

3. When *Leo* came to reign, the sedition revived at *Alexandria* between the murderers of *Proterius*: *Timothy Elurus* made Bishop by the Councils enemies, deposed by *Leo*, and *Timothy*, *Salophaciolus* put in his place, and all was in confusion. The *Egyptian* Bishops write to the Emperour against the *Eutychians*; The Emperour sends forth his circular letters for the Council; *Niceph. l. 15. c. 17. 18. 19.* 4. At *Antioch*, *Petrus*, *Cnaphes* ambitious of the Bishoprick, got into *Martyrius* place by *Leo's* help, and anathematized all that would not say that *God was Crucified and Suffered*, and tore that Church in pieces: *Martyrius*, when he could do no good, forsook them, with these words [*Clero rebelli et populo inobedienti & ecclesie contaminata nuncium remitto*:] *Cnaphes* reviled the Council: *Leo* for this banished him: *Stephanus*, a friend of the Council, succeeded him; him boyes killed with sharp quills and cast him into the river for favouring the Council: And *Calendion* succeeding him, made them Anathematize the aforesaid *Cnaphes*. *Leo* being dead, dissolute *Zeno* reigned, *Basiliscus* taking advantage of his lewd life, usurped the Empire, and made use of the Schisms to promote his ends: And first publisheth his circular against the Council of *Calcedon*; to this faith *Niceph. l. 16. c. 4.* besides the three Patriarchs no less than five hundred Bishops subscribed, and renounced the Council. But *Acacius* of *Constantin.* and *Dav. Columella* perswaded *Basiliscus* quickly to write clean contrary Letters for the Council, seeing that this was like to prove the stronger side. And when *Zeno* was restored, who was for the Council, the *Asian* Bishops turned again, and



wrote to *Acasius* to be pardoned, saying that they subscribed to *Basiliscus* first Letters, not voluntarily, but through fear *Nceph. l. 16. c. 2.* Then things were turned back again; till *Zeno* thought it the best way to write his *Henoticon* or a Conciliatory edict, that none should be forced to profess themselves either for or against the Council, perceiving that the Bishops would never come to agreement, either as for it or against it: But this ended not the divisions: But at *Antioch* *Calendion* was cast out. And *Pet. Cnaphens* got in again: And at *Alexandria* between *Peter Moggus* and *John* striving who should hold the place, all was in confusion. Yea the Schism reached to *Rome* also; for *Moggus* at *Alexandria* Anathematizing the Council, and persecuting dissenters, The Emperour seeks to reconcile them: *Felix* at *Rome* condemneth *Acasius* at *Constantinople*, for communicating with *Moggus*: *Acasius* condemneth *Felix*, blotting his name out of the Sacred Albe. *Acasius* dyeth, and the Emperour found it so hard to choose a Patriarch, that should cause no sedition, that he will have God choose one; and to that end puts a black paper on the Altar, and another requesting God that an Angel might write there the name of the Patriarch that should possess the place: The doors are lock't, and forty daies fasting and prayer commanded to prevail with God: One *Flavitas* bribeth the Key- Keeper, who was the Emperours Lord Chamberlain, and he writeth, *Flavitas* name in the Paper and sealeth up the door again, and so there was a Patriarch chosen by an Angel; but dyed suddenly within four months: But before he dyed, he joyned with

Peter

Peter  
mar  
to  
mur  
he  
Rom  
Peter  
the  
Gene  
each  
succe  
Chur  
Cnap  
joyn  
Ther  
Flav  
the  
Conj  
dieth  
He  
Peac  
left a  
Calo  
fell  
wor  
were  
fion  
with  
Wet  
Easte  
amo  
selv  
(N  
(sai  
Emp



*Peter of Alexandria* by synodal Letters to Anathematize the Council of *Calcedon* and yet wrote to the Bishop of *Rome* that he renounced Communion with *Peter*, and he wrote to *Peter* that he renounced Communion with the Bishop of *Rome*. *Euphemius* succeeded him, and he rased *Peters* name out of the Book, and joyned with the Roman Bishop. *Peter* and *Euphemius* as Generals were gathering synodical Armies against each other, and *Peter* dyeth. *Athanasius* that succeeded him, would fain have reconciled his Church but could not: *Palladius* succeeded *Peter Cnaphens* at *Antioch*: Both these Patriarchs joyn together to curse the Council of *Calcedon*; They die: *John* succeeded at *Alexandria* and *Flavianus* at *Antioch*: These also joyn to curse the Council, while the Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople* are for it, and curse them. *Zeno* dieth, and *Anastasius Dicorus* is chosen Emperour. He (saith *Niceph. l. 16. c. 25*) being a man of Peace, and desiring the ceasing of all contention, left all to their liberty to think of the Council of *Calcedon* as they pleased: Hereupon the Bishops fell into three Parties, some fervent for every word of the Council; some cursed it; and some were for *Zeno's* Henoticon, or silence, or suspension: These renounced communion accordingly with one another; the East was one way; the West another; and *Libya* another: Nay, the Eastern Bishops among themselves; the Western among themselves, and the Lybian among themselves, renounced communion with each other (*Niceph. c. 25*) *Tanta confusio mentiumque Caligo* (saith the Historian) *orbem universum incussit*. The Emperour having resolved to keep peace, and  
make



