



A N  
APPENDIX.

---



Meeting lately with a very  
worthy Brother, at *East  
Haddon* in the County of  
*Northampton*; he did much  
importune me, to admit  
of a short dispute with him  
about the principle under  
consideration; to whom  
I consent, and he laid down this Assertion.

*That Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2.  
is not a foundation Principle, nor a  
practical Duty.*

Against which I laid down this Position:

*VIZ.*

*Laying on of Hands Heb. 6. 2. is a  
Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, to  
be practised by his people, and a part  
of the Foundation there mentioned:  
Which my Opposite did wholly deny.*

It was argued that I should be Opponent,  
whereupon I offered this Argument.

*Opponent. Arg. 1.*

The word *Principles*, Heb. 6. 1. being of the  
plural number, is refer'd to all these particu-  
lars; namely, Repentance, Faith, Baptisms,  
Laying on of Hands, the Resurrection of the  
dead, and the Eternal judgement.

*Ergo*, Laying on of Hands, *Heb. 6. 2.* is a  
principle of the doctrine of Christ.

Re-

Respondent.

*You ought not to prove it a Principle by that Text.*

Opponent.

*My position is not the Text, therefore I may prove it by this Text.*

Respondent.

*The Text about which we differ will not prove it.*

Opponent.

*If any Scripture will prove it, it is sufficient; and therefore answer to the Argument. Either distinguish, or deny the Antecedent or consequence.*

Respondent.

*I will prove that Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. is no foundation principle, thus. —*

Opponent.

*Sir, you would by no means be Opponent, when I desired you to make good your Assertion; but complain'd, as if I put you upon that which was not your part: Why then do you*

now refuse to answer, and put your self into the place of the Opponent, which you know is contrary to rule, sith I am now to prove.

Respondent.

*Well, I answer by denying the consequence.*

Opponent.

I desire to know whether you grant the Antecedent, for your denial of the Consequence only, supposeth that you grant the Antecedent.

Respondent.

*I do grant your Antecedent.*

Opponent.

Then take notice that you grant the first branch of my Position, which you denied [ *saying, I deny it all* ] for that the word *principles*, *Heb. 6. 1.* refer to all the particulars aforesaid, then to Laying on of Hands; and so the Consequence will follow. Thus you grant as much as I can desire.

Respondent.

*I will prove*

Oppo-

Opponent.

Brother, you ought not to prove till you be Opponent, this you know better than I do. Therefore either recal your answer to the Antecedent, or confess your error in denying the first branch of my position.

Respondent.

*Well, for Argument sake, I grant an error in matter of form.*

Opponent.

No Brother, your error is an error of judgement. First, to deny Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. to be a principle of the Doctrine of Christ, and then to grant it; in one of these you must needs err in judgement.

*Here my Respondent was not willing to acknowledge an error in judgement. And therefore ( as also for divers other pressing occasions that was to be considered, and the time but short ) I put a period to the dispute.*

And because I had many other things to say, which time would not then permit to be spoken, I will now offer them to consideration; and that as for other causes, so chiefly for that I hope it may tend to the satisfaction of my honoured Brother, and others that are under the same mistake.

Argu-

## Argument 2.

*Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. is a Principle of the Oracles of God.*

*Ergo, Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. is a Principle of the doctrine of Christ.*

The Antecedent is manifest, because the same particulars which is called the principles of Christs doctrine, *Heb. 6.* is called the principles of the Oracles of God, *Heb. 5. 11.* which is evident; Because as the principles of Gods Oracles, *Hel. 5. 12.* were the things which the Hebrew Church ought not to have any need to be taught again; so the principles of the doctrine of Christ, *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* are the things which (as a foundation) among them, ought not to need any laying again.

## Argument 3.

*All those particulars, which in Heb. 6. 1, 2. the Apostle saith he would intermit, and so go on to perfection, are the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ:*

*But Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. is one of the particulars, which the Apostle said, Heb. 6. 1. that he would intermit.*

*Ergo,*

Ergo, *Laying on of Hands*, Heb. 6. 2. is a *Principle of the Doctrine of Christ*.

I take this Argument to be irrefragable, therefore I proceed to the second branch of the position, which is; That laying on of Hands, *Heb. 6. 2.* ought to be practised by the people of God.

