

A
FULL REPLY

To certaine briefe
Observations and Anti-Queries

ON
Master PRYNNEs twelve Questions about
Church-Government:

Wherein the Frivolousnesse, Falsenesse, and
grosse Mistakes of this Anonymous Answerer (ashamed
of his Name) and his weak grounds for Independency,
and Separation, are modestly discovered,
refelled.

By *William Pryne* of *Lincolnes Inne*, Esquire.

Socrates Scholasticus Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 20.

*Ecclesia cum semel esset divisa, non una divisione acquiritur, sed homines ab se mu-
tuo aversi, al. ex ab altero denno scesserunt; atque adeo EXIGVAM LE-
VICVLAMQVE OCCASIONEM nacti, mutuae communionis
consociationisque vincula diruperunt.*

Mark 9. 50.

Have salt in your selves, and have peace one with another.

John 18. 37.

*To this end was I born, and for this cause come I into the world, that I should beare
witness unto the truth.*

Gal. 4. 16.

Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?

LONDON,

Printed by F. L. for Michael Sparke Senior, and are to bee sold at the
Blew-Bible in Green-Arbour. 1644.



A full Reply to certaine briefe Observations and *Anti-queries* to Mr Prynnes Twelve Questions about Church-Government.

Eccles. 4. 4.



Of all the *vanities* and *vexations of spirit*, enumerated by the royall Preacher, this is one of the principall, [a] *That for all travell, and every right worke, a man is envied* (yea, many times hated, oppugned) by his neighbour. This hath been alwayes my condition heretofore and now; my *best actions* and *publike services* for the common good, have been misconstrued, traduced, nay censured in an high degree, as *evill*, by many; though (blessed be God) approved, yea gratefully accepted by the best-affected to the felicity, tranquillity of Church and State.

Gal. 4. 16.

The importunity of some *Reverend friends*, lamenting the *deplorable distractions of our Church*, which threaten disunion, and so ruine to us, in these unhappy times of intestine warres, prevailed so farre, as to induce me to compile and publish *Twelve considerable serious questions touching Church-government*; out of a cordial desire (as much as in me lay) to close up, not widen our divisions. Which though they have given ample satisfaction to many truly religious, of all ranks and qualities, who have returned me speciall thanks; yet they have found very *harsh entertainment* from others, who of *Friends* [b] *are become my professed Antagonists* (if not enemies) in print, because I have told them the truth: to whom I should have returned no Reply but silence (there being nought in these *Observations* worthy answer) but only to rectifie some mistakes therein and shew the opposite party those common errors wherby they deceive themselves and others.

Page 1. 2.

The first thing this namelesse Respondent quarrels with, is [c] *For my writing by way of Quore*; To which I answer, that I had both *Presidents* and *Reasons* for it.

Presidents, from our *Saviour* himselfe, who *both instructed, refused, convinced his opposites and auditors by demanding Questions onely*, Luk. 2. 46, 47. Matth. 11. 1, to 20. c. 12. 3, to 13. 26. 27. 29. c. 21. 23, to 43. c. 22. 18, to 23. c. 16. 26. *Presidents* from *Philosophers, Fathets, School-men*, and all sorts of *Writers*, ancient modern, over-tedious to recite.

Reasons: 1. I conceived the *Questions touching church-government* were not rightly stated by most; and that the right stating of them by way of *Question*, would be the best and speediest meanes to decide them. 2. The *Independent party* had neither then, nor since (to my knowledg) dogmatically resolved or discovered in print, what that church-government is they so eagerly contend for, and pretend to be so plainly set down in the Word of God: and therefore I conjectured such *Queries* to be the onely meanes to discover and refute their concealed