make no change, was forced to fall upon those of both sides that were most turbulent. At *Constantinople* he put out *Euphemius* (or for dislike of him.) This Emperour, before his inthroning, had given under his hand to *Euphemius*, a promise to stand for the Council: He demanded his writing again; *Euphemius* denied him, and was cast out: *Macedonius* succeeded him: He had the same writing: The Emperour demanded it of him: He also denied him: The Emperour would have put him out: The people rise up in sedition, and cryed, *It is a time of Martyrdom: Let us all stick to the Bishop*: And they reviled the Emperour, calling him a Manichee, unworthy the Empire. The Emperour was fain to submit to *Macedonius*, who sharply rebuked him as the Churches enemy; but in time he remembred this, and cast out *Macedonius*, and burnt the Councils Acts, and put *Timothy* in his place, who presently pull'd down the Image of *Macedonius*: The Patriarchs also of *Alex. Antioch*, & Bishop of *Jerusalem*, were all cast out, even those that were against the Council. *Pet. Cnapheus* had made one *Xenaias* a *Persian* servant & unbaptized, Bishop of *Hierapolis*: He was against Images, and brought a troop of Monks to *Antioch*, to force *Flavianus* the Bishop to curse the Council: *Flavianus* denied it: The people stuck to the Bishop, and so unanswerably disputed down the Monks, that so great a multitude of them were slain, as that they threw their bodies into the River *Orontes*, to save them labour of burying of them. (*Nicep. c. 27.*) But this was not all; another troop of Monks of *Calosyria*, that were of *Flavianus* side, hearing of the tumult, flockt to *Antioch*, and made ano-



another slaughter as great as the former (saith the Historian.) For this the Emperour banished *Flavianus*, whose followers thought his punishment too great after all these murders. *Peter* being dead, the Bishops of *Alexandria*, *Egypt* and *Lybia*, fell in pieces among themselves; each having their separate Conventions: The rest of the East also separated from the West, because the West would not communicate with them, unless they would curse *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, *Dioscorus*, *Moggus*, and *Acacius*. And yet (saith *Niceph. l. 16. c. 8.*) *Qui Germani Dioscori & Eutychetis sectatores fuere, ad maximam paucitatem redacti sunt.* *Xenaias* bringeth to *Flavian* the names of *Theodore*, *Theodorite*, *Ibas*, and others, as *Nestorians*, and tells him, if he anathematize not all these, he is a *Nestorian*, whatever he say to the contrary: *Flavian* was unwilling, but his timorous fellow-Bishops perswading him, he wrote his curse against them, and sent it to the Emperour. *Xenaias* then went further, and required him to curse the Council: They prevailed with the *Isaurian* Bishops to consent and all renounced the refusers as *Nestorians*: And thus the Council having (in name) condemned the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, the *Eutychians* called all *Nestorians* that cursed not the Council, and got many cast out. After *Flavian*, *Severus* got in at *Antioch*: The first day he cursed the Council (though it's said that he swore to the Emperour before that he would not) *Niceph. c. 29.* In *Palestine* there were renewed the like confusions about the condemnation of *Flavian* and *Macedonius*: About *Antioch* *Severus* Letters frightened many Bishops to curse the Council, and those that



that held two Natures : Some Bishops revoked their sentence, and said they did it for fear : Some stood out : And the *Issaurian* Bishops, when they repented, condemned *Severus* himself, that drove them to subscribe : And some Bishops fled from their Churches for fear. *Cosmas* and *Severianus* sent a condemnation to *Severus* : The Emperour hearing of it, sent his Procurator to cast them out of their Bishopricks for presuming to condemn their Patriarchs. The Procurator found the people so resolute, that he sent word to the Emperour, that these two Bishops could not be cast out without blood-shed : The Emperour answered, that he would not have a drop of blood shed for the business. *Helias* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, found all the other Churches in such confusion, condemning one another, that he would communicate with none of them but *Euphemius* at *Const. Nicop. c. 32*. And that you may see how people then were moved, a Monk or Abbot *Theodosius* gathering an Assembly, loudly cryed out in the Pulpit, [*If any man equal not the four Councils with the four Evangelists, let him be Anathema.*] This voice of their Captain resolved them all, and they took it as a Law, that the four Councils should be [*sacris libris accensenda*] and wrote to the Emperour *certamen se de eis ad sanguinem usq; subituros*. (This was then the submission to Princes by the adherents to the Councils of the Bishops.) And they went about to the Cities to bring them to joyn with them. The Emperour wrote to *Helias* to reform this : He rejecting his Letters, Souldiers were sent to compel them. The Orthodox Monks gathered by the Bishops, tumultuously cast the Emperours Souldiers out of the



the Church: (c. 34) After another conflux they anathematized those that adhered to *Severus*. The Emperour provoked, sent *Olympius* with a band of Souldiers to conquer them. He came and cast out *Helias*, and put in *John*: The Monks gather again, and the Souldiers being gone, they cause *John* to engage himself to be against *Severus*, and stand for the Council, though unto blood; which, contrary to his word to *Olympius*, he did. The Emperour deposed *Olympius*, and sent another Captain *Anastasius*, who put the Bishop in prison, and commanded him to despise the Council; consulting with another Bishop, he promised to obey him, if he would but let him out of prison two daies before, that it might not seem a forced act: This being done, the Bishop contrarily to the Congregation in the pulpit, before the Captain cryeth out. [*If any assent to Eutyches and Nestorius (contraries) and Severus and Soterichus Cæsar, let him be Anathema: If any follow not the Opinions of the four universal Synods, let him be Anathema.*] The Captain thus deluded, fled from the multitude, and was glad to save himself: The Emperour being offended at this, the Bishops write to him that at *Jerusalem*, the fountain of Doctrine, they were not now to learn the Truth, and they would defend the Traditions, if need be, even to blood.] Nic. p. c. 34.

