

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

be in that a Conformist to them. Christian communion in the *Essentials* is equally necessary to *Christian Bishops* and *Christian Kings*: And the same I say of the *Integrals*. Doth this man think that all Readers are such Sots, as to acquiesce in the cheat of the general name of *Christian communion*? Are Christian Princes no Christians? Are they not as much as Bishops under the general obligation, to do all things in Love, and promote the concord and peace of Christians? This is not arbitrary, that is, left to their refusing choice: But the time and other circumstances are left much to the prudence of Kings, as they are to Bishops.

But, saith this Doctor, [*The Episcopal Office is but one, and therefore ought to be administred by the mutual advice and consent of Bishops, who all equally share in it.*]

Answ. I doubt if I do but distinguish the *Species* and the *Individuum*, these new Doctors are so far above me in Academical Learning, that they will but scorn it. But I must venture. The Episcopal Office in *specie* is but one. And I am such an Heretick as to think the same of Monarchy (though there may be gradual and accidental differences) yea of Fathers, Husbands, Masters of Families, Schoolmasters: The Office is one in *specie*. Is it one as individuate by the subject? Sure *Chrysostome*, and *Theophilus*, and *Epiphanius*, *Bonner*, *Gardiner*, and *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, were not one man? But perhaps you think that as *Averrhois* thought all Souls are one, individuate only by receptive matter; so all Bishops are one, and individuate only subjectively. But if it were proved that Spirits are like Light, which in an hundred Glasses sheweth an hundred Faces; yet Episcopacy being a Relation, a *Fus* and *Obligation*, methinks is not capable of being one in many thousand various subjects, save only by an union in *specie*. But, Reader, I am no University Scholar, and must not be too peremptory against the elevated Doctors of this Church, the most Learned and excellent, if you will believe themselves, that are in all the world.

But it is *Cyprians* words, that *Episcopatus unus est*; some fence that holy Martyr meant by those words: No doubt of it. In *specie* the Office is one: Though such as Mr. *Dodwell* would persuade men, that we have just so much power and work as the ordaining Bishops intended to give us; yet Christ is Christ, whether these men will or not, and hath described the Pastoral Office which no man hath power to alter, and it is the same in all the world. And it is one therefore, in that it is one sort of work which they have all to do:

do. And one Church Catholick whose publick good they are all to promote, and one end to attain.

And the difference between men whose power is founded in personal sufficiency, and others, must be still observed. *E.g.* A man licensed in general to be a Physician, a Schoolmaster, &c. is hereby related *indefinitely* to all the world; because he may set up any where, when called; and may practise occasionally where he comes. But as he is related specially to an Hospital, to a School, as their peculiar Physician, Schoolmaster, &c. so he is not related to all the world. And therefore Bishops are so oft condemned by the Canons, that play the Bishops in other mens Dioceses (as *St. Epiphanius* did in *St. Chrysostomes*.)

And thus indeed a King is not so much related to all the world, nor the General of an Army, as a Christian Minister, a Physician or a Philosopher is. For the Offices and Power of these is but for the exercise of their personal qualifications (as they will find one day to their cost, who have learned to do their Episcopal works *per alios*, and as the Lord Bacon in his *Considerations* hath clearly opened): But the very place of a King (like the first figure in numbers) is of great signification without his personal abilities, and more of the Government may be committed to Officers, than by a Bishop in Church-Government, or a Philosopher, or Physician, or Schoolmaster, can be done. A man may be first a Licensed Physician, Schoolmaster, or Preacher in general, and after fixed to some company, (and in the fixed sense no man is a Bishop out of his Diocese, much less to all the world: But in the first case he is in an aptitude to be employed or fixed any where in the world). But a King or a General is not first for his personal Abilities ordained in general to the Office, as an aptitude preparatory to his fixing; though personal aptitude is exceeding desirable *ad bene esse*. And now judge, whether *Episcopatus unus est*, do make a Sovereign Aristocracy, as *una persona politica* by a major Vote to govern all the Church.