But first I must explicate the words [*Laying on of Hands*] which in the understanding of any considering man, must needs signifie an *Act*, and therefore cannot be restrained to the passive; for as the subject on whom Hands is laid, is passive as to the Act, (but not in faith) so the party imposing of Hands is active. And evident it is, that the word [*Principle*] *Heb. 6. 1.* refers to the *Act* expressly, and to the passive implicitly, as any considering man may understand: Whence I argue,

#### Argument 1.

Seeing the *Laying on of Hands*, Heb. 6. 2. as it is a *Principle* (or *Doctrine of Christ* (if you please) is not passive only, but active also. It must needs be practised, either by the servants of Christ, or the servants of Satan;

But

*But Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. as it is a principle of the doctrine of Christ, is not to be practised by the servants of Sathan:*

*Ergo, Laying on of Hands, as it is a principle of the doctrine of Christ, is to be practised by the servants of Christ.*

The Major is plain. The Minor surely will not be denied. For who will presume to say, that the principles of Christs doctrine (as such) are to be practised by the servants of Sathan. Seeing it is Christians (*not the devils Vassals*) who as they are once to lay it, so are *not to lay again the Foundation*. As for wicked men, they will persecute the Saints again and again, and so Christians must have the hands of wicked men laid on them again and again; and that when they are gone on to perfection, as well as when they begin their profession, so then this Laying on of Hands, *Heb. 6.* being but once to be laid, cannot be that which the wicked do impose; sith its certain as they do it often, so sure it is, they ought not to do it so much as once. Again, *The laying on of Hands by the wicked, to persecute the Saints, is the doctrine of the Devil.* Ergo, *no principle of the Doctrine of Christ.* Ergo, *Not that laying on of Hands mentioned, Heb. 6. 2.*

Argu-

## Argument 2.

*Laying on of Hands*, Heb. 6. 2. *was held and practised by the primitive Church, as a principle of Christs Doctrine;*

*Ergo, It ought to be held and practised as a principle of Christs Doctrine now, by the subsequent Churches.*

The Antecedent is proved above, therefore the consequence is indubitable; which yet I may demonstrate thus.

## Argument 3.

*None of the principles of Christs Doctrine (which were practical) are abolished, no more then those which are not practical.*

*Ergo, Laying on of Hands as a practical principle, Heb. 6. 2. ought now to be practised by the servants of Christ.*

The Antecedent cannot be denied, without manifest danger to all the principles of Christs Doctrine; for if one be abolished, then why not the rest? So then the consequence must not be denied.

The third branch of my position proved, *Viz. That the Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. is a part of the foundation there mentioned.*

But

But first, for explication of the word [*Foundation*] it is to be considered; That when it is applied to Christianity, or the Church of God; It may be considered first originally, and in the main, and so Christ our Lord is only the foundation. Or secondly, demonstratively, or in the mean; and so his doctrine may be said to be the foundation, by an usual manner of speech, when the thing containing or holding forth is taken for the thing contained or held forth. For, whatsoever Christ is in himself, certain it is, he is not a foundation *TO US*. But as he is held forth in his doctrine, *Heb. 6. 1, 2, &c.* Hence I argue,

#### Argument 1.

*The word Foundation, Heb. 6. 1. cannot be refer'd to Christ, as the foundation of his Church, originally, or in the main, or in the highest or most sublime consideration.*

*Ergo, The word [Foundation] is refer'd to the doctrine of Christ, in the first, or most easie demonstration; to wit, the first rudiments, or principles of Religion; even such as Babes in Christ may know them.*

The Antecedent is true, otherwise what shall we think of *Paul*. Would he not teach the  
Chri-

Christians concerning the knowledge of Christ in the more sublime points of Christianity: Surely he professes to do this, at the time he wrote to them; and indeed, how else could he lead them on to perfection? *Hel. 5. 11. and 6. 3.* So that our consequence is very rational.

### Argument 2.

*The word Foundation, Heb. 6. 1. is comprehensive of all these particulars, to wit, Faith, Repentance, &c.*

*Ergo, the word Foundation, Heb. 6. 1. is comprehensive of Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. as well as any of the rest.*

That the Antecedent is true, may in part be perceived by the Searchers themselves; For they were more rational than to deny, the word Foundation to be meant, of this or that particular only; and grant it to be meant of the rest. Therefore they would have none of the said particulars to be understood by, or comprehended in the word *Foundation*, but restrain it only to Christ; which yet is contrary to their own opinion, sith they have since granted, *Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. to be a part of the Foundation.*

The

The consequence is good, because no reason can be assigned, why the doctrine of Baptism should be a part of the foundation there meant, rather than the promise of the Holy Spirit, with the way of God to seek for it.

*Argument 3.*

The Apostle in *Heb. 6. 12.* describes the foundation in its several parts.

