Grammarians, Metaphysical and Political Teachers, What the meaning of *Union* and *Communion* is? What is the difference between *Essentials*, and *Integrals* and *Accidents*; and of *Union* and *Communion* in each of these? And how many sorts of *Union* and *Communion* there are, that are pertinent to our case? And whether a Supreme Aristocracy be not constitutive to the governed Society? Many of these things you must learn of some body else, before I dare presume to teach you. But I'll tell you, 1. That I cannot talk sense about these things, without distinguishing between the *Unifying* of the Society, and the uniting a single Member to that Society. 2. An *Essentiating Union*, and an *Integrating* or *Accidental Union* and *Communion*.

And so my account which you demand is this. 1. It is only essential to the Church, *That there be an Organized Body of Pastors and People united to Christ the Head.* I put in the most: For this much was not needful to the Church at first; when there was none but Christ and his first Disciples, not yet Pastors: but the Church was then an *Embrio in fieri*: This is the most *in facto esse*: not meddling with the Question, Whether if all Pastors ceased, it would be annihilated, or only unfit for its acts of communion.

2. In this Definition, *Christ only is the formal constitutive summa Potestas, or Regent part*; the *Organized body* of Pastors and people is but the *Pars subdita*; and the *Union* of Christ and that Body maketh it a Church.

As in the constitution of Man; 1. The Rational Soul is the *real Form*, which is *principium motus*. 2. The Organized Body is the constitutive Matter: That there be Heart, Liver and Stomack, is but the Bodies Organization: That these parts be duly placed and united, is *forma corporis non hominis*, and makes the Body but *materia disposita*. 3. The *Union* of Soul and Body is that *nexus* (like the *Copula* in a Proposition) which may be called the *Relative Form*, or that which maketh the Soul become *Forma in actu*.

3. In this *Union* there is no *Summa Potestas*, or *Universal Governour* (Monarchical or Aristocratical) but Christ: All subordinate Governours have a local, limited Power, every one in his Province, limited by *natural Capacity*, and by Obligation and Office. As there is no need of a Vice-King to make this a Kingdom, nor a subordinate Soul to make a man; So P. Gregory well concludeth, That an Usurper of Universal Episcopacy is Antichrist. And an Aristocracy is more incapable than a Monarch.

4. The Body is sufficiently organized, if it consists of local Churches, called single or particular, being Pastors and Christian people (having all the Essentials of Christianity:) As this Kingdom is, if the Body consist of Corporations, Counties, Hundreds, that have no Power over one another, nor any universal Power, but the Supreme. And that which maketh this Body to become a Church, is no Union of the Members among themselves (that maketh them but *materia disposita*,) but their common Union with Christ; and then all single persons and Churches are one *Catholick Church*, because united in and to him: As all Lines are united in the Center.

5. As to the Question, Whether a single Church, or the Catholick Church be first? Christ was first himself, and then *Christians* as *Christians* were united to him, and were the Catholick Church *in fieri* or an *Embryo*: And then the Pastors Office was made as the organical Office to make the rest; As Nature maketh the Heart and other noble organical parts, before the rest of the Body. And when the particular Churches are formed, they are thereby parts of the Universal, and as such are *simul & semel*, such Churches, and such parts.

6. There is no Christian, nor any single Church or Nation, nor the major part of them, an essential part of the *Catholick Church*, but meerly an *Integral*. If *England* Apostatize, if all *Europe* Apostatize, or turn Hereticks, or any way be cut off from Christ, the *Catholick Church* loseth but *Integral* parts, and no Essentials. If there were none but Christ and this Nation, it would be essentially the same *Catholick Church*: Much more if such a Council as *Ariminum*, *Sirmium*, yea or any of the rest had fallen from Christ. If a Hand, or Foot, or Leg be cut off, the man is still a man: If the Soul and Body be separated, he is no Man: If the Head, or Heart, or Stomack, or Lungs, or Liver be gone, the Soul will be

be gone, because the Body is not organically capable Matter. But in Politicks, the subordinate parts are not tyed together by so unchangeable a contexture as in natural Bodies. If all the Corporations in *England* were put down, it would be a Kingdom still *ejusdem speciei*: If the Justices and Constables, yea and Judges were all changed as to their subordinate *Species* of Magistracy, the Kingdom in *specie* would be the same. But if the *Supreme Power* be changed in *specie, vel individuū*, the Kingdom is changed accordingly. If you object, That a Parliament is an universal Power; I answer, Either they have part in the Supremacy, (that is, in *Legislation* and *Judicature*) or not? If yea; then still there is but one *Summa Potestas* mixt: If not, their utter destruction would not alter the *Species* of the Government.

