

least. 4. Most Christians on earth are guilty of Schism, and yet are not prevalently Schismatics, but still members of the Catholick Church. 5. The Bishops, e. g. in France, are more guilty of the Schism than the Protestants. See Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defence of *Land*.

Here are two parts.

1. That all are obliged to submit to all un-
finsful conditions of the
Episcopal communion
where they live, if im-
posed by the Ecclesia-
stical Government
thereof.

This proved by these
two degrees.

1. That the suppo-
sition of their being less
secure of salvation out
of this Episcopal com-
munion than in it, is
sufficient to prove them
obliged to submit to all
terms not directly sin-
ful, however unexpedi-
ent, rather than sepa-
rate themselves, or suf-
fer themselves to be ex-
cluded from this com-
munion, chap. 1. §. 7,
8, 9, 10.

1. This is false in the fore-expected ca-
ses: 1. If he be a Bishop to others, and
not to me (unless communion include
not subjection; for so we communicate
with many other Bishops). 2. If the con-
dition imposed be a thing which a Superi-
or Power forbiddeth, (King, or in some
cases Parents.)

The matter and consequences are so
weighty, as tell us it is not well done to a-
buse dull Readers thus with the deceitful
unexplained nature of *Episcopacy*, and
Communion. The love of truth and souls
forbid such deceit. 1. If some receive
only Parish-bishops (of the old sort) and
others also their Archbishops, and o-
thers such Diocesans as put down all Pa-
rish-bishops, which of these have Episco-
pal communion? 2. When of old, many
Ages, Voting, and Fighting, could not
tell men which was the true Bishop among
many competitors, and when at *Rome*
there were oft two or three at once; and
when the worst oft carried the possession;
and Councils themselves were for divers;
which was the Episcopal communion?
3. Is communion and subjection all one with
him, or divers? If divers, I have com-
munion with many Bishops that I am not
subject to. If the same, how many must
each man be subject to? and in what or-
der and cases? 4. *Communion* is 1. mental
or local; and the first, 1. In essentials.

2. In-

2. Integrals. 3. Accidents of Christianity. I have communion with all Christians in Essentials, with the best in most integrals; with none in all, nor in all accidents. 4. I am more secure in the mental communion of many Bishops, than of some one, and of All in Essentials, and certain things, than of some one in suspected things, especially in universal communion with Christ and his whole Church.

2. That there is indeed less security of salvation to be had even on performance of the Moral conditions of salvation, out of this Episcopal communion, than in it.

2. He that hath no communion with any true Bishops of Gods institution, in his judgment, will, and profession, hath no communion with Christs Church: But if they are, 1. of a false species, 2. incapable, 3. unordained, 4. obtruders not consented to by the Clergy and the Flock, it's safest to disown them. 5. And if they turn wolves, thorns, and thistles, or hereticks.

2. It's dangerous to refuse communion with the true *Episcopi Gregis*, but not with such as depose them. 3. And its doubtful as to the *Episcopi Episcoporum*.

This proved from two things.

1. That they cannot be so well assured of their salvation in the use of extraordinary as of ordinary means: nay that they being left to extraordinaries, is a condition either very hazardous, or at least very uncomfortable at present, whatever it may prove hereafter, Ch. II.

1. It's but deceit to distinguish only ordinary and extraordinary, in speaking of the necessity of means. The Gospel written or preached, is an ordinary means, which to want is hazardous indeed; so is meditation, prayer, and sacraments, where they may well be had, and Pastors to administer them. But there are many lesser means that may be wanting or ignorantly refused, where salvation is safe. The Church of England thinks preaching to be such, which forbiddeth men to go for Preaching, and from a bare Reader in his own Parish. And the *Indians* converted by *Ermentius* and *Edesius*, might have certain

2. That these ordinary means of salvation are, in respect of every particular person, confined to the Episcopal communion of the place he lives in, as long as he lives in it.

certain salvation before they had any Pastor. And so may they that cannot know among contenders which is the true Pastor either as to the *species* or individual.

But 2. Communion in every lawful thing is no ordinary requisite means of salvation.