*But it is irrational in such a description, to intermix two particulars in the midst of four, the two first, and two last, being Fundamental, and the two middlemost Circumstantial (or what else would you have them.) And yet give us no intimation of any such unsuitable commixtion.*

*Ergo, Laying on of Hands is one part of the Foundation, which is mentioned, Heb. 6. 1, 2.*

T. G.

THE



## *The Second part.*

### Of the Constitution of a true C H U R C H.

**N**either are the demands of our Brethren, about what truths, the knowledge whereof are necessary to the Constitution of a true Church, so difficult ; but that we shall give them a direct answer, at least to a larger degree, than what they in that case have assigned ; for they only set down Faith, Repentance and Baptism, with a holy life, &c. omitting not only the fourth principle of Christs Doctrine, ( though they confess laying on of Hands , *Heb. 6. 2.* to be a part of the foundation ) but also they omit the Belief of the Resurrection, and the eternal Judgment. If it should be said that they comprehend the two last principles in that of Faith towards God, we must tell them they

had better by far have expressed them ; for certainly in this case we cannot be too express, if we express nothing but the truth. But to be plain, it's justly suspected that they do not make the Knowledge or Belief of the Resurrection and eternal judgment necessary to the Essence of a true Church ; for if they had, they would some where or other have asserted these truths to be necessary in that behalf ; which they have not done, but rather argued to the contrary, whiles they reason from the state of the Church before Christs Ascension to the state of the Church after it, as we shall see more anon.

These things premised, I answer directly to their demands, (in this case) That the belief and practice (so far as they are practical) of all these principles or truths, *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* Are necessary to the right or perfect Constitution of a true Church, which I thus demonstrate.

*All the first principles of Gods Oracles (from the time they were in being) are necessary to be known, believed, &c. in the Constitution of a true Church : Ergo, all those truths, Heb. 6. 1, 2. Are necessary to be known, believed, &c. in the constitution of a true Church.*

The Antecedent I prove, because, first principles are either necessary in the constitution of a true Church, or not at all. But first principles are

neces-

*necessary; Ergo, they are necessary in the constitution of a true Church. This will yet further appear, by considering every principle apart after this manner.*

1. If Repentance from dead works be not necessary to the constitution or beginning of a true Church, no man can shew a reason why it should be necessary at all.

2. If Faith towards God be not necessary to the constitution of a true Church, then not at all.

3. If Baptisms be not necessary to be taught, &c. in the constitution of a true Church, then not at all.

4. If Laying on of Hands for the promised and Sealing Spirit be not necessary in the constitution of a true Church, then not necessary at all.

5, 6. If the Knowledge that the dead shall rise again and be judged, be not necessary in the constitution of a true Church, then not necessary at all. And therefore I argue further.

*Milk is necessary for Babes, or mankind in his first estate; Ergo, all these principles, Heb. 6. 1, 2. Are necessary to Churches in their beginning, or constitution. The antecedent is evident by sense, the consequence is true, because all the principles, Heb. 6. 1, 2. Are called Milk, Heb. 5. 12. And that which pertains to Babes in Christ,*

and consequently to the constitution of Churches.

Again, If the Principles of Religion be not to be taught in the beginning of our Christian State, no man can tell the time when these things ought to be taught. For pass but the time of the beginning, Plantation, or founding of Churches, and let our Brethren resolve us concerning the proper time to begin to teach the Principles of Religion, and particularly, that principle of Laying on of Hands? Mean while we conclude, that the proper time to instruct Men concerning the promise of the Spirit, and consequently touching the means to obtain it, is at or about the time of their beginning their Christian course, or being made the Members of Christs Body, because every Member of that body ought to be vivified by that one Spirit, which God hath promised to them that obey him.

Again, *The whole foundation is necessary to the constitution of a true Church; Ergo, all the principles, Heb 6. are necessary to the constitution of a true Church.*

The *Antecedent* will never be denied by any wise builder, for they know the Superstructure is not like to be secure, if the Foundation be defective. The consequence is good, because every principle, Heb. 6. is a part of the Foundation,

dation, and so Laying on of Hands among the rest, as is granted on all sides.