§ 11. He adds, [*And Catholick Communion is essential to the Unity of the Church: And he who violates it by an unreasonable dissent, whatever he be, is a Schismatick, and therefore no Member of the Catholick Church.*]

Answ. Almost as many Fallacies or Errours, as words. 1. What Communion is essential to Unity? Is it Communion in one form

of Liturgy? Or in the same Ceremonies? Or the same mutable Church-Offices? Or the same Oaths, Covenants, Declarations, Subscriptions, which are imposed on pain of Silencing in *England*? Communion in the same Spirit, Faith, Hope, Love, and reception of all the essentials of Christianity, is needful to our continued Unity; but so is not our communion in mere Integrals and Accidents.

Answ. 2. Communion in the usual sense is not essential to Unity, but its necessary consequent, no more than *operatio* is essential *ad esse*, which ever goeth before it.

Answ. 3. That which is essential to your Union with the Church, is not essential to the Church: You and all *Europe* may Apostatize, and the essence of the Catholick Church not be altered.

Answ. 4. Every man that erreth in any thing, so far violateth Communion by an *unreasonable Dissent*: So did either *Chrysostome*, or *Epiphanius* and *Theophilus*; either *Cyril* or *Joan. Ant.* and *Theodoret*; either *Martin*, or the Synods of Bishops that he separated from; either the Bishops of *Rome*, or the *Italians* that cast him off, and set up a Patriarch at *Aquileia*; either the *Roman* or the *Greek Church* long: In a word, the twelve fore-mentioned great Parties of Christians that now make up the Christian world (which to me is the Catholick Church) do dissent and partly separate from each other: And every erroneous dissent is unreasonable. But many that separate from local Communion, and rashly judge others, separate not from Faith, Love, or any Essential of Christianity, and therefore not from Christ nor his Body.

Answ. 5. A Schismatick that separates from Christ, or the Universal Church, is no Member of it; but millions are Members of it, that are guilty of sinful Divisions in the Church, and Schism from particular Churches.

Answ. 6. Ex ore tuo: As by this general charge of Schism you cut off almost all the Christian world, so your self and such as you notoriously. Do not these violate Catholick communion, who *ipso facto* excommunicate all that your Canons so Excommunicate, and that Silence thousands of Ministers, and plead for their being laid in Jayls with Rogues, for not doing such things as ours, which the Catholick Church never owned or agreed in? Do you believe the Christian Verity and the Life to come, and yet think that God will not judge them guilty of Church-dividing that do
all

all this? And that reproaching his Servants will excuse you from the Guilt?

§ 12. Saith he, [*The Christian Church is governed by the Episcopal Colledge, wherein every Bishop hath equal Power.*]

Ans. 1. This is your fundamental Errour, if it be not a down-right Heresie; and you and the Papists Hereticks by it; we must have a narrower Definition of Heresie than most of you yet allow. If it prove that Christ hath set up no Vicechrist, nor universal Subgovernours; Can you deny this to be High-Treason against him? Dr. Barrow hath fully proved it.

Ans. 2. Then if you be not governed by such an Episcopal Colledge, you are a Schismatick and Usurper, unauthorised, as not governed by such a Colledge: No man is governed by that which is not. But there is no such universal governing Colledge. Bishops now govern the world but *per partes & in propriis Provinciis*, as local Governours, as Justices do the Kingdom, and not as an Universal Colledge or Aristocracy. Where is that Colledge that governs you? Which way had you their Mandates? Were they gathered from all Nations of the Christian world? Who compared the Votes? What were the cases put to them? Are you not ashamed to tell sober men of such a Colledge?