*Timothy* Bishop of *Constantinople* took the man-pleasing way, and one while was for the *Calcedon* Council, another while he cursed it. Being to choose an Abbat, the Abbat refused his election, unless he consented to the Council of *Calcedon*. *Timothy* cursed those presently that received not the Council: His Archdeacon hearing him, reproached



reproached him that like *Euripus*, roled every way: The Emperour hearing it, rebuked him, and *Timothy* washt away the charge and presently cursed every one that received the Council. *Niceph. c. 35* Yet *Rome* though now under another King ( *Theodorick* an *Arria* Goth ) had a part in the Schism: *Festus* a Roman Senator was sent from *Theodorick* to the Emperour on an Embassie: Which when he had done, he desired that *Constantinople* would keep holy daies for *Peter* and *Paul* as *Rome* did, and he prevailed: And he secretly assured the Emperour that *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome* would receive the Henoticon ( to suspend the consent to the *Calcedon* Council ) and would subscribe it. But when the Embassadour came home, the Pope was dead: To make good his word, he got a party to choose *Laurentius* Pope, that would do it: The people ( that then had the chief choice ) chose *Symmachus* so there were two Popes: And the sedition continued three years *not without slaughters, rapines and other calamities* ( *Niceph. c. 35.* ) till *Theodorick* an *Arrian* more righteous than the Popes, called a synod and confirmed *Symmachus*: But *Laurentius* stirred up the people to sedition and was quite degraded. The Emperour favouring the addition [ *Qui Crucifixus est pro nobis* ] the people seditiously cut off a Monks head and set it up on a pole inscribing it an enemy to the Trinity: The Emperour overcome with their confusion and orthodox rebellions, called an assembly and offered to resign his Crown, desiring them to choose another; which smote them with such remorse, that they desired him to reassume his Crown and promised to forbear



bear sedition : But he dyed shortly after. But I  
 must not transcribe historical Volumes. *Justin*  
 succeeded *Anastasius* in the Empire, and *Justinian*  
 him : These were for the Synod : But *Theodora*  
*Justinians* Wife was against it : Some thought  
 by compact, that each part might have a head,  
 which was indeed but one ( *Niceph. l. 17. c. 7.* )  
 Should I tell you in their reigns how the Eccle-  
 siastical war continued, how Pope *Agathon*  
*munus imposuit Mene Constant. quod antea nun-*  
*quam factum est, Niceph. c. 9;* How *Menas* and  
 the Pope excommunicated one another, and how  
*Justinian* used *Vigilius* the Pope, &c. it would be  
 over tedious to tell. I have wrote this much to  
 shew you how far the Patriarchal seats conduced  
 to the Churches peace, and how far the four first  
 Councils of Bishops caused Christian Love and  
 Concord : No such things can be said of the  
*Arabians*, and *Novatian Phrygians* and others  
 that had Bishops in the villages : Should I but  
 now turn to *Rome* and tell you what was done  
 there, all this Confusion, blood and misery is but  
 a jeast to it : But I have said enough of that in  
 many treatises against Popery ; and particularly  
 of the above 40 years Schism when they had 2  
 or 3 Popes at once; and of the above 50 Popes  
 that *Baronius* and *Genebrard* themselves call  
 Apostatical, put in by whores and poyson, men  
 not to be named, save to keep a reckoning of  
 the times; many damned by Councils as horrid  
 Adulterers, Murderers, Simonists, Hereticks, or  
 Infidels : Nor will I recite how in the many  
 wars between the Popes and Emperours, the Bi-  
 shops swore, and unswore, and forswore as the  
 upper side compelled them, as *Urspergensis*  
 com-



complaineth. Nor will I stand to tell you, how the Pope and Patriarch of *Constantinople* (to whom adhere those of *Antioch*, *Alexandria* and *Jerusalem*) have these thousand years almost, divided and distracted the Christian world, by striving which should be the greatest, when Christ had so fully decided the case. But what now if after so many hundred years confusion it should prove, that all this stir was in the dark, and that *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and *Dioscorus* were of the same mind except in words: Can the tongue of man then sufficiently express the Bishops guilt? A rare French Divine and Philosopher *David Derodon* hath written a Treatise *de supposito*, copiously proving that *Nestorius* was orthodox; and *Cyril* an heretick, and all the first *Ephesian* Council that adhered to him; that *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus* taught but the same heresie that *Cyril* did; that the Council of *Calcedon* ignorantly condemned *Nestorius* and truly stablished his opinion; and cryed up *Cyril* and damned his doctrine: And he citeth abundant passages out of *Cyril*, where he expressly denyeth two natures in Christ, (as *Ep. 2. ad success. In Christo duas naturas unitas asserimus: post unionem vero ademptam iam in duas divisione, unam esse credimus naturam filii incarnati:*) And that *Nestorius* expressly assureth that there are two natures and but one person: The citations are numerous and undeniable. But I think that *Cyril*, *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus* (who were all of one mind) did mean that the natures were but one in opposition to division, but not in opposition to distinction. And that *Nestorius* said they were two as distinguished but not as divided, and all



this blood, separation and confusion was between men of one mind, for want of skill in the explication of words, and through worldly designs. I know some will say, *were all these Councils of Bishops such fools in comparison of you?* But can a man deny notorious truth in reverence to Bishops? If so, which part of the Bishops must I believe if they say the snow is black: The *Arrians*, and *Eutychians* were far the greater number.