Mark Reader that he said, *that suffer themselves to be excluded from Communion by such Governours, for refusing submission to un sinful things.* And Dr. Saywell, Bishop Gunnings Chaplain, and this man, make such refusal and schism damnable. Now mark here, how they make all indifferent imposed things consequently necessary to salvation, and make all such indifferences to be Articles of faith, or necessary to salvation to be believed. *E.g.* if Organs, the Cross in Baptism, Surplices, Church-images, Exorcisms, and five hundred such, be indifferent, and commanded by the Bishop, he that is excommunicated for not conforming to them, or withdraweth for it, is a damnable Schismatick: *Ergo*, it is necessary to salvation to conform to every one of them in that case: *Ergo*, it's necessary to salvation to hold them to be lawful (or else to use them while I verily take them to be sins). To what a mass now have these men brought the Articles or necessities to salvation! Doth any living man know all lawful things to be such?

This proved from Two things.

1. That these ordinary means of salvation are confined to the external Communion of the visible Church.

1. Then in *Abassia*, where there is but one *Abuna* Bishop, local Communion with him is impossible to most. 2. And how is the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who ordaineth him of that Place that is another Kingdom. 2. Then in one Place-Communion with *Papists*, in another with

Greeks, Moscovites, Abissines, Armenians, &c. is necessary in *unsinful things*. 3. Who will judg, but the Excommunicator, what is *unsinful as to his act*? 4. What a case were men in at Rome, under *Formosus* Stephen, *Sergius*, *Eugenius* 4. *John* 12. and 22. &c. and at *Alexandria* under *Peter*, *Meletius*, *Paulinus*, *Flavianus*, and so oft in other Schisms, and Nullities? 5. The *Novatians*, and *Joannites* had the ordinary means of salvation in *Constantinople*, under separate Pastors.

But it's true, that the ordinary means are confined to the visible Church, and its external Communion where it may be had. Of which more anon.

This proved from Four things.

1. We cannot be assured that God will do for us what is necessary for our salvation on his part, other wise than by his expresse promises that he will do it, *Chap. III. §. 1, 2.*

2. The ordinary means how we may assure our selves of our interest in his promises, is by our interest in his Covenant, by which they are conveyed to us, *Chap. III. from §. 5. to the end.*

3. The ordinary means by which we may assure our selves

1. Some think that if God had only commanded men to love him, call upon him, hate sin, seek life eternal, without an *expresse promise*, one might be sure it should not be done in vain.

2. But God hath expressly promised salvation to all that truly love, trust, and obey him, and seek first Gods Kingdom, and are pure in heart, holy, and love all men, though they were excommunicate for not crossing, subscribing, or thinking *Diocessans* unlawful.

Chap. 3. The Promises of God, and his *Covenant*, on his part, are all one. Those that God promiseth to save, shall certainly be saved: who those are, the Gospel fully tells us, yea, and told men before the particular Churches were fixed under their proper Pastors, called Elders and Bishops in the Scripture.

3. *Transaction* is an ambiguous word. 1. It was transacted by making the promise by Christ on Earth. 2. It is transacted

of our interest in this Covenant with him, is by our partaking in these external solemnities, by which this Covenant is transacted and maintained, *Chap. IV, V, VI, VII.*

4. The participation in these external solemnities, with any legal validity, is only to be had in the external Communion of the visible Church, *Chap. VIII.*

B. (II.) That this visible Church, to whose external Communion these ordinary means of salvation are confined, is no other than the Episcopal Communion of the place where

acted by giving the consenting penitent Believer a Right, before God, to Christ and salvation, when he first truly so consenteth. 3. It is transacted by a solemn Ministerial Investiture, sealing and delivering that Right for the fuller comfort of the consenter, and *in foro Ecclesie*, to give the Right of external Communion, as a Tessera, when the person is baptized. 4. It is transacted by renewed confirmation, and for further grace, daily in the Eucharist. I love not to offend you; but I must be true to truth and souls, and therefore tell men, that these Generals and Confusions are but Cheats.