Ans. 3. By this you unchurch all the Christian world: For none of them are governed by such a Colledge. All good Christians live in as much concord as confederates, as their imperfections will allow; but none on earth obey an Universal Senate, or Colledge. The Papists do not, for they cut off (saith your Archbishop Brambal, three fourth parts.) The Protestants are governed by no such Colledge, who know of none, and here by Oath renounce all Forreign Jurisdiction. The *Greeks*, the *Armenians*, the *Abassines*, &c. are none of them so governed: It's a brave Plea for the Catholick Church, which nulleth it, and makes all Christians Schismatics and no Catholics. You have no shift but the Papal and Sectarian tricks, to unchurch all save themselves, and call their Sect all the Catholick Church, and then there may possibly be a Colledge at *Rome* or elsewhere that you may hear from, and be judged by.

§ 13. Saith he, [*This is a very different thing from the arbitrary combinations of Secular Princes.*]

Ans^w. 1. Are not *Christian Princes Spiritual* as well as Bishops? I hope you are not ripe for *Hildebrand's* Doctrine, that Kings are but for the Body, and Priests for the Souls, and therefore as far below the Priests, as the body is below the soul, and as the Moon below the Sun.

Ans^w. 2. What difference is there but accidental, and the different matter of their Offices? Princes are bound by God to promote the Churches Unity and Peace, and to confederate and consult as far as the common good of all the Churches doth require it, and to do nothing against it. And this is it that justifieth and requireth Pastoral Synods.

Ans^w. 3. But indeed there is a difference between the obligations to Synods, and subjection to them, which was laid on men in one Empire, (and so in other National Churches) and that which is laid on men all over the world for supposed General Councils, or a Colledge, by your fiction: This difference you must not hide.

§ 4. His third proof is from the old use of *Communicatory Letters or Certificates*, which, he saith, is a plain argument of *Communion*, &c.

Ans^w. 1. Are not all these three proofs the same, *Writing Letters of Church-affairs, Consultation and Communication*?

Ans^w. 2. Do any of us deny his conclusion, That this proveth communion among them? Are these kind of arguings fit to prove us Schismatics to be ruined? Or is not the world heinously abused by such men? The Question is, *Whether there be an Episcopal Colledge as one Aristocratical Supreme, having power of Legislation and Judgment over the whole Christian world, whom all must obey that will be Christians in the Catholick Church?* And the Papists and these men prove the need of communion, and then think they have proved such an *Aristocracy*, and our *Subjection necessary*. Communion must extend as far as we are capable of it. You have communion I think with the National Church of *France*, if not with some Protestant Churches; Are you therefore subject to them? Or can you have no communion but in a common subjection to some Universal Supreme under Christ?

Ans^w. 3. Reader, It is the effect of errour and sin to be self-condemning. These communicatory Letters the Nonconformists are greatly for; that no man may be admitted to communion in any particular Church, without either a personal understanding, owning of his Baptismal Covenant, or a Testimonial that he hath done

done it, and been received into communion with some Church, with whom we have such communion, as is due between several Churches? But our Accusers will rather Silence and utterly ruine us as Malefactors, than grant us this one thing. They huddle over Confirmation without ever trying the knowledg, faith and life of the Confirmed; and utterly opposed and rejected our earnest suit, that the Parish-Ministers *Consent* or *Certificate* (who is supposed to know them better than a Bishop, that never before saw them) might ordinarily be necessary. Not one of a multitude is so much as ceremoniously Confirmed. The Ministers give the Sacrament to they know not whom. Thousands live in the Parish whom he is an utter stranger to. Travellers and Lodgers may come who will, if they be the disciples of *Hobbs*, or *Spinosa*, or utter Infidels, without any Communicatory Letters. Any one that removeth his dwelling into the Parish, is supposed (unless excommunicate) to have right to Communion unknown. I am puzzled with cases which this makes. Some children of Anabaptists, never baptized, at age are called with the rest to the Communion, and admitted by the Priest that never put a question to them. God awakeneth their consciences, and they now ask us, Whether they must be yet baptized, when they have long Communicated? Yet these men that will not endure the practice, do prove *universal Sovereignty* in a Colledg from the ancient use of Communicatory Letters. These be our condemners.