And now as the best Philosophers think that experiments *de facto* must be premised to the Theory, so we think this touch of history must be considered by them that think Jewish High Priesthood, or National, Patriarchal or Metropolitcal superiority is the necessary means of the Churches Concord: Let them compare the dissensions caused by little village Bishops and synods for meer Concord, yea or by separating heady people, with these which Patriarchall and Metropolitcal seats have caused, and they will appear to be to them but as a scuffle at Billingsgate to the French Wars: And yet we have instanced but in the best times of dominion, in comparison of which Councils, Prelates and later times have been a meer *hurricane*. In a word, they that think that the mischiefs of *superiour seats* are greater than the benefits, do appeal to *all Church history*, whether they have not been the true and principal causes of the distractions of the Christian world, and of the long division of the East and West, and of many civil and grievous wars.

§ 40. And to the objections they say, I. As to Appeals and Government of Inferiors, 1. That the last appeals have ever been made to General Councils: And how they went when ever the



Prince did but countenance error, (as in the daies of *Constantius* and *Valens*, many great Councils that were for the *Arrians*, and in *Theodosius Juniors* time, for the *Eutychians* &c.) is too sad to think on. And is it not far more dangerous for many hundred in a Council to bear down a whole Empire or Kingdom, and raise persecution, and there be no appeal from them, than for a poor Priest to put a man from the Sacrament in his own Parish Church? How many Councils have been against Images in Churches, and how many for them, condemning one anothers acts? What good will appeals do to such, 2. In doctrinal cases the consent of many tends to concord: But in cases of personal practice, are they fit judges to appeal to, that dwell many hundred miles off, and know none of the persons; suppose a poor man in *England* is put from the Communion by a Parish-Priest (yea, perhaps an hundred or many hundred in some parishes) because he findeth some to be utterly ignorant some to be drunkards, fornicators, heretical, &c. If these appeal but to a Diocesan which dwelleth 20. miles from some, 40, or 60, or 100 miles from others, the remedy is worse than the disease: For if the Priest must travel so far, and bring his witnesses and plead the cause with men that never saw the party before, (where neighbourhood giveth a surer knowledge than any such examination of strangers can do, and a strange Chancellor or Diocesan knoweth not which witnesses are most credible) and all this while his Pastoral Charge (perhaps many thousand souls) must be neglected, while the Minister is prosecuting these appealing sinners; will not the evil of this be greater than the benefit? But how much more if  
every



every sinner must appeal to a Patriarch many hundred miles off? A sober mind will be ashamed to think of the process of such a suit. If you say that it is not in the case of such sinners as these whereof every Parish abounds, that you would have appeals, at least not to Patriarchs, so far off; I answer, 1. Then answer your own objection: What remedy shall they have if the Bishop wrong them? 2. What is the case than that you suppose such supraordinations of power necessary for? If you say, *If Ministers themselves should be excommunicate*, It is answered, That none but Bishops or other superior powers pretend authoritatively as Rectors to excommunicate Pastors; Therefore this is nothing to them that are against all such superiority of Pastors: Where none such are, none such can excommunicate, or be injurious. And if there must be a higher Bishop to deliver men from the injuries of a lower, who should deliver us from him, who may injure Kingdoms?

Obj. *But it is supposed that Patriarchs are wiser and better men than Metropolitans; and those than Bishops, and those than Priests: And that a meer Priest is not to be trusted with the power of the Keys.*

Ans. 1. The power of the Keys of his particular Church is essential to his Office; 2. They that will make Priests of raw lads and naughty fellows, and then plead that such must not be trusted with the Office which they themselves ordained them to, do condemn themselves by such allegations, 3. The old Church Government was, for every particular Church, no more numerous than our Parishes, to have a Bishop and Presbyters: And these were thought sufficient to judge who was fit for their own Communion, 4. *Hierom* was but a Priest, &c. And *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, *Dioscorus*, *Timothy*  
V 2 Elur