Nor will our Brethrens demands grounded on the state of the Church before the Ascension of our Lord, prejudice ought that we have said, seeing it is evident, that they were not only ignorant of the promise of the Spirit, and by what means it should be obtained, but they were plainly ignorant that Christ must die for the sins of men, and rise again for their justification, as appears Luke 24. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. And he [that is Jesus] said unto them [that is his Disciples] what things? And they said unto him concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a Prophet mighty indeed, and word before God, and all the people. And the chief Priests and how our Rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him; But we TRUSTED that it had been he that should have delivered Israel. And beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done; yea, and certain women also of our own company, made us astonished, which were early at the Sepulchre, and when they found not his Body, they came, saying that they had also seen a Vision of Angels, which said That he was alive. And certain that was with us went to the Sepulcher, and found it even as the women had said, but him they saw not: Then he said [that is Jesus] unto them, [that is his Disciples] O fools, and slow of

*heart, to believe all that the Prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things.*

Hence these three things are evident. 1. That Christs Disciples were ignorant that he should work mans deliverance by dying for them. 2. That he should overcome death by rising again from the dead. 3. That Christ both reproveth their ignorance, and instructs them in the knowledge of the Scriptures touching these principles.

Now let us see what our Brethren have gained by quering from the state of the Church before, to the state of the Church after the Ascension of our Lord; surely not an hairs-breadth of proof, that Laying on of Hands should be dispensed with in the perfect constitution of a true Church, any more than that the knowledge of Christs dying for our sins, and rising again for our justification, may be dispensed with in like manner.

But howsoever it was the pleasure of God to wink at the days of this ignorance, yet surely we know that men are not now under the promise of salvation, unless they confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus [that is, not to cry Lord Lord only, but acknowledge him their Lord purchaser, and their Lord commander] and shall believe in their heart that God hath raised him from the dead: whence we conclude,

clude, if they be not under the promise of salvation, they are very unfit for Church-Communion.

And here we will take notice of your demand, *Where the Apostles Laid Hands upon any after they had received the Holy Ghost?*

The ground of this demand seems to be corrupt in two respects; first, in that it supposeth, that if the end of an Ordinance be obtained, the Ordinance ceaseth. The contrary to which is evident in the case of Baptism, *Acts* 10.47,48. For Baptism in the ordinary way of Gods communicating the graces of the Gospel is antecedent to the reception thereof, & is propounded as a means wherein not only the Remission of our sins shall be granted to us, but as a condition whereupon we shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 2.38. yet we know the Spirit was (once at least) given, and received before Baptism was dispensed, yea those persons had the chief end of Baptism; for God that knew their hearts did now evidence the Remission of their sins, purifying their hearts by Faith, *Acts* 11. yet did not all this in the least make void that solemn Ordinance, the Baptism of Repentance for Remission of sins, which was fore-ordained to signify and Sacramentally to confer the grace of the pardon of sin, and the inward washing of the

the Conscience by Faith in the bloud of Jesus Christ. If then the end of an Ordinance being obtained, doth not make void the practick part (during the time that the Church is under Ordinances) then who can forbid prayer with the Imposition of Hands, for the gift of the promised Spirit, even for those that have received a measure thereof already, seeing none will say (I trust) that they have received so much, but that they are capable of receiving more.

Again, it is the will of God that there should be no Schism in the body, nor confusion in the Doctrine or practice of his holy things, *1 Cor. 1. 10. Rom. 16 17. 1 Cor. 14 33.* And therefore hath not ordained a divided or confused order in the constitution of his Churches, which yet cannot be avoided, if once it be allowed that part of a Congregation (under a pretence that they have the Spirit or gift of the Holy Ghost already) must be admitted to all manner of priviledges in the Church, without any regard had to an Ordinance, or principle of the Gospel, without the observation whereof, the other part cannot arrive at the priviledge of Communion in the same body, without being guilty of the breach of order. A weak sight may perceive whither such a conceit would lead us at last, even into that Wilderness

derness whither many are gone, who (for-  
sooth) because they have the kernel, to wit,  
the Spirit, they have no need of the shell, to  
wit, the Ordinance of God [as if that Spirit  
which leads men into disobedience were the  
Holy Ghost] till at length they have so much  
Spirit, that the knowledge of Christ crucified  
without the gates of Jerusalem, is of as little  
esteem with them as his Ordinances.

The other corrupt ground of this demand  
seems to be an over-weening conceit of present re-  
ceivings, and hath too much of that Language,  
*What profit shall we have if we pray unto him?* And  
seems to border much upon their apprehensi-  
ons, who concerning Holy Baptism do thus  
speak, *I am as well as Water can make me.* Not  
considering that the way of God is strength to the  
upright; and that God never said to his people seek  
me in vain. The ground therefore of this  
demand being thus corrupt, we shall leave it  
without further Answer.