§ 15 Next he confuteth Dr. Barrow, who saith, *that a common Unity of Policy (or supreme Regiment) is no more hence inferred, than from Princes recommending their subjects to others for trade.* And his answer is, *That all the Churches in the world were united in one body, and one communion.*

Ans. And so are all the Kingdoms of the world, so far as they are Christian: It is the same Christians that are under the power of the *Word* and of the *Sword*, and both now of Christ, the Lord Redeemer. The Kingdoms of the Christian world are the Kingdom of Christ, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Christ is the universal Sovereign to all Christians, and no mortal man or men. So he is over all Churches: Christian Kingdoms and Churches are all bound by Christ, to live as united under one Sovereign. It's true, that Christ hath made Pastors by the Church-Keys, to be Judges of Church-Communion, which is not
the

the same thing with that sort of Communion which Princes are the Judges of; which only proveth, that the Offices materially differ. But God never made an *universal Judge* of every Mans Communion, Civil or Ecclesiastick, but Jesus Christ. Must all the Bishops of the world judge whether I am to be baptized, or must receive the Lords Supper? If with some Sectaries, you deny Christ to be the Head of Magistrates as such, you will confess, that God is, and that all the world is the Kingdom of God: And must God needs set up one humane Kingdom or Senate over all the world, to govern at the *antipodes* and the *terra incognita*? If not, why one universal Church-Senate, or Monarch (which is more unreasonable as to *Church-Government* than to *Civil*)?

Great reason commands me to tell you, 1. That if you would not have us know, that *it's the fundamental difference between us and the Papists, whether there be any universal humane Church supremacy*; and but the 2. *Whether this be in the Pope?* we must know it, whether you will or not.

2. That it's a doleful case, that any King that hates the name of a Civil Monarch of all the world, can be so deluded, as to think that there must be an universal Church-Monarch, or supreme Senate, or Colledg, which is more impossible.

§. 16. But saith the Consuter of Dr. Barrow, *They are received into all the rights and priviledges of the Christian Communion in the Church whither they went, by being owned Members of the Church from whence they came; which cannot be said of Subjects—recommended by the Princes Letters——not making them free Denizons.*

Ans. 1. This signifieth no more, but that Church-priviledges and Civil priviledges have not the same conditions; which who denieth? But what's this to prove an Universal Sovereignty? Must all the Bishops on earth be sent to judge of every mans Christianity or Testimonials? Whoever in all the world professeth the true Faith, is by baptism to be taken into this one Church of Christ: And yet all the Bishops on earth are not to be consulted before a man be judged meet for Baptism; nor doth the baptizer receive his Commission from them all: Philip baptized the Eunuch without a Commission from all the Apostles or Bishops: The *Abassines*, *Copties*, *Jacobites*, *Nestorians*, *Armenians*,
Ge.

Georgians, Greeks, Papists, &c. all baptize now without a Communion from a Colledg that's taken for the Ruler of all the Christian world.

Ans. 2. The justly recommended by Bishops, are but to be received into the common privileges of Christians, but not into the special privileges of that particular Church, without a further condition. They may have transient Communion of strangers (*Communione peregrinam*), but they may not be Church-Officers, nor have suffrages, as the members have about that Churches affairs, nor in the Election of Bishops and other Officers; nor is the Pastor obliged to the same particular care of every such stranger in point of vigilancy, instruction, reproof, discipline or relief, as of his Flock; nor is a man one of his Flock by such a recommendation and cohabitation. A mutual consent to that particular Church-relation must be a further condition.

And so it is as to Civil Communion. Every Nation is bound to receive a recommended person to all the common Civil privileges of a Man and of a Christian, a subject of the King of all the world; but not to those special privileges of incorporate Bodies, Honours or Offices, which require a further condition, for that would be to the wrong of others, and of the State of which they are not regularly capable. So that your dissimilitude here, is nothing to your purpose.