7. That a single person be united as a Member to the Church, no more is necessary *ad esse*, but that he be a Christian baptiz'd, and so he is united to Christ the centre, and consequently to that Church, which is nothing but all *Christians* united to *Christ*, and in him related as Members of one Body. External Baptism maketh a visible Member of Christ and the Church, which supposeth a Profession of Christian Faith, Desire and Subjection. Internal sincere Heart-consent maketh a Spiritual Member of the Church as invisible. This which is necessary *ad esse* to a single persons Union with the Body, is necessary to every one of the material, subject part of the Church, and must be in some *ad esse Ecclesia*, because without apt receptive matter the form is not received: But still this Person, or Nation, or greatest part of the Church, is but an Integral, which may be cut off without the Churches cessation.

8. By all this it is evident what I think, 1. That Communion in Essentials, that is in Christianity, is after Union necessary to continue and prove the Church to be one true Church, and to prove any man a Member of it. 2. That Communion in Integrals is necessary to the Integrity of the Church, that men do not as the Pope and Mr. *Dodwell*, and his like, Schismatically cut off others, yea most of the Christian world. 3. That communion in Accidents is necessary neither to the Essence nor Integrity; but like hair and nails. Natural Accidents should be alike in all. But I hope all that use ceremonious Periwigs are not cut off and damaged; though I have the Apostles fear, that Satan beguileth multitudes as he did *Eve*, by drawing them to depart from the sim-

plicity that is in Christ. And every Humanist that useth artificial teeth, and eyes, and paint, and hair, and gawdy fashions, is not thereby unchristened, unchurched, or unman'd.

§ 3. Now let us learn of Mr. Sherlock, seeing he is so humble as to learn of us. He saith, p. 595. *I shall not insist here on Catholick Doctrine, or Catholick Charity, which are necessarily supposed as the foundations of Catholick Communion; but yet are not sufficient to make the Church one, when they do not unite all in one Communion.*

Ans. 1. If such Doctrine be supposed, is he a Catholick that hath your fore-described Doctrine against God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that writeth as malignantly as you have done, to urge men to hate, and silence, and imprison those that will not be as bad as you?

Ans. 2. Is Catholick Doctrine and Catholick Charity insufficient to make the Church one? Surely you take Catholick Doctrine to include our belief of the Holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints: And Catholick Church to include our love to the Holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints.

1. That which is enough to make a Christian, is enough to make a Member of the Catholick Church; For every Christian is such a Member, (He that is a Member of Christ, is a Member of his body the Catholick Church). But Baptism is enough to make a Christian or Member of Christ (*viz.* as oral consent and Baptism visibly, heart consent mystically): Ergo, such Baptism is enough to make a Member of the Catholick Church.

2. They that have the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, are Members of the Body of Christ: But he that hath true Faith and Love, or Catholick Doctrine and Catholick Charity, hath the sanctifying Spirit of Christ. This is not enough *ad bene esse*, but its enough to the being of a Christian and Church-Member. And that which maketh all Christians one in Christ, maketh the Church one; and if they have Pastors in their several Provinces, they are one organized ordered Church.

§ 4. But (saith he) [Catholick Communion, strictly so called; principally consists in two things; 1. In the agreement and concord of the Bishops of the Catholick church among themselves and with each other.]

Ans. I know not well how Agreement and concord differ, nor
[among]

[among themselves, and with one another.] But I know that there are divers terms and degrees of Concord: To repeat what is said, There is Agreement in Essentials, Integrals and Accidents: Doth this man dream that no Bishops are Christians and Catholicks, that have any disagreement? that is, no two in the world? If he think not so, what doth he take his Reader to be, who will take communion and union for all one, and then will take up with the name of communion in general, without ever hearing in what that communion must consist, and in what degree?

2. And is communion of Bishops only necessary to Church-unity? why not of Presbyters also?

3. Who doubts but there must be communion? But the Question is, Whether it must be in or under an Aristocratical Sovereign? He adds,

§. 5. 2. In the communion of particular Churches and Christians with one another.

Ans. 1. This is after Union. 2. The Question is, What communion this must be?

§ 6. Saith he, [All the Bishops in the world are Collegues.]

Ans. So far as the Church is a Colledge: And so are all Presbyters and Christians Collegues.

Sher. No man can have the honour of a Bishop, who doth not live in Unity with his Fellow-Bishops.