We shall seriously consider the most impor-  
tant pinch of a great part of our Brethrens de-  
mands; and that is, *whether they ought not to be  
esteemed a true Church, they being under the pre-  
fession of Faith, Repentance, and Baptism, reso-  
ving to believe and do further what they shall from  
time to time understand to be according to the will  
of God?*

These

The Confession of Faith

These latter words (I confess) do make a fair shew, yet are as little satisfactory to us with respect to the truth under consideration, as the like resolution would be to them, from such persons of other perswasions as should desire Communion with them, only desiring to be born with, in the case of Holy Baptism, till they see it to be their duty; though in the mean time, they frequently dispute and write against it, and do more than any other Adversaries whatsoever, to weaken the Hands of many Christians, who religiously observe it, as necessary to the perfect constitution of the Church of Christ. I say, like as this kind of resolution, would little comfort our Brethren, so doth the other as little comfort us, till we see them in good earnest more solicitous for the knowledge of the truth which they see not, than hitherto (or at least than by this their search) they have appeared to be. But notwithstanding this, and much more of like nature which might be said, I shall answer this demand with all integrity and ingenuity: And first Negatively,

That those baptized Christians who reject prayer with the Laying on of Hands, for the Spirit of promise, hath a Church-state perfect in principles and orderly in constitution, according to *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* [which I take to be a platform for  
the

*the constitution of Churches, if there be one in all the New Testament*] I say, that our Brethren hath such a constitution, or Church-state I must plainly deny, and for the grounds of this denial I dare refer my self (if not to the Consciences of our differing Brethren yet) to the Reasons and Scripture-evidences preceding: But Secondly,

That our Brethren have a Church-state in some good measure according to truth; I must and do chearfully grant, like as I must grant him to be a man in respect of the genus, who wants an hand, or foot; as also in respect of that measure of Form and proportion which he holds with other men, and yet deny the same person to be a man in respect of the species or parts, which are necessary to the perfect Essence, composition and Form of a man. Or as I may call an Edifice by the name of an house, though it want not only much of its compleateness in respect of the Superstructure (as God knows all Churches do) but also though it be somewhat defective, by reason of the absence of some material part of the Foundation, which defect no Churches (but by reason of their wilful want) need to have; for though it is certainly true, *that we cannot do the things which we would*, in going on to perfection (at least according to the highest import of that expression) by reason of the manifold obstructions within and without,

yet

yet doubtless we may learn all the *Rudiments* or first principles of Christianity, maugre the opposition of Sathan and all his *Auxiliaries*; otherwise it will follow that we cannot exceed the stature of Babes in Christ.

And that we may improve our Simile (by which we have explained our selves in Answer to the most important of our Brethrens demands) for the defence of the truth under debate. Let it be considered, that look how far forth such a necessary Member as the Hand, &c. doth conduce, not only to the well-being, but even to the very being of the body Natural, so far doubtless the least Foundation principle of Christianity, conduceth not only to the well-being, but to the very being of the Church of Christ; and consequently as he that taketh a Member from the body Natural (be it Hand or other Member) detracteth somewhat from the being of such a body, even so, he that taketh away from the principles or Foundation of Christianity, doth intrench upon the being of the body Mystical.

Now, that the Laying on of Hands, Heb. 6. 2. is such a principle as is a part of the Foundation, &c. is granted by our Brethren (as we have heard) and therefore we do with good right stand for it, as necessary even to the Essence of a Church, in such sort as we have even now declar-

red.

red. And, that that very Laying on of Hands, *Hel. 6.1,2.* is that which we hold it to be, and accordingly do practise, we trust is sufficiently proved before, and that as by other Arguments, so also by this; namely, because no other Laying on of Hands practised by our Brethren, or any body else, can with any shew of Truth or Reason be called the fourth principle of Christs Doctrine, or Milk for Babes in Christ.

Our Brethren do seem to be very sensible how that the removal or extirpation of any other of the principles, *Hel. 6.* would leave (if not mortality yet) a dangerous wound or grievous maine in the Body of Religion; and therefore could they but once humbly consider, they would certainly see that their rooting out the fourth principle, is very injurious to the Body of that Doctrine contain'd in those principles, *Hel. 6.1,2.*

Were our Brethren only wanting in respect of the truth we plead for, the case were the more tollerable; but now, together with their being wanting, they are become the enemies, and greatest opposers of it. It is certainly (O ye Searchers) your opposition to the truth which we profess, which is, and ever was the **CHIEF** cause of our *divisions*, as is evident by what is to be seen in several Congregations, where, they being imbodyed before they saw  
this

this truth, yet abstaining from *opposition* and *contradiction*, have very much Christian Communion, though they differ in their apprehensions about the point depending.