§. 17. *Sherl.* And if it might not be thought immodest to pass a censure upon so great and deservedly admired a man, I should venture to say, That he was so much bent upon opposing that notion of Church-Unity, which set up a supreme and Sovereign power over the Catholick Church, such a constitutive Regent Head as Mr. B. would have over a National Church (which he hath effectually done beyond all contradiction) that he was not so careful to avoid some expressions, which might seem to reflect on Catholick-communion.]

Ans. 1. It were far better to be free from Immodesty, than from being thought immodest. Who would think that a man that pleadeth for so much mischief to others, did scruple Immodesty? Is it modest to say and unsay, to dispute for so pestilent a Cause, and then to give it up, and confess that Dr. Barrow hath beyond contradiction overthrown it? Do we not all agree in the many sorts of Union and Communion which he describeth? Do you not maintain

tain, that [the Christian Church is governed by the Episcopal Colledge]? And yet is it not one Governing Colledge? Do you not say, That the Catholick Church consists of a *pars Imperans* and *pars Subdita*, and that the united Bishops are this Regent part, which all that will be Members must obey? Are they One *pars Imperans* as united, or not? If not, they make not the Church One: If one Regent part to govern the whole, our communion is not enough without subjection, as you profess, and as One they must govern; which must be either, 1. By the *major Vote* through the world. 2. Or else by one part joyned with some of the *Quorum* (Pope or Patriarchs) to be instead of a Majority. 3. Or else every one must consent. 4. Or else they govern *per alios* as deputed Officers under them, and not *per se*. And this is the Aristocracy which Dr. Barrow so effectually confuteth; and a mere obligation to concord of Princes and Pastors we all maintain, *Quis teneat vultum*, &c. When you know better what to say your self, others may come to know what you mean, and you may be fitter to censure Dr. Barrow.

§ 18. Sher. [After this I need say nothing to that communion which was maintained between distant Churches and private Christians, who were Members of them, which was to own each other as Sister-churches, and actually communicate as occasion offered, &c.]

Ans. Who would have thought but that all this while he had been speaking of this only, How these Sister-churches and Members must be united under one universal Regent part? Understand the man he that can, for I confess I cannot.

§ 19. H. Sher. [Let us now briefly consider what place there can be for Catholick communion in this broken and divided state of the Church this day: I confess the Divisions of Christendom are sad, we cannot finde any one entire communion in a National, much less in the Universal Church.]

Ans. 1. Yes, in Spain, and where the Inquisition prevaieth: And when we are all choakt in Jails, your party boasteth of hopes of it here, *Solitudinem faciunt & pacem vocant*.

Ans. 2. There is essential communion among all Christians, though not entire communion: And entire, where there is not communion in all accidents.

§ 20. Sher.

¶ 20. Sher. [*But I take that man to be a catholic Christian, not who communicates with all Sects and Parties of Christians (which is Mr. B's notion of a catholic Christian); but he who preserves the communion of the church wherein he lives; and is ready as occasion shall offer, to communicate with all Christian churches, which are neither Schismatical nor Heretical.*]

Ans. 1. It concerns yourself more than us, whom you take to be Catholics. But who would think that these Doctors should at once write Books to prove me a Separatist, and yet accuse me of holding communion with all Sects and Parties of Christians? But even the witnesses of Christ's Accusers did not agree. A vehement flood of words can make good any contradictions with some men. And all Readers are not wiser nor honeste than such Writers.

Ans. 2. Sure I ever except such communicating as maketh me partaker of their sin: I refuse local communion where I cannot have it without a sinful condition, as I do Ministration where I cannot do it without deliberate Lying, Perjury, Church corrupting, and renouncing Repentance.

Ans. 3. Do not the Spaniards and other Papists preserve the communion of the Church wherein they live? And do not Papists, Greeks, Jacobites, and the rest, profess such occasional communion with all Christian Churches, which are not Schismatical or Heretical? And seeing the Nonconformists do all this, why may not they be Catholics also in your account?