3. Would you have men believe that *external solemnities* are necessary to the Right of Heart-Covenanters before God, as to salvation? Or that all *external solemnities* are of the same necessity? The Church of England takes Confirmation to be an external solemnity, for assuring men of Gods favour, by the sign of Imposition of a *Diocesans* hands; and yet bind you to profess that it is not necessary to salvation, but the baptized Infants are *certainly and undoubtedly saved* without it. Litanies, Processions, and many *external solemnities* are not essential to external Communion with the visible Church.

Chap. 8. O tremendous! Is it no other? Is not the universal visible Church, consisting of all professed Christians, *Headed only by Christ*, the only universal Church visible in the world? Is there no Communion with this as such? Had the baptized Eunuch (by *Philip the Evangelist*) no Communion with
the

any one lives, whilst
he lives there.

the visible Church, nor promise of salvation; nor the *Iberians*, *Indians*, and many others that were baptized before they knew, or had a Bishop? Do not baptizing Presbyters (and Lay-men say, *Tertullian* and the Papists) assure men of salvation, though they should not hear of a Bishop? Why was not *Diocesan* Episcopacy in the Creed, if the belief and obedience be necessary to salvation?

This proved in Two parts.

a (1.) That the visible Church, to whose external Communion these ordinary means of salvation are confined, is the Episcopal Communion.

a (1.) 1. Apostles and Evangelists took men into the visible Communion of the universal Church, before they had particular Church-Bishops. 2. Fixed Church-Communion was exercised universally under Congregational, or Parochial Bishops or Pastors, without such as our *Diocesans*. It must be Pastoral, or true Episcopal regular Communion. 3. Many Individual Bishops, separating from one another, have been, and may be in one City. 4. If e. g. the Bishop of *Lincoln*, have many Counties, and one differing from him, were chosen by the Clergy at *Leicester*, *Hartford*, &c. as he was by the King, which of them is the Bishop on the place? If *Gloucester* Clergy and People had chose another when *Goodman*, a Papist, was Bishop, which was the Bishop?

This proved by these degrees.

(A.) 1. That salvation is not ordinarily to be expected without an external participation of the Sacraments.

1. 1. Salvation is pronounced by Conformists to be certain upon Baptism, without any other Sacrament. 2. Popes and Papists are as much as any for tying salvation to Sacraments; and yet a Pope *Victor* and his Council, at *Benevent*, 1078. decree, that rather than Communicate with a *Simonist*, they should persist without visible Communion, and in mind join-
ed

ed to Christ, have his Communion.

3. What shall they do *ordinarily* in *Italy, Spain, France, &c.* that have none but Papist Bishops.

1. *Negatively*, Not by those other popular means, which ordinary persons are apt to trust in, to the neglect of the Sacraments; that is,

1. Not by hearing the Word Preached, Chap. IX.

2. Not by private Prayer, nor indeed by any out of the Communion of the Church, Chap. X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV.

2. *Positively*, That Salvation is ordinarily to be expected only by this external participation of the Sacraments.

1. Proved concerning Baptism, Chap. XV.

1. Wilful neglect of any known means, sheweth wilful disobedience against God. But many means may be ignorantly neglected without destroying assurance of salvation. *Tertullian* thought children should stay from Baptism, unless in danger of death: and *Nazianzen* was for some years delay. This ignorance damned not the practisers. Apoeryphal books, divers Sacraments, Ceremonies, Church-Offices, Doctrines, have been controverted means among true Christians. 2. *Faith comes by hearing*, *Rom. 10.* Christ blesteth them that hear and do it: Thousands are mentioned as believing by hearing, and salvation is promised to Faith.

2. 1. *Whoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved: Ask and ye shall have.* True faith and conversion, wrought by hearing Gods word, and working by true love and prayer, hath many a promise of pardon and salvation. 2. Is a baptized praying believer out of the Communion of Christs Church, though he doubt of Diocesans, or Patriarchs? He is not.