*Elurus, Peter Mogus, Gregory Alex. Lucius Al-*  
*Job. Al. Theodosius Al. Eulalius Antioch.*  
*Euphronius Ant. Placitus Ant. Stephanus Ant.*  
*Leontius Ant. Eudoxius Ant. Euzoius Ant.* all  
 Hereticks were all Patriarchs; and to reckon the  
 enormities of the Roman High Priests, is a need-  
 less work. Is it to be supposed then, that these were  
 better than Priests? Doth Christ say that it is as  
 hard for a rich man to enter into Heaven as for a  
 Camel to go through a needles eye, and shall we  
 that are Christians say, that it is to be supposed  
 that the rich clergie are better men than the poor?  
 When *Greg. Nazianz.* Saith that such great places  
 use to make Bishops worse than they were before.  
 All history tells us what striving there was for such  
 places? When *Eusebius* refused *Antioch*, two Priests  
 were presently at *Constantines* elbow to beg that  
 place, and he was fain to mention them (though  
 they were not chosen.) What a stir did *Maximus*  
 make at *Constantinople, Egypt*, and with the Empe-  
 rour to have got *Gregories* place at *Constantinople*?  
 And so with others. And is it not a fleshly, proud  
 and wordly mind (which is the work of the De-  
 vil) which is the importunate seeker? And must  
 we needs appeal to such? 3. But to come neerer,  
 what need is there of any such appeal or such a  
 Government, if, 1. A Bishop with his Presbyters  
 be over every particular Church (associated for  
 personal Communion in holy doctrine, worship  
 and Conversation?) 2. And if these Churches  
 associate for meer concord and mutual help (and  
 not for Governing Bishops?) 3. And if the Ma-  
 gistrate govern them all as he doth Philosophers,  
 Physicians, &c. For 1. If a Bishop of a particular  
 Church deny one the Sacrament or excommunicate  
 him



him, he doth it justly or unjustly : If justly, the person must submit : If unjustly, he may be received by a neighbour Bishop who is not bound to reject those whom upon trial he findeth to have been wrongfully excommunicated : All neighbour Churches must refuse those that are by any one excommunicated justly; but not all that are wrongfully cast out. Some say that he that doth excommunicate doth cast a man out of the whole Church, and therefore no one else may receive him : But unexplained words must not serve to confound truth, Souls and Congregations. Every Minister is a Minister in the Universal Church (as every Physician and Schoolmaster is in and to the Kingdom ( indefinitely not universally ) but his *work* and *power* are commensurate; his *power* being only *to and for his work*. Therefore the Bishop or Pastor of one particular Church or Parish, is bound to confine his ordinary labour to them, though occasionally he may help others. And accordingly his power is to use the Keys *ordinarily for his own Church only*, as to the *direct effect* : though *extraordinarily* he may use it in other Churches when called thereto; and by *consequence* it may reach further : For few Bishops will think if another Bishop come into their Diocesses or Parishes and excommunicate divers of their flocks, that *they* and *all others* are bound to stand to such mens sentence, and to hold such excommunicate. That which a Pastor doth in ordinary Excommunicating, is to declare ( after proof ) that *This person is by his sin and impenitency made incapable of Communion with the Church, and therefore to require him to forbear it, and the people to avoid Communion with him; and to pronounce him unpardoned before God,*



*Will he repent.* Now if this be done by one known to be heretical with whom the other Churches have no Communion, those other Churches are not bound to deny that man Communion. Nor yet if he offer himself to their Communion, and they examine the matter, and find him wronged. It is concord, in good, and not in evil, that we are bound to by the command of God: Therefore if any man be wrongfully put out of this Church, the next may and should receive him: And what necessity is there then, of going a thousand or an hundred miles to a Pope, or Patriarch, or Diocesan, to right him? And whoever thought that there was need of an Universal Physician, or Schoolmaster, or a General Council of such to receive appeals from Patients and Scholars that are wrongfully turned out of the Hospital or School?

The Caviller will here tell you of disparities in the cases; but the question is, whether the disparities be such as alter the reason of the Conclusion. What man of conscience will be a Physician, Schoolmaster or Pastor, that hath not power to judge whom to receive for his Patient, Scholar, or part of his flock, but must take all that some other man shall send to him, or command him to receive, and give them what others command him to give? An Apothecary may do so, but not a Physician. What if a man had no other scandal, but to say, *I will not take you for my Pastor, nor take my self obliged to answer you, speak with you, give you any account of my self, nor be questioned by you on any accusation,* must I be constrained to suppose this man to be one of my flock in despite of his own denial? If the freedom of consent be not mutual, but I must be constrained to take those  
for



for my charge as Christians, that renounce such a relation, or will not own it; a Pastor is not a free man, nor hath any power of the Church-Keys, but is as an irrational Slave, a Cryer, or Executioner, that must but execute another mans commands.

2. But if there be need of appeals, and our own actions must not be free, why will not the Synods of Neighbour-Pastors met only for *Counsel* and *Concord* (and not to command the Pastors) suffice for such persons to appeal to? And what if I turn a servant out of my house, or from his meat, and he may take another Master when he will, must there be an universal Judge of all family cases, that shall force me to keep my servant against my will? Is it not enough that I know why I am unwilling to keep him, who am no way more bound to him than to others, but by my own consent? What if (as *Nazianzen* left *Sasimis*, *Constantinople*, and *Nazianzum* at last) I should give up my whole Charge and Bishoprick, and say, I will be a Pastor to none of them any more, (upon sufficient reasons, as *Latimer* did :) Is it not better for the people to take another, than to accuse me at *Rome*, or *Canterbury*, as wronging them?

3. But if all this serve not (neither the sufficiency of Pastors for one single Parish, nor yet the Counsel of all the Neighbour-Pastors or Bishops,) what is there more to be done, which the authority of *Princes* and *Magistrates* may not do? All Christians confess (almost) that no Bishops or Pastors, as such, have from Christ any forcing power over the flocks; that belongeth to the Magistrates only; And *they* are to keep peace, and force us to our certain duty. And I would ask the contrary-minded, whether if Bishops, Patriarchs and Councils



cils had no forcing power, but only to excommunicate by the application of Gods word, and leaving all men to their consciences, would this sort of Government serve their turn, and keep out Heresies, or maintain order and unity? They say no, themselves: And next, whether it be not certain, and confessed, that the Pastors have no other power, but the Magistrates only?