Ans. 4. But you know the Question is, *Who shall be Judge?* They think them Schismatical that are for casting out, excommunicating, and separating from such Ministers and Christians as you would have thus used. They think those Heretical that would alter the Article of the Catholic Church, and set up a Regent part with Legislation and Judgment over all the Christian world: Almost all parties of Christians think others Schismatical at least. Why did you not put in, [*Those that the Episcopal Colledge of the world shall judge Schismatical or Heretical?*] But if I judge you to be both, and yet lately heard you Preach and Pray, I hope that proveth me not a Separatist? But I am a Separatist, for not separating from those that you separate from, and you are none.

¶ 21. Sher. [*By Schismatical I mean those Churches which separate from the National Church wherein they live, without just and necessary*

'necessary reason, which can be nothing less than sinful terms of communion']

Answ. 1. Your Mr. *Thorndike* Epi. saith, That the very name of *National Churches* is barbarous. And that it was the Patriarchal Churches, and Churches diversified by the pre-eminence of Cities, that the Apostles ordained, which order is necessary to Catholic Concord: And so the Bishop of *Canterbury* is a Schismatick for overtopping *London*.

Answ. 2. But which is the National Church? Is it the greater number? Or is it that which is owned by the Civil Power? Which is it in *Hungary*; in the *Turks* or *Persian Dominions*? Is it *Lutheran* or *Calvinist* under the Duke of *Brandenburgh*, or elsewhere, when the Prince and Bishops differ? The *French* Protestants disown the National Church.

Answ. 3. But who is there among us that separateth any further from your National Church, than terms which he judgeth sinful do constrain him? After such a cartload of words to prove such as I am to be Schismatics, you now openly acquit me, and confess your self a Calumniator, if you cannot prove that I separate from the National Church, further than sinful terms constrain me. And could you think me so much void of Reason, as to take what you have said in this Book for a proof of the lawfulness of all things imposed, named in my first Plea for Peace?

Answ. 4. But have you not here destroyed the foundation of your Church-communion, and your Doctrine? Are there not National Churches that obey not your Universal Colledge? Yea, that condemn one another? Are none of these Schismatical? Are not *Abassia*, *Armenia*, *Georgia*, *Muscovie*, and other such here, quit from Schism, without obeying your Supreme Regent Universal *Pars Imperans*? But this is your ordinary Method.

§ 22. Sherl. [*'And by Hereticks, those which impose any Doctrine as the terms of Communion, which contradicts some plain and express Article of Faith.'*]

Answ. 1. What if they hold, e. g. *Arrianism*, *Socinianism*, *Manichisme*, &c. and do not impose it as terms of Communion; No, nor impose it it all, Are they not Heretical? How gentle are you in some fits?

Answ. 2. What if a Church impose your Principle of [An Episcopal Colledge, which is one Regent Supreme to the Universal Church]

Church] and make this to be the Catholick Church named in the Creed, and so directly corrupt that Article, must all separate from such a Church as Heretical?

Ans. 3. Your Conclusion fully acquits us from the Accusations of Schism in your Book, and owneth us now as Catholick Christians.

§ 23. Having done with Mr. *Sherlock's* Catholicisme, I shall do that right to the party, as to tell the Reader what Mr. *Thorn-dike* saith, to vindicate their conceit of an Universal Regent Colledge from common scorn, and make it possible.

I. It is supposed that the Apostles governed all the Church (with the Disciples) as a Colledge. II. That they left the power to all the Bishops. III. But that it might be possible to use it, they ordained some Churches to be Heads over the rest, as *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. IV. And that Churches should differ as the civil pre-eminence of their Cities did. V. That among these, *Rome* hath the pre-eminence, especially in the summoning of General Councils, and authorizing them and their Decrees; and so is as Bishop *Bramhall* speaks, *Principium Unitatis*. VI. That these chief City-Bishops represent the inferior. VII. And all Bishops represent all their Churches. And now do not laugh at a Colledge of Bishops of all the world as impossible. May not a few represent all the Bishops of the Earth?