2. 1. Ordinarily faith comes by hearing, and hearing by preaching; and he that truly believeth shall be saved, *John 13. 16.* 2. I think many Score, or Hundreds of Protestant Divines have proved that Baptism giveth not the first Right to life, but only solemnly confirmeth, sealeth, and by Ministerial investiture publicly delivereth that which true

Faith.

Faith received before. See *Gataker's two Tracts* on Dr. *Ward's* and Dr. *Davenant's Theses*. 3. What's Baptism to Episcopacy; till King *James* alter'd it, Women might Baptize in *England*, and Priests still may. And are men Baptized into the *Name*, or *Belief* of *Diocelans* (as *Bellarmino* saith, Baptism binds them to the Pope). Prove this if you can.

2. Concerning the Lords Supper, Chap. XVI, XVII.

2. If Baptism undoubredly save, at what Age doth the effect cease? 2. The Lords Supper is necessary for corroboration, and for expressing true obedience, and living by Faith on Christ, where it can lawfully be had, and the need and use of it is understood.

II. That the validity of the Sacraments depends on the Authority of the persons by whom they are administered, Chap. XVIII.

(B.) This is false: If they be given by a Lay-man, falsely pretending Orders, or by one who hath no Authority through incapacity, or usurpation; yet the receiver loseth not his Right; he taketh it as from God: and if his ignorance be not culpable, there is not so much as disobedience in it. 2. If I prove that Papists have no such Authority as you plead for, are all their Baptisms and Ordinations null?

III. No other Ministers have the Authority of Administring the Sacraments, but only they who receive their Orders in Episcopal Communion.

III. *Episcopal Communion* is the *Coturnus*, the Hose drawn over your ulcer and Inare. 1. We have mental Communion, in Essentials, with all true Bishops in the world. 2. We have Subject Communion with true Parish-Bishops. 3. And with their Ruling Bishops, at least as Magistrates. 4. *Novatians*, *Luciferians*, *Donatists*, and others, in time of Schisms, had all Orders in Episcopal Communion, and so have *Papists*, *Greeks*, *Moscovites*, *Armenians*. 5. Parish-Bishops have more proof of Authority from

from Christ than the Diocesans, or many hundred Congregations that have no other Bishops. 6. Authority may be given by God, without any Ordination, where it cannot be had, or not without sinning.

This proved by Four degrees.

1. That the Authority of Administring the Sacraments must be derived from God, Chap. XIX.

2. That though it be derived from God, yet it is not so derived without the mediation of those men to whom it was at first committed, Chap. XX.

3. That it cannot be so derived from those men to whom it was first committed, without a continued succession of persons, orderly receiving Authority

1. No doubt but all true Authority must be derived from God.

2. Those to whom it was first given, were the Twelve Apostles. They are considered, 1. As the Inspired Prophetical Declarers and Recorders of the Laws, and Doctrine, and Promises of Christ. 2. As chief Pastors of the Church, to gather and rule it. All Gods gifts and graces that come to us by the mediation of the Gospel, come by the Apostles mediation in the first sense, as declaring Christs Will, how Ministers shall be made in all Ages. And as chief Pastors, gathering, and settling the first Churches, which, by Christs Charter, shall call their Pastors, and so others, to the end of the world; they may be said to be *Mediators* herein. 3. But they mediate not as the Donors of the Pastoral power, as being Pastors themselves, but only as Ministerial investors. The Sacraments come not to us without the mediation of the Apostles, but they made them not, nor make them effectual, nor make new Apostles to deliver them.

3. This is deceitful confusion. 1. Authority to Administer Sacraments, and Authority to call others to administer them, are different things. 2. And so is succession of Apostolical power, and succession of common Ministry. 3. And so is giving power, as the Donor, and giving

from those who had Authority to give it them from those first times of the Apostles to ours at present, *Chap. XXI.*

4. That this Authority is not now to be expected any where but in the Episcopal Communion, *Chap. XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV.*

giving it as an investing servant. 4. And *proper giving it*, and *improper*, which is but *qualifying* the persons to *receive it*.