Obj. *But shall all men gather Churches, and teach Heresie, and do what they will?*

Ans. 1. The power of Popes, Patriarchs or Councils, did not prevent it, when there were all the Heresies that fill *Epiphanius* Volumns: And when the far greatest part of the Clergy was long *Arrian*: And when the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* so greatly multiplied after the condemnation of the Councils: And when the *Novatians* lived so many years in reputation: and when the *Donatists* nor they were not diminished by Prelates or Councils Censures, till the sword dispersed them. And cannot the Sword be drawn without such as have no power of it?

3. And as to the last (and greatest) reason, that the Apostles have successors who must orderly exercise their Government; it is answered 1. The common doctrine of the Church was, that all Bishops are their Successors so far as they have successions; and every Church of one Altar had a Bishop in the daies of *Ignatius*, and long after. 2. The Council of *Carthage* said, None of us call-eth himself Bishop of Bishops. 3. But if any be set as the Bishop of many Bishops and Churches, so be it they use no violence, but govern volunteers as all the old Bishops did, and forbid them nothing commanded of God, nor command them any thing



thing which God forbiddeth, and destroy not the order, doctrine, worship or discipline of the lesser particular Churches, we have before said, that we shall submit to such.

§ 41. IV. As to the question, whether the Government settled by Christ in National Churches be (as to the Clergy from all parts, Monarchical) Aristocratical or Democratical, and who must have the *summam potestatem*? The disagreement of the persons that we have herein to do with, puts us into utter despair of any solution. And what good will it do us to believe that some must be obeyed, if we cannot be certain who it is.

§ 42. V. And to the question, *Whether the King be the formal, or only the accidental Church-head?* We find no more agreement. 1. Some think that the King, as *Melchizedek*, is a mixt person, secular and Clergy, and hath both Offices to use and communicate, as they say, the Princes before *Aaron* had. 2. Others say, that this is not so, but that the Clergy-jurisdiction, distinct from the Priestly common power, is a branch of the Christian Magistrates power, and so derived from the King. 3. Others say that the Church, *formally*, is distinct from the Civil State, though not alwaies *materially*: And that the King as King, is but an Accidental Civil Head, as he is over Physicians and Schoolmasters, being neither himself; and that the National Church must have a *formal Clergy-head*, (*Personal or Collective*) which shall *in suo genere*, be the highest, though under the Magistrates Civil Government, as Physicians are. 4. The Papists say, that all National Churches are under the Pope as Universal Pastor, who may alter them as he seeth cause. 5. Some moderate men say, that only Diocesan (and Metropolitcal) Churches are *jure Di-*  
*vino*,



vino, and that they are called *National*, only improperly from one King, or *concording* association as *ab accidente*, and not properly from any formal *Clergy-head*.

§ 43. VI. Lastly, which is the formal Head of the Church of *England*, and so what that Church is, we are left as much uncertain. 1. If it be only a Civil Head that denominateth it *One*, then it is but a Christian Kingdom, which we never questioned. And Dr. *Rich. Cofins*, in his Tables of the English Church-Policy, saith [*That the King hath Administrationem supremam magisque absolutam, quæ dicitur Primatus Regius*. And *Tho. Crompton* in his dedication of it to K. *James*, saith [*Ecclesiastica Jurisdictio plane Regia est, Corona & dignitatis vestra Regia prima, præcipua, indivisibilis pars: Ecclesiastica leges Regia sunt, neque alibi oriuntur, aut aliunde sustentantur, aut fulciuntur: penes Ecclesiasticos iudices per Archiepiscopos & Episcopos, derivata a Rege potestate, jurisdictio Ecclesiastica consistit*: And yet our Kings and Church explaining the Oath of Allegiance, declare that the King pretendeth not to the Priesthood, or power to administer the Word and Sacraments; but, as *Crompton* adds from *Constantine*, is *extra Ecclesiam constitutus a Deo Episcopus; alii intra Ecclesiam Episcopi*. This is plain: If they hold to this, and claim no power in the English-Policy, but as the Kings Officers, in that part which belongeth to Christian Magistrates, who will oppose them? But this reacheth not to the Keys, Preaching or Sacraments. 2. Some say that the King is partly a Clergy-man, as *Melchizedek*, and so that he is the formal Head, and might perform the Priestly Office if he would: But this our Kings have themselves renounced. 3. Some say that



that the Archbishop of *Canterbury* is the formal Head; but that cannot be, because he is no Governour over the Arch-Bishop of *York*, or his Province. 4. Most say that the *Convocation* is the formal Church-Head, which makes it One Political Church. But 1. If so, then why saith the Canon that the Convocation [*is the true Church of England by Representation*] and those excommunicate that deny it? We enquire after the Church-Head or Governour: And that which is but the Church it self by representation, is not its *Head*, unless the Head and Body be the same, and the Church govern it self, and so it be Democratical: The governed and Governours, sure, are not the same. 2. And the *Supream Power* is supposed, By those that take Episcopacy for a distinct Order, to be in the *Supream Order* only: But the far greater part of the Convocation are not of the *Supream Order*: Nay, thus the Presbyters should be partly the chief Governours of the Bishops while they make Canons for them. 3. When we did but motion that according to Arch-Bishop *Ussers* form of the Primitive Episcopacy, Presbyters might joyn with the Bishops in proper executive Church-government instead of Lay-Chancellors, and such like, they decryed it as *Presbytery*, and call us *Presbyterians* ever since: And if they say that the Presbyters have so great a part in the *Supream Government* it self, which obligeth all the Nation, how much more would they be themselves *Presbyterians*, which they so abhor?