§ 24. But yet many knots must be untied or cut, if this dream were granted? 1. What shall we do for a Colledge when the Apostles chief Seats are destroyed, as *Alexandria* and *Antioch*? 2. Or when they cease to be chief Cities? 3. Or when they are in the power of Infidel Princes, that will not let them meet or meddle abroad? 4. And when their nominal Patriarchs all condemn each other, as all the five old ones now do? 5. And how shall we know which are the ruling Cities in a multitude of Principalities that have no rule over one another? Yea, when now Cities have no Rule over each other at all in the same Kingdom? And is it the Pope, or who, that must send to all the chief City-Bishops in the world?

Reader, Mr. *Sherlocke* was so wise as to break off here; but those that have opened the Mystery, bring it all to this. 1. The Patriarchs and chief Prelates represent the whole Church; (you must

must not ask who these be, nor who chooseth them.) II. The particular Bishops chosen by —are authorized to tell you the Laws and mind of their Superiors, and to rule you by their Decrees in Councils, or Letters Mandatory. III. The Lay-Chancellors, and Commissaries, and Officials, and Surrogates, and nearest to us, the Parish Priest, is to tell you the mind of the Bishops: And this whole grand design of a Council or dispersed Colledge as one supreme Aristocracy governing all the Christian world, is resolved into the actual *Credit* and *Government* of every Parish-Priest or Lay-Chancellor, &c. that is governed by a Bishop, that is governed by Metropolitans, that are governed by Patriarchs, or no body knows whom: *But a Forreign Jurisdiction it must be.*

C. H. A. P. VII.

§ 1. **I** Have done with the beginning, or fundamental part of this Dr's book, which is his end, or last Chapter. I was about to go backward, and answer what he saith of *National*, and then of *Diocesan Churches*; and so to come to his more minute particulars concerning my self: For his book is like a tree with the Branches downward and the Root upward. But to confess my weakness, if it be such, I had not patience enough to endure to open such a rapsody of contradictions and mistakes, or gross fallacies or untruths; nor can I think, that many Readers have patience and leisure any more than I, to peruse an hundred more sheets (or pages either), which would be little enough to shew all the faults and fallacies of his book, as fully as word by word it should be answered.

Who can endure to be large in confuting a man that pleads for a *Government without superiority*? One *pars imperans* and *pars subdita*, and yet no *constitutive Regent part or head*, that knoweth not the difference of a City or Polity, and a meer Community: That sometimes describeth it but as confederacy, and anon confuteth such as say it is no more: That says and unsays, it is a Polity and it is not: It maketh Laws, as one *pars imperans*,
for

for one Society, and yet is no constitutive governing part: because it is but by *consent*, it's no such constitutive Power: As; the Senate of *Venice*, or the States of *Holland* were no constitutive head, because they govern by consent. But this *consent* is *commanded of God*. Very true: as if confederacy of Princes and Bishops were not commanded of God, as far as the publick good requireth it, as well as one Regent Colledg. Doth this consent make *them all one Aristocracy*, or *Regent Senate*, or Political Supreme, or not? If yea, why do you boggle to affirm it? If not, why do you cavil against Dr. *Barrow*, that denieth it? Doth this Colledg make *true Laws obligatory to all the Christian world*, or only draw agreements, which all are bound to observe by Gods Law; which binds us to as much concord as the publick good requireth; and our condition will allow? If the first, why do you deny them to be the Regent constitutive visible Head of all the Church? If the latter again, why do you speak against Dr. *Barrow* and others, for asserting such a Communion as is distinct from subjection? If you know not the difference between laws and agreements, I'll not repeat what Bishop *Usher* said; read what *Grotius* saith *de Imper. sum Poteſt.* Plainly, either my ignorance disableth me from finding intelligible sense, or cogent evidence in your book, or yours from writing it. I have lost my labour in reading it, and will not tire the Reader with a particular examination of it.