1. Apostolical Prophetical conveyance hath no such succession. 2. The Flock that have no Authority to Administer Sacraments, partake of the Authority to call others to do it. 3. Inferiors may have Authority to call Superiors (else the highest could not be made). 4. None of these people give the power, but their Election is part of the receivers qualifications, to whom God giveth it by his Law or Charter; And then as servants, they solemnize the Investiture. 5. The power of this Law or Charter is never interrupted: But if all Pastors were dead an Hundred years, it would renew Pastoral power in the Church, without uninterrupted Donors or Investors.

4. This conveying power is where-ever Gods Law, and capable receivers are: A capable receiver is, 1. One personally qualified with sufficiency and willingness. 2. And that hath the Churches and Ordainers necessary consent, when ordinary for order sake, the Ordainers then must invest him by declaring him authorized by God, &c.

The regular Ordination (like publick Matrimony after contract) is to be by authorized Ordainers; and most Bishops, *Diocesan, Papists, Greeks, Moscovites, Armenian*, &c. are of more doubtful Authority than Congregational, or Parish-Bishops, though the former usurp the name, as appropriated to them.

b. 2. 1. Then

b. (2.) That the Episcopal Communion, to which every particular person is obliged to joyn himself, as he would enjoy the ordinary means of his own particular salvation, is the Episcopal Communion of the place where in he lives, whilest he lives in it, *Chap. XXVI.*

b. 2. 1. Then men in *Rome, Italy, Spain, France, &c.* must be of the Papists Prelates Churches and Communion. 2. *Paulinus* and *Flavian, Donatists, Novatians, Arrians, &c.* may have Bishops in the same place. And the Orthodox, two, or more at once: *Grotius* thought as many as there were Synagogues in a City. 3. Then if I prove the chief Pastor of a Parish, or City-Church, to be a true Bishop by virtue of Gods Law; and if he have better Qualification, and Election, and Ordination, to be of surer Authority than the Diocesan, it's his Communion that we must prefer. 4. But indeed Baptism and Salvation are ordinarily given before Episcopal Communion of any sort. 5. They that thought the Pope Antichrist (as most Protestant Bishops long did), thought it a duty to reject the Communion of the Bishops of the places where they lived: And *Denmark*, and other Countries set up others against them that were ordained by *Bugenhagius*, and other Prsbyters. 6. Parochial and Diocesan bounds are humane mutable institutions. 7. If the Bishop of the place be a Schismatick, the Communion of a better near is better.

b. II. That the nature of this obligation to un sinful conditions of their Episcopal Communion, is such as will make them guilty of the sin of SCHISM, who rather than they will submit to such Condi-

b. II. 1. All causeless separation from any Christians, or causeless disobedience to any Pastor, or neglect of any Christian duty, needful to the Churches peace and concord, and every opinion and practice that is against them doth make a man guilty of sinful Division, or Schism in some degree. And while every Christian hath many errors and

sins,

tions, either separate themselves, or suffer themselves to be excluded from Communion by their respective Diocesan Ordinaries, Chap. XXVII.

ins, which all tend to some sinful breach (as the least fore is *solutio continui*), I cannot see but every man living hath some guilt of Schism; nor that there is any Church on earth that hath not some such guilt: But every degree of guilt denominateth not the man, or Church a Schismatick, in a predominant or mortal sense. And in Charity, I hope that even some of those heinous Schismatics may be saved, that divide the Churches by their usurpation, obtrusion, sinful impositions, and worldly domination; yea, some that in blind zeal put down Parish-Bishops, and smite and silence the Pastors, and scatter the Flocks. And if I must have Communion with none that's guilty of Schism, with what Church or Bishop should I joyn? And if their Sacraments be invalid, what a case is *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, yea and *England* in? Must all be baptized again that they baptized?

2 But it's no schism but a duty for the people as far to forsake a sinful Bishop (much more an usurper) as *Cyprian* and that Council advised them to do in the case of *Martial* and *Basiliides*.

3. And after all this deceitful confusion, note Reader, that he denieth not our disobedience to be lawful in case of *sinful conditions imposed*. And if we fully prove not this to be our case, let our accusers silence us, and let our guilt be our shame.