It is our *Saviours* rule, *He that is not against us, is on our part*; whence it will follow, *that he is not on our part who is against us*: But then (our Brethren) are the men (and in a manner the only men) which are against us in this point of Faith; And this is it which hath made two parties, where indeed there should have been but one.

You see then Brethren, that we lay the ground of our Non-*communion* with you, more upon your *opposing* the truth we hold, than upon your *non-submission* to it. Yea beshrew your late *opposition* discovered in your late *unseasonable* and *partial* search: for had it not been for that, we had gained some ground (through the help of God) of our long *dissensions* and unhappy distractions.

Had you (or at least many of you) carried it humbly and peaceably as men desirous to know the truth, it may be easie for you to know how dear you had been to us, when you consider how much it was upon our hearts, to imbrace you in *as large a degree of Communion as we could possible, without violation of our principles*; meerly upon consideration of your (as we thought)

thought) very Christian-like offers in order to peace, viz. That you would not only permit, but desire us to preach up the principle under consideration in your Congregations, but also that you would cease your opposition against it. And though it is true, our endeavours for peace went slowly on (you know the cause) yet you ought to have had patience, for things which are carried on with least violence, are commonly most permanent.

And here I should have given the Reader no further trouble about this particular, but that the Searchers are pleased to upbraid, and very strangely to reflect dishonour upon some among us, and upon us all for their sakes, as if we made not only many more *Fundamentals* and *Essentials* to Communion, then ever God made; but that we are so eagerly set upon making every thing fundamentall, as that every circumstantial thing is by us ready to be received into the adoption of Fundamentals.

But, what the Searchers should mean to suggest by their demands, as if we made mixed *Marriages*; The eating of bloud and things strangled: matters of *Apparel*; and the taking an *Oath* to end strife, the *Essentials* and *Fundamentals* of Churches, I cannot so much as imagine, unless it be to make themselves (as well as their Brethren ridiculous in the eyes of their Adversaries. However a necessity lyeth upon  
us

us to give the Reader not only a true account of the received Doctrine of the Church touching these matters, but also the grounds or reasons thereof; least otherwise being prejudiced with their strange reflections, their souls should be insnared in these enormities.

And first concerning mixed Marriages, thus we teach, *That it is unlawful (by the positive L.<sup>w</sup> of God) for those that are Members of the Visible Church of God, to Marry with those that are not of that body.* And for this we have the consent of Holy Scripture, declaring the will of God herein, ever since he chose a people out of the fallen race of *Adam* to be his Church. As appears by his revengeful stroke on those his Sons, who in the days of *Noah* took unto themselves Wives of those who were only the Daughters of men; but not such as were born from above. *Gen. 6. 2, 6, 7.* To which we will add our Saviours premonition and prediction, that the sin of the last days will be like their's in the days of *Noah*, *Luke 17. 27. to 30.* and particularly in the case of Marriage; for it cannot be that our Saviour in that place should be opposite to Marriage, as it is instituted of God for mans use, no more than he is against eating and drinking lawfully, but it is the sins of men committed in these actions respectively, which he disalloweth.

How

How much the Lord disallowed such Marriages in the time of the Law is evident, *Exod.* 34. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. *Deut.* 7. 3. *1 King.* 11. 1, 2. *Nek.* 13. And that the same transgression in the time of the Gospel ought to be avoided, cannot be denied, *1 Cor.* 7. 39. and 10. 8. *2 Cor.* 6. 14.

And that the nature of the sin committed by persons so unlawfully coupled is a carnal pollution (to say no more) cannot be withstood, but by such as trust more to their own Arguments then to the Scripture, seeing the Law which forbids Members of the Church to marry with those that are not, *Deut.* 7. 3. is interpreted of the very act, *1 King.* 11. 1, 2. *Thou shalt not go in unto them, &c.* and for further Light in this matter, read and consider these Scriptures, *Act.* 15. 29. *Mal.* 2. 11, 12. *Rev.* 2. 14.

As in this case the Scriptures are plain to him that is not perverse, so we have the consent of the Generality of men professing Christianity, both ancient and modern, to omit the manifold testimonies that might be brought, I will only set down two; The first saith thus.