§. 2. I did also peruse his description of *Diocesan* Communion. But to tell you what an unsatisfactory Mass of words I found, is all the answer I'll give it, save this, That if he dare deny the Bishop to be the constitutive Regent part or head of his *Diocesan* Church, he may hear of it with both ears. And if the *Archbishops* have no government of the Bishops, it's odd that they swear obedience to them. And are *Diocesan* and *Metropolitan* Churches different from his *Catholick totâ specie*? Or will they not all at last come to Mr. *Thorndike's*, *Bramhall's*, and such others way, even to a subordination to the *Patriarchal* Churches, and to the Pope, as *Principium unitatis*, and *Patriarch of the West*?

Once he made me smile by saying, a *Bishop of Bishops* is *Antichristian*, because I denied not Apostles to be such, and will not maintain, that they have no successors in the point of overseeing and

and Ministerial visiting many Churches. Who would think, but this man were less Episcopal than I, and such as I?

§. 3. I did also gather abundance of untruths, mistakes, vain arguings and fallacies, tending to abuse the Reader, out of all his book. But on two accounts I cast them by: 1. Because his sequacious partial party will not read them; and others need them not. Either men will impartially compare my Books with his Answers, or not. If they will not, why should I write more for such? If they will, and yet need any confutation of such a Book as his, they are no Readers for me: I leave them to Teachers that can make them capable of the use of Reason.

2. Chiefly, because this great point of an humane Universal Church-supremacy, for Legislation and Judgment, is of so great and dangerous consequence, that they shall not draw me from the examination of it, nor hide our grand difference about an Article of the Creed, and the essence of the Catholick Church, by turning me to lesser matters. I intend, God willing, hereafter to let the matters of meer Conformity comparatively alone, and further to examine this fundamental difference; Seeing it is evident, that now Satans design is to call the *French* Popery by the name of the Protestant Religion, and the Protestant Religion of the true Church of *England* by the name of Nonconformity and Schism, and to deceive the simple by a noise against the refusers of Episcopacy, Liturgy and Ceremonies. But that noise shall no more divert me from opposing the foundation of Popery.

But if any man desire more against this Accuser, he may find enough already written in one book by Mr. *Humphreys*, and a Conformist, and Mr. *Lobb*, all conjoynd.

F I N I S.

These Books following are written by the same Author.

Baxter's Christian Directory, *Fol.* containing a sum of practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience, in Four parts. 1. Christian Ethicks (or private Duties). 2. Christian Oeconomicks (or Family Duties). 3. Christian Ecclesiasticks (or Church Duties). 4. Christian Politicks (or Duties to our Rulers and Neighbours). The second Edition, with an Alphabetical Table.

——— Catholick Theology, plain, pure, peaceable for pacification; in Three Books. 1. Pacifying Principles about Gods Decrees, Fore-knowledg, Providence, Operations, Redemption, Grace, Mans power, Free will, Justification, merits, certainty of salvation, Perseverance.

2. A pacifying Praxis, or a Dialogue about the Five Articles, Justification.

3. Pacifying Disputations against some real Errors, which hinder Reconciliation, *viz.* about Physical predestination, Original sin, the extent of Redemption, sufficient Grace, Imputation of Righteousness.

——— Life of Faith; in Three parts. The First is a Sermon preached before his Majesty, and published by his command, with another, for fuller Amplification. The
Se-

Second is Instructions, for confirming Believers in the Christian Faith. The Third is Directions, how to live by Faith, or how to exercise it on all occasions.

— which is the true Church.

— An Apology for the Nonconformists preaching, containing 1. The Reasons of their preaching. 2. An Answer to the Accusations urged as Reasons for the silencing of about 2000. by Bishop *Morley*, and many others. 3. Reasons proving it [the Duty and interest of the Bishops and Conformists, to endeavour earnestly their Restoration.

Two Disputations of Original sin, as from *Adam*. 2. Of Original sin, as from our nearest Parents; by *Richard Baxter*.