§ 44. Having oft said that we desire *Christian Kingdoms* as the great blessing of the world, we mean not either that 1. All in a Kingdom should be forced to be baptized, or profess themselves  
Chri-



Christians, whether they are so or not : For lying will not save men, nor please God ; and even the Papists are against this: 2. Nor that all should be supposed to be Christians that are in the Kingdom. But that the Kings be Christians, and the Laws countenance Christianity, and the most or ruling part of the Kingdom be Christians, and all just endeavours used to make all the rest so: The Ancient Churches continued them Catechumens till they were fit for Baptism ; and though they were for Infant-Baptism, they *compelled* none to be baptized in Infancy, or at Age, but left it to free choice. They baptized but twice a year ordinarily. They kept many offenders many years from communion. And if *Crabs Roman Council* *sub silvest.* be true, they at *Rome* admitted not penitents till *fourty years* (understand it as you see cause :) The true Elibertine Canons kept many out so many years, and many till death, and many absolutely, as shewed that they were far from taking all the Nation into the Church. And the Christian Emperours compelled none. It was long before the greatest part of the Empire were Christians. In the daies of *Valens*, the Bishops were some of them banished into places that had few Christians, if any. In *France* it self, even in *St. Martin's* daies, the Christians of his flock were not the most, but he wrought miracles to convince the Heathens that raged against Christianity, where he dwelt, &c.

§ 1. There are two appendent Controversies handled by some that write for National Churches; which need but a brief solution : The first is, whether it be not an Independent Errour to expect *real holiness in Church-members, as necessary in the judgment*



ment of charity? The second, *Whether it be not such an Error to require the bond of a Covenant beside the Baptismal Covenant?*

§ 2 To the first we say, that so much is written on this point by one of us in a Treatise called *Disputations of Right to Sacraments, &c.* that we think meet to say no more: The Opponents now confess that it must be *saving Faith and Consent to the Baptismal Covenant* that must be professed: And Papists and Protestants agree with all the Ancient Church, that Baptism putteth the true Consenter into a state of certain pardon and title to life: And God maketh not known lying, a condition of Church-communion: *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.* It is true, that God hath not made Ministers Arbitrary Judges of mens secret thoughts, but hath limited them in judging to take *their tongues* that *profess Faith and Consent* to be the *Indices* of their minds: But sure the power of the Keys containeth a power of judging according to Christ's Law, who is to be taken into the Church by Baptism, and who not: If only the seeker be made Judge, it will be a new way of Church-Government, and a bad. And then the question is, 1. Whether he that accepts ones profession seemingly serious, of *Faith and Consent*, and that *de presente*, is not bound to hope in charity that such a one doth not lie or dissemble? 2. Whether a baptized person, as such, have no right to our special love which we owe to those that we hope are true Believers, and sanctified; but only to our common love and kindness, which belongeth to those also that are the heirs of Hell? Some friends that are gone from extrem to extrem, and in remembrance of their ancient Schisms, can

look



look but one way with impartial sense, and that have made their repentance the passage to a greater error and sin, should better bethink them what they do. They did well to stand still in the way of Schism, when they saw here a leg, and there a hand, and there an arm in their way; and who but a mad-man indeed would not: But if they have impartially read Church-history, and the works of such Fathers as give us historical notices, and ever since *Constantine* made a Bishoprick a bait to a proud and worldly mind; even such as *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore Pelusiota*, *Hilary Pictav.* and the over-orthodox disputations of *Cyril*, and the Epistles of *Theodoret* rejoycing at his death, and abundance of such like; had they seen in the way of Church-pride and tyranny, not here a leg, and there an arm, but here a hundred carcasses, and there a thousand; here two thousand godly faithful Preachers silenced, and many thousand dry Vines planted in their rooms, and there whole Kingdoms interdicted, and their Churches shut up; here Churches and Kingdoms turned into confusions about a word, or about the interest of Prelates, striving which should be the Chief, and have their will and rule the rest; and there hundred thousands murdered in the name of Christ, for obeying him, and bloody wars managed by the Clergy against Christian Emperours, and Kings stabbed one after another; and most of the Christian world, *Roman*, *Greek*, *Moscovites*, *Armenians*, *Abassines*, degenerated into doleful ignorance and dead formality under the Government of great High-Priests, and millions of the vulgar bred up in ignorance and senselessness of spiritual and eternal things; this should stop them, (at least from serving



ving the master of such designs) as much as a leg, or an arm in the way.