Marriage is not only grounded on the Law of Nature and Nations, but also on the Law of God; for it was instituted and commanded by God, and was by Christ vindicated from abuses and corrup-

cions.---In which, regard must be had to Religion,  
that Marriage be not

The opinion of the  
University of Basl. made between those of dif-  
ferent Religions. It is one

thing to speak of Marriage  
already made; and of that which is to be made; of  
the former the Apostle speaks, 1 Cor. 7. But the  
latter is most severely prohibited, Exod. 34. 12.  
&c. Deut. 7. 3. Where a reason is rendered taken  
from the danger of seducing, to which Pauls saying  
agrees, 2 Cor. 6. 14. Be not unequally yoked with  
the wicked, or bear not the strange yoke with unbe-  
lievers. Sad examples we have of the events of  
such Marriages of the first world, Gen. 6. Of So-  
lomon, 1 King. 22. of Ahab, 1 King. 21. 15.  
of Jehosaphat, 2 King. 8. Of Valence the  
Emperour, who by his Wife was seduced and drawn  
to Arianism.

It is not lawful for Catholicks to marry with  
Hereticks or Infidels. Rhemi its Testament, in  
2 Cor. 6. 14. Where they al-

The opinion of  
the Rhem. so refer to St. Jerom. contra  
Jocinian lib. 1. and to the Coun-  
cil at Laodicea, cap. 10. 31.

Neither may it be inferred of these things  
which we have said that persons thus trans-  
gressing, must put away their yoke-fellows, no, God  
forbid that any should so imagine; for though  
it is true, God suffered that sin once to be so se-  
verely

verely punished, yet he hath no where by any *standing Law* enjoyned such a penalty; but on the contrary, hath permitted such Marriages to continue as have been unlawfully made, as is evident in the case of *Leah*, who was fraudulently given to *Jacob*, by which means *Rachel* the lawful Spouse was withheld from her Husband.

*Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall man be more Righteous then his Maker, Job 4. 17.*

Nothing can be said, why the Marriage of *Leah* to *Jacob* should stand, that will not as well argue the continuance of the Marriages of such as err in the case of their choice as aforesaid, the sin being rather greater in the one, than in the other; for it was not lawful to marry two Sisters, especially not in the life-time of each other. There was also in this act the sin of *Fornication* or *Adultery*. The Learned Protestants affirm the sin to be *Adultery*. See *Dr. Willet in his Hexapla in gen.* upon this Text.

Again, *Poligamy* (or having more Wives than one) was neither according to the *Institution of marriage*, nor warranted by any *positive Law of God*, but is rather against it. And had its rise (so far as the Scripture bears Record) from *Gen. 4. 19.*

a wicked man, yet divers such Marriages were permitted (when contracted) though never commanded, and so never lawful by any appointment of God.

When the sin of marrying unlawfully was punished, by separating the persons so coupled, the *Children* also was put away as well as the *Wives*, which howsoever it might stand with the state of the Jewish Church (and perhaps was necessary in respect of their Terrestrial Inheritances, and the policy of their Nation) yet surely it would be great cruelty for men professing Christianity, to turn their Wives and Children out of doors, who both by *the Law of Nature, and Nations* have as clear a right to all Temporal or Domestical priviledges now, as the Husband himself in any Nation whatsoever.

Finally, sith God hath grievously punished this sin of marrying contrary to his positive Laws in that case, provided for his peoples good, chiefly in things pertaining to the worship and service of God, let all Christians therefore stand in aw, and sin not, but commune with their own hearts in this behalf, least they provoke the Lord to plead against them by his judgments, for his eyes are upon the ways of men; to render to them the fruit of their doings. Chiefly those, who sin presumptuously

ously, for such do reproach the Lord, as it is written *Numb. 15 30, 31.*

In the next place, touching blood and things strangled, we know the wisdom of God hath forbidden the eating thereof to Noah and his Sons for ever. And when men had generally forgot- *Lev. 17. 13, 14, 15.* ten the Lord, he severed *Abraham* and his seed to be his heritage, and gave them this Law to observe (among others) which Law he hath established in the Churches of the *Gentiles* in those right needful decrees, which doth declare the repeal of the Cerimonial Law, and gives continuance to what was generally necessary, *Acts 15. 29.* upon the delivery whereof the Churches were established in that *F. i. h.* by which a man is justified, and not by the works of the Law.

True it is that which goeth into the man, defileth not a man, and consequently blood doth not defile any man by eating thereof. But disobedience which proceedeth from an unlawful desire to that which God hath forbidden, and so cometh out of the man, that defileth a man; so then, not the fruit which *Adam* did eat, but the sin which he committed defiled him, and the same will defile his Posterity, if they cover

and take the thing which God hath forbidden.