4. And if people that had Parish-Bishops on the place where they lived, lawfully called, shall forsake them to obey a Diocesan that is not on the place, but perhaps

perhaps Forty, or Fifty, or Sixty Miles off, and never saw them, and was obtruded contrary to the ancient Canons, which nullifie such, and sets himself to silence faithful Pastors, and persecute them, and other godly Christians, for not sinning heinously upon deliberate choice and covenant, doth not even this man conclude such to be Schismaticks that are out of the ordinary way and hope of salvation.

CHAP. III.

The consequence of Mr. Dodwell's foresaid doctrine.

1. **T**HOSE that live under the Popish Bishops in *Italy, Spain, France, &c.* must live in their communion, and under their command in all un sinful things.

2. The Protestant Churches that have not Episcopal Ordination, are no true Churches, and have no true Ministers or Sacraments, nor any Covenant-right to salvation.

3. The Protestant Churches are in the same unchurched damnable case that have Bishops, if they have not an uninterrupted succession of such from the Apostles canonically ordained.

4. Therefore the Churches of *Denmark, Germany, &c.* that have Superintendents ordained at the Reformation by *Bugenbagius, Pomeranus* a Presbyter, and all the rest whose succession was interrupted, are in the same case.

5. It is Schism, and rejecting Sacraments, and Covenant-right to salvation, in all the people that continue in such Protestant Churches, and communicate with them.

6. It is better for the Protestants in *France* to joyn with the Papists, than to live as they do without Sacraments or Church-communion.

7. Yet (by self-contradiction) it will follow, that certainly the Church of *Rome*, and all that derive their ordination from that Church,

Church, have no true Bishops, Ministers, Sacraments, Churches, nor Covenant-right to salvation; for it's certain their true succession hath been oft interrupted, 1. By such utterly incapable persons as all History describeth, and even *Baronius* calleth *Apostaticos non Apostolicos*; and such as divers General Councils judged Hereticks, Infidels, Simoniaks, &c. e.g. *Eugenius* 4. who yet kept in. 2. By such whose false ordination the Canons expressly null. 3. By many Schisms, two or three Popes at once, of whom none can tell who had the right, or whether any. 4. By the Popes taking on him to be Christs Universal Vicar, an Office in *specie* usurpt, which he maketh his Episcopacy, and as such giveth his orders. And all his Presbyters have turned the true Ministry into the false one of Mass-Priests; and being no true Ministers, can give no true Sacraments by his rule.

8. Yea it is certain, that few, if any Churches on earth, can prove such an uninterrupted succession as he and the *Papists* describe, and most its known have no such thing.

9. Therefore if any have such a succession, they cannot know it, it being a thing that cannot be proved; and so cannot be sure that they are true Churches, &c.

10. For the certainty of any true Ministry, Church, Sacraments and Salvation, dependeth on such knowledg of History as is not in the world: *viz.* To know that this Bishop and his Ordainer, and his Ordainer, and his Ordainer, and so up to the Apostles, were every one true Bishops, and truly Ordained; which no mortal man can know.

11. Men that by a Prince, against even the Nullifying Canons, can but get possession of Patriarchal and Diocesan Churches, without the Clergy or peoples choice, have thereby the power of damning men that fear God, at their pleasure. For, 1. they must pass for the Bishops of the place. 2. They may command any *unsinful thing*, and excommunicate him that doth not obey. 3. He is a Schismatick that *suffers* himself so to be Excommunicate, and so is in a damnable state. 4. He cannot hinder it, not knowing the thing to be *unsinful*.

12. For by this whoever will escape damnable schism, must be one that knoweth the *unsinfulness* (as he speaks) of all things in the world that are such, which a Prelate may command; or else he must do any thing which he judgeth sin, if a Prelate command it. But that is wicked Idolizing man.

13. And

13. And therefore by this rule, no man living can be saved that a Prelate hath a mind to damn; or from his damning impositions. For no man living knoweth the lawfulness of all lawful things, and therefore may take a commanded thing for sin that is not: and then if he wilfully do that which he judgeth sin, he rebelleth against God; if he do it not, the Prelate may excommunicate him, and irresistibly make him a damnable schismatick.