Ans. But what Unity? No one that liveth not in a Union in the Essentials of Christianity and Ministry? But Chrysostome and Theophilus Alex. and Epiphanius, might all be Bishops, though they had much Discord, and condemned one another: And so might Cyril, and Memnon, and Johan. Antioch. and Theoderet, and the Orthodox, and the Novatians, and the Eastern and Western Bishops since; and the old and the new sort of English Bishops, if they differ not tota specie.

2. And Unity in Essentials is needful with Presbyters and people, as well as with Bishops.

Sher. That the Catholick church is one, when it is not rent and divided, &c.

Ans. True, when it is not rent or divided from Christ, or any Essential of Christianity: But the most of the Christian world excommunicate, curse or separate from each other, as supposed
unsound

unfounded and usurpers at this day. Else, alas, what a case are those of you in, who smite the Shepherds, and scatter the flocks; and do not only divide, but persecute and separate from, and unchurch most of the Christians upon Earth?

§ 7. Sher. *And hence it is evident, That a superior Power over Bishops, is not necessary to the Unity of the church.*

Ans. All unintelligible! Do you mean over the *species* of Bishops, or over the *Individual* Bishops? 1. In any Aristocracy, there is no power of man above the persons that constitute it in *specie*. The *Roman* and *Venetian* Senators are equals: but the Senate hath power over every Individual. But why did you never prove what we deny, that there is any such supreme Senate? 2. And the Pope is but a Bishop claiming the Supreme seat. 3. And why then do Bishops swear Obedience to Archbishops, if Archbishops have no superior Power over them?

§ 8. Sher. *This communion among Bishops was expressed, 1. By writing and receiving Letters about church-affairs.*

Ans. So do the Independents and Presbyterians. Do none do this but a Sovereign Senate? 2. Is this the Communion that unifieth the Church? I hope it is a Church, and men are Members of it, before they write Letters.

§ 9. Sher. 2. *By advising together about the publick affairs of the Church, and communicating counsels with each other, and giving a reason of their actions, &c.*

Ans. 1. This Independents and all good Christians are ready to do. 2. How doth this differ from the former? Do you not mean advising by Letters or Messengers? If not, Is it General Councils that you mean, or what? How is it that we must advise with them of *Armenia*, *Abassia*, and the rest? Did not *Claudius* the *Abassian* Emperour stall *Oviedo* or the other Missionaries, when he asked him, If Subjection to the Pope be so necessary, why they never heard from him till now? And made them confess the Popes natural incapacity, the distance was so great, and the way precluded: And so we may say of a General Senate. 3. But how? Is it only *Publick Affairs* that the Colledge adviseth you about? Who is it then that must dispose of the Church, state and Souls of all us Individuals? It seems it is some body below the Senate that is meant,

meant, when we are told that we must obey the Universal Church? I thought whither it must come at last.

Here he instances in many *Letters written* as a distinct way from *writing Letters*, which was the first.

He tells us, [*Provincial Councils sent their Decrees to be confirmed by universal consent, which did serve the ends of Catholick communion better than any General Councils did.*]

Ans. 1. Really! did they send Messengers with their Provincial Canons all over the world, and receive their approbation? Was the Consent Universal, or by Major Vote? And who gathered the Votes? And where are they recorded? Have your Canons or late silencing and excommunicating Church-Laws, which you call for our Obedience to, been sent to, and approved by all the Christian world? Where are the Testimonies or Records of their approbation? Was *France, Spain, Italy* sent to? Were the *Greeks, Armenians, Abassines, Georgians* sent to? Have all the Protestant Churches whom you unchurch, approved them? How shall we know all this to be true? Or are you Schismaticks for doing what you have done without the consent of the Universal Church?

2. But did you think men may not be obliged to the fullest consent and concord attainable, without being subject to an universal Aristocracy?

§ 10. He next confuteth *Dr. Isaac Barrow*; but he had dealt more craftily, if he had never named his Book: For upon my knowledg it hath tempted some to look into it, that had never read it, and there all the cause of the *Universal Senators* is exposed to shame, and trodden in the dirt. I heartily thank *Dr. Tillotson* for publishing, and open owning it, and shewing his dissent from the Universal Supremacy.

He saith, *Dr. Barrow*, p. 30. (he thinks) *bath not made a true representation of it, when he saies, that the case of the Bishops was like to that of Princes, each of whom bath a free Superintendency in his own Territory; but to uphold Justice and Peace in the world, or between adjacent Nations, the intercourse of several Princes is needful.*

Well Sir, And what have you against this? Why, 'This makes 'Christian communion as arbitrary a thing as the confederacy of 'Princes.

Ans. Reader, This sort of men hate distinction; but I cannot be