3. At least we would intreat them to hate that mistake, which will pretend to do all this for charity, unity and the Churches good; and to believe that it is no sign of charity, 1. To believe that charity should not be exercised in judging that men professing saving faith do speak the truth, and have the faith that they profess: 2. Nor to teach all Christs Church, that a baptized Church member *as such* is to be lookt on but as a man in a state of damnation; and no man is bound to love him as a true Christian with a special love: 3. And that to prove that a man is not to be taken for a true Christian, but to be admitted into Church Communion as one that shall have a greater damnation than heathens, without a further renovation, is a great act of Charity, Contrary to the uncharitable narrowness of others. These are too great recesses from Anabaptistry, but not from real Schism.

§ 3. As for those that will not take the *intelligent serious profession of true Faith, and Covenant-Consent* for a credible sign of the sincerity of the Professor, till they can sufficiently disprove it, but will be the arbitrary Judges of mens hearts, either as pretended heart-searchers, or by self-devised, or uncertain signs, not taking up with this Profession, we are no Patrons of such mens presumption and uncharitableness.

§ 4. There are various degrees of Credibility in mens professions; some give us so much as is next to certainty; some but small hopes: But yet till we can disprove them, we are to take their professions as credible in some degree. And if they prove false, it is they that will have the loss.



§ 5. II. The second case about Church Covenants deserveth no longer a discussion. He that will put any article unnecessary into any such Covenant, sinfully corrupteth the order of the Church: As if he would bind the people to be Church Governours, or never to depart from that particular Church but by the consent of the Pastor, or the flock, or any such like: And he mistaketh that will make a more *explicite* contract to be more necessary than it is. But it seemeth strange to us that any understanding Christian should deny, that *consent* is absolutely necessary to the being of an adult member both of the universal, and each particular Church respectively. What *bindeth* a man to consent is another question, but if he be any member of the Church till he *profess consent*, we know not what a Christian or Church member is. An *explicite covenant* is necessary to our relation to the *Universal Church* for it must be *solemnized sacramentally*: That we express it by *writings or words* is not of necessity to our membership of a particular Church: But *consent* is necessary; And *mutual consent expressed* satisfactorily, is a contract or Covenant: If the Pastor say all that consent, hold up your hand, or stand up, or stay here while the rest depart, &c. these are significations of consent: And if it be notified that all that appear at the solemn Assemblies, and attend the Pastors Ministry, shall be taken for Consenters, their presence and attendance is a profession of Consent indeed, and so a covenanting. But though the most explicit be not necessary *ad esse*, no man can give a reason why it should not be best *ad bene esse*, seeing the most intelligent and plain dealing in the great things of God, are most suitable to the work, and fittest



fitteſt to attain the end: why ſhould we not deal openly and above board?

§ 6. It is certain that to be a Chriſtian maketh no man a member of any mans particular flock or charge. And it is certain that none can be ſuch without conſent. And it is certain that the Paſtor is not to take every Atheiſt, Jew, Infidel, Papiſt, Heretick, &c. in his Pariſh for a member of the Uniſverſal, or of that particular Church. Therefore he muſt know whom to take for ſuch. And it is certain that the conſent muſt be mutual, ſo far is the Paſtor from being a ſlave, and bound to every mans deſires, that he is entrufled with the Church Keys himſelf.

§ 7. A worthy perſon on this ſubject maketh theſe fix things ſufficient to ſuch Church relation: 1. That they be baptized Chriſtians; 2. Neighbours bound to mutual love; 3. And apt to Neighbourly duty; 4. That providence make us ſuch Neighbours; 5. Scripture Churches took their name from cohabitation: 6. The command of authority, that ſo it ſhall be. *Freſh ſuit. pag. 260.*

*Anſ.* By making theſe fix the ſufficient proof of Pariſh Churches, our friend unhappily would conſequently unchurch them all: For if this were all, certainly they were none at all. For all theſe (which he maketh more than they are) are but the *diſpoſitio materiae*, antecedent to any reception of the form, 1. For all that he inferreth or can infer from them all is *obligation to conſent* and to other duties after conſent. But *obligation* maketh not the relation of a member: All that are *obliged* to be Chriſtians are not Chriſtians: All that are obliged to be Paſtors are not Paſtors: Nor all that are obliged to conſent firſt and to do the duty of Paſtors



after : Even as all that are obliged to consent to be subjects, Husbands, Wives, Masters, Servants, Tutors, Scholars, &c. are not such : If meer obligation serve to one relation, why not to others ? 2. Else a man might be a true Pastor unchosen, unordained and against his will. For he may by his qualifications be obliged to be ordained and to become a Pastor. 3. And so the people may be the flock of one that was obliged to be their Pastor, when another is set over them and in possession, because it was the first that was obliged, and they to choose him : And so utter Confusion will come in : And if a man can prove that another mans wife and servant was obliged to be his, he may take them as his indeed. 3. By this rule all the Papists, Seekers, Quakers, &c. that renounce our Churches, should yet be members of them, because they live in the Parish, and are commanded to be members: Which *who* believeth ? 4. A member of a Church hath right to Communion and Ministerial vigilancie and help : But so hath not every baptized person that is commanded to be a member, and obeyeth not that command. If a man say to a Pastor, I will be none of your flock, or Church, but yet I require you to do the office of a Pastor to me, though I renounce your relation to me, and the people to use me as a member of the flock, because I am commanded to be a member, this were a strange claim. 5. If this did hold, then no man that liveth in the Parish could be a proper separatist, so as to break off himself from that Church, nor become a member of another, unless he apostatized from Christ : For he would be still under the Magistrates Command and obligation : But the consequent is absurd : Why do  
the