14. And hereby there are as many hundred new Articles of Faith made, as there are things lawful which a Prelate will command. For though all is not to be done that is to be believed, yet all must be *believed* to be lawful and duty which must be done as such: e. g. We cannot love God, worship him, hear and read his Word, &c. as by Divine obedience, unless we believe it to be our duty by a Divine command. Therefore when as Mr. *Dodwell*, Dr. *Saywell*, and such others tell us what damning schism it is to disobey such commands of the Bishops, or to suffer our selves to be Excommunicate, it plainly includeth that it is as damning a sin to take any lawful thing to be a sin, and not to believe it to be lawful whatever the Bishop shall command. And so to how many hundred indifferent things may the Articles of our Faith be extended, while it is made ordinarily necessary to Salvation to do them, and therefore to believe them to be lawful?

15. By this he confoundeth *Communion* and *Obedience*: I may have communion with many Bishops whom I am not bound to obey: But I cannot hinder them from Excommunicating me without obeying them.

16. Yea, he maketh Communion and Salvation to lye not only on such obedience, but on such *perfection* of obedience as reacheth to every lawful indifferent thing. Whereas God himself under the Gospel accepteth of sincerity, instead of perfection which the Law required of perfect man.

17. This is the way to make Bishops absolute Lords of Kings and States, and all the world, if they can make them believe that on pain of damnation for schism, all must obey them even in every indifferent thing.

18. If you would ferret him out of his Burrough, ask Mr. *Dodwell*, what if the Bishop of the place where I live contradict the Archbishop, or the Synod, or most of the Bishops in the land, which must I obey to escape damning schism? Doubtless he will allow me to disobey my Bishop. But what if the National Synod gain

gainſay the Provincial? He will ſay, I may diſobey the Provincial? But what if a Council of many Nations, called General, gainſay the National? and it be known that our National Church is gainſayed by the far greateſt part of the Biſhops in the world? which muſt I obey? If the National, why not a Provincial againſt them? And why are not they Schiſmaticks for diſobeying a General Council? If it be the greater Council that I muſt obey, 1. What's become then of his doctrine of obeying the *Episcopacy* of the place where we live? 2. And then we are brought under a foreign Jurisdiction. 3. And who but the Pope muſt call that General Council, preſide, approve, &c.? 4. And among all the erroneous and contradicting Councils called *General*, how ſhall all Chriſtians know which of them to obey? We ſee whither all will come at laſt. But ſaith Biſhop *Bilſon*, *To ſuch Councils called General, we owe reſpect for concord, if they abuſe us not by error or uſurpation; but ſubjection and obedience we owe them none.*

19. How hardly will theſe men ever reſolve one's conſcience which is to be taken for the *Episcopacy of the place*, when there are in the ſame place both different ſpecies of Biſhops, and alſo divers Biſhops of the ſame ſpecies, and all pretending to be right. In *Ireland* both the *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant* Biſhops pretend to juſt ſucceſſion; and ſo they did in *Bohemia*, *Poland*, *Transylvania*, *Hungary*, &c. And doth ſalvation lye on mens knowledg who hath right?

20. And how contrary is it to the way of Chriſt, and the ancient Church (that made the Baptiſmal covenant the terms of ſalvation) for men to make it neceſſary for every poor man and woman that will have Covenant-right to ſalvation, and eſcape damning ſchiſm, to be able to decide the controverſies between all ſuch pretenders, and to know whether their Biſhops be of a true ſpecies, and have true Ordination, and to be ſuch rare Hiſtorians as to know that all the line of Ordainers down from the Apoſtles to their Biſhops, were truly ordained? O difficult terms!