The Doctrine of our Churches about Apparel is this, that the adorning of Christians ought not to be that of *plating the hair, wearing of Gold, nor costly array*, with Rings and toys, as the humour of phantastick persons in City or Country commonly leads them. But that instead thereof, moderation, modesty, and yet decency, according to the state and condition of persons respectively, should be observed on all sides, that so Christians might be examples to others, even in these matters. And what though some person or persons in the Church be more than ordinary set against the vain fashions of our days, and sometimes lets their zeal go a step too far, is this so offensive to our Brethren, that they can no way bear this without such a publick reprehension? I fear in so doing they may have done the Church more disservice, then those whom they inveigh against.

What the Searchers should mean about these matters being made the *Essentials of Communion*, I cannot imagine, unless they would have us to suffer men to sin in these cases without being called upon to reform, and in case of obstinacy to be withdrawn from by the Church, as disorderly persons, that they may learn to be

ashamed

ashamed, (yet we mean not that they should be accounted as enemies, but admonished as Brethren) and surely, if this be their meaning, that offenders in these cases must be let alone in their sins; we should in so doing loose the order, and in time the Essence of Churches. For suppose now a gallant of the Times should desire to be Baptized, and to walk in Communion with the Searchers, only he tells them they must give him leave *to marry out of the Church*, and allow him the liberty to transgress the *Apostolical decrees*, in eating bloud and things strangled, and meats offered to Idols: and therewithall that he may wear Gold, and tread the steps of the *Gallants in matters of Apparel, &c.* Would the Searchers now admit such a person into their Communion? if not, then they make these things as necessary to Church-communion as we do: And certainly that which is ground sufficient to keep men out of the Church, will justify a Church in withdrawing from such, if they refuse to reform.

To give evidence by Oath, to terminate strife among men, we have not one Congregation in *England* (that I can hear of) doth oppose it, (indeed some particular persons are doubtful in that matter, because of our Saviours words, *Swear not at all*) and therefore it was very unnecessarily put to publick observation, as

an Essential of our Church-Communion.

What the Searchers do suggest against some, as *denying that Christ took flesh of the Virgin Mary*, is, I confess, a matter of great importance. And sure I am, many of our Congregations never heard of such a thing, till the Searchers became their informers: nor do I think there is so much as one Congregation in *England* that holds such a thing (for particulars no man may speak) however upon this occasion I can do no less then protest against that Opinion as a most *dangerous conceit*; nothing inferior to theirs that *deny that glorifies and blessed person to be God by Nature*; for as the one denies his *Manhood*, the other denies his *Godhead*, and so between them we have little left to fix on, for our Redemption and Salvation.

And as I have shewed my dislike to these conceits (to say no more at present) so I hold it requisite to protest my Faith in this case, as I have been taught, and as I have believed, and as (I trust) I shall hold fast unto the end.

That Faith which I have learned (and is the Faith of our Churches generally) is this, First,

*That the Lord Jesus, the Saviour of the World is God by Nature, and therefore of one substance with the Father as touching his Godhead. He is called the only begotten of the Father.*

The

The express image of his Fathers person. The true God and Eternal Life. The Lord Almighty. It is he by whom the Worlds were made. Without him nothing was made, which was made. He is that very Lord who in the beginning laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of his Hands. He is the *Alpha* and *Omega*, the first, and the last. He is said to be before all things, and by him all things consist. He is the *I A M*; who being in the form of God, thought not robbery to be equal with God. He is God over all blessed forever Amen. I conclude then, that he of whom these things are spoken, is doubtless God by Nature.

2. *This Lord Jesus the Saviour of the World is man by Nature.* He was made lower then the Angels, he took not on him the Nature of Angels, but the seed of *Abraham*. He is of one substance with his Church touching his Manhood; and for that cause he is not ashamed to call them Brethren. As they are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. He was made of a Woman, raised up of the fruit of *Dauids* Loins according to the flesh. He is *Dauids* Son, called frequently a man; and the Son of man. He had the properties and infirmities of man in all things, sin excepted. This his Birth, Growth, manner of  
Life

Life and Death do declare. I conclude then, he of whom these things may be said, is man by Nature. The short is this.

*Jesus the Saviour of the World was before all things, and he that made all things, therefore he is God by Nature, Jesus the Saviour of the World was born in time, and suffered death, or was slain; therefore he is man by Nature,*

Yet more shortly  
This Jesus is Immanuel, or God-Man in one Person.

## *The Third Part.*

**S**HowETH that our Brethrens rejecting and opposing the fourth principle of Christs Doctrine, enforceth a distinction in Communion (at least in part) between them, and the Churches which walketh in the Religious observation of it; and that all divisions which happen in the Church are not properly, but accidentally against her: as also that it is no absurdity to refuse to communicate with a people who may be allowed the appellation of a Church.

As