21. Doth he not condemn all thoſe Ancient and Modern Chriſtians as Fautors of damning Doctrine who thought that when there were none of the Clergy to do it, lay-men might baptize and give the Lords Supper? *Grotius* told us his judgment for it in *Differtat. de Cena adminiſtrat. ubi Paſtores non ſunt*: And he hath vindicated *Tertullian's* judgment for it, confeſſed by *Rigaltius*. *Anton. Govea* tells us it was the caſe of the Chriſtians of *Malabar*,

Malabar, &c. called of *St. Thomas*, whose Bishops being all destroyed, they caused a Deacon to administer the Eucharist, as the Bishops and Presbyters had done (which *Grotius* also repeateth). *Jonan. Antiochenus* magnified by *Socrates*, lib. 6. cap. 3. when at *Antioch* there were two Churches, with two Bishops, *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, stuck to *Meletius* till he died, and after, for three years, would communicate with neither. Did he by this become a damned Schismatick, or lose his Covenant-right to salvation?

22. Many of old were chosen for Bishops before they were baptized (the cases of *Ambrose*, *Nectarius*, *Synesius*, &c. are known): If the Church thought them all to be in a state of damnation, for want of the Sacrament, it's strange that they would choose them to be their Bishops (though it was irregular).

Indeed it's true that *Grotius* saith (*ibid.* in fine), that *Chrysostomes*, *Nazianzenes*, and others cases tell us, that it was ordinary in the *Greek-Church* to delay baptizing even the children of the faithful, till at full years (about Twenty). Were they all that while without any promise of salvation, or ordinary hope?

23. What a task will it be for *Mr. Dodwell* to tell us what state the baptized are in till they receive the Lords Supper? Baptism saveth them once; but yet till they receive the Lords Supper by a Minister, in successive Episcopal Orders, they have no Covenant-title to salvation, by his way. But some Communicate not till Thirty years old, some not till One and Twenty, and in *England* scarce any before Sixteen. Are they all this while the children of God, or of the Devil? And when is it that their Christianity ceaseth for want of the other Sacrament? I believe that if they truly believe, they are Gods children before they come to the second Sacrament (or the third, as some call it.) Was *Constantine Mag.* in a state of damnation, who was not baptized till near his death? Or the good Emperour, *Valentinian*, who died unbaptized, but taken by *Ambrose* for a blessed man? What absurdities are men fain to use, to get the Mastery of the Christian world, by making men believe that they can save or damn them by the power of Sacraments?

24. And how is this man for Conformity, by which they subscribe assent to the certain salvation of Infants, so dying without Confirmation; and ordain that the Lords Supper be not Administred to any till they are ready to be Confirmed, by learning the Catechism, and recognizing the Covenant? &c.

25. Doth he not make the chief Bishops and Reformers of the Church of *England*, to be the promoters of the Doctrine which he accounteth so damnable, when Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in his *Irenicon* recites the words of *Cranmer*, and others of them, at a Consultation, down-right against not only the necessity of his uninterrupted succession, but also even of Episcopal Ordination it self? And I have elsewhere cited about Fourteen of them, for the validity of Ordination without Bishops: And Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, Bishop *Edw. Reynolds*, and many more, held that no Form of Government was of Divine determination. Did all these plead for damning Schism, against all title to salvation?

26. And what could more directly contradict the main tenor of the Gospel, which tells us of the saving power of the Word Preached, how it converteth souls, and promiseth salvation to all that truly believe and repent? Inasmuch that *Paul* thanks God that he baptized few of the *Corinthians*, because God sent him not to baptize, but to Preach the Gospel?

27. But his Doctrine feigneth, that God will damn them that truly believe, repent, love God, forsake sin, for want of the Sacrament: or else that the Word converteth none, but only Sacraments convert men.

28. And then it will follow, that none but unbelievers, impenitent wicked men should be first admitted to the Sacrament; for if that only converteth, then it is only the unconverted that must first be received to it.

29. When all's done, he doth but contradict his end; for it's hard to find a National Episcopacy on earth, which imposeth no unlawful thing on Ministers or people: And with all such he speaketh not for our Communion.

30. Either Ordination, and Collation of Church-power, must be given by Superiors, or by Equals: if by Equals, why may not Presbyters make Presbyters? If by Superiors, then who shall give the Pope his Power? Or if you think any other be the highest, who makes them such? Who giveth the Archbishop of *Canterbury* his Power?