concealed Platforme. 3. The controversies concerning church-government, were then and now in agitation in the Synode and high Court of Parliament, the properest Judges of them; therefore I thought it better became me in point of modesty and good manners, to expresse my opinion of them by way of *Question*, then *Decision*. Finally, I found all *Independents* guilty of *Petitio principii*, in their Writings, Sermons, Discourses, peremptorily concluding their forme of church-government, to [d] be the *only Government instituted by Christ; the ONLY WAY OF GOD, which hath more of God and Christ in it then any other; the Kingdome, Scepter, and Throne of Christ himselfe, and no other way beside it; [e] That by the beauty and perfect consonancy of this Governemnt with the Word of God, it may very reasonably (yea, and upon higher termes then of reason) bee thought, THAT IN TIME IT CANNOT BVT OVERTHROW ALL SORTS OF ECCLESIASTICALL GOVERNMENT, (and I feare civill too by the selfe-same reason) AND STAND VP IT SELFE IN THEIR STEAD; which they close up with a, Faxit Deus & festinet: and, that writing or disputing against this Government, or opposing it in any kind, yea in thought, is no lesse then [f] A FIGHTING AGAINST GOD, which will bring certain ruine on our Realme in generall, and all private, open opposers of it: yet not one of them (nor this Respondent) hath hitherto fully discovered to us, what this *WAY* or *Government* is; nor produced any one Scripture or Reason to warrant these superlative *Eucomiums* of it, but we must take all they say as *Gospel*, upon their own bare words, without examination or dispute: And therefore I proposed these, with 12 other subsequent *Questions* to them, to induce them to make good these *transcendent* (that I say not arrogant) *Positions* touching their *Way*; since I seriously profess before God, Angels, and men, that I could never yet discover the least footsteps of it in *Scripture*, or *Antiquity*, nor descry this their *Patern* in the *Mount*, which no age till ours had ever the happines to behold, if it be worth the viewing, when unvaild by them to us.*

d The Apologetical Narration, Mr Symphon. A Reply of two of the Brethren, with others. e A Reply of two of the Brethren to A.S. p. III. f Master John Goodwins 669. maxia.

Having thus given this Respondent the true grounds of my writing by way of *Question*, I shall briefly answer all his materiall *Observations* and *Anti-queries* upon my twelve *Questions*, pretermittting his *Impertinencies*.

I. To the first *Question* the Respondent gives no Answer at all to the things demanded, but only miscites the *Question*, without my limitations; and then seemes to refute, what himselfe propounds, not I: He should have demonstrated by direct *Scriptures*, That *Christ* hath prescribed one set *immutable forme of Government* to all *Christian Nations, Churches in the World, from which none must vary in the least degree, without sinne, schisme, or being no true Churches of Christ, with whom good Christians may with safe conscience communicate; that nothing herein is, or can be left free to humane prudence: And then have positively delineated, exactly proved the modell of this pretended Government, Discipline, in every particle thereof, by Gospel-Texts. so far as to satisfie mens erroneous judgments, consciences herein, that so they might either submit thereto without dispute, or propound their objections against the same. But in this maine point (whereon the hinge of the controversie turnes) the Respondent is wholly silent, and I shall expect his answer ad *Grædas Calendas*. Only lest he might seem to say nothing, he endeavors to prove, that there is a set forme of *Church-government**

prescribed by Christ in the Gospel, not by direct Texts, but from pretended *absurdities* of his owne fancying, (for which he can produce no Text nor Reason) wherein he hath prevaricated, and shewes himselfe *absurd*.

First, (writes he) *if this were granted (that there is no such set form of Church-government prescribed to all) the Gospell would be *straiter then the Law, Christ more unfaithfull then Moses.* If we deny these *absurd consequences*, you shall have these found proofes of both subjoined; *God set a patterne to * Moses of a carnall Temple,* (you mistake good Sir, it was a *Tabernacle*, and that *not carnall*) which he charged him not to vary from in a tittle: (well, I grant it, because you produce *two full Scriptures for it) Ergo, *he hath prescribed a set pattern of Church-government and Discipline to all Christian Nations, Churches in the new Testament, from which they must not vary in one tittle.* If he (or any other) can shew me such a pattern as he contends for, so clearly delineated to us in the *new Testament*, as that pattern of the *Tabernacle* God shewed *Moses* was in the *old*, and then produce as direct precepts enjoyning all Christians, Republickes, Churches, not to vary from it in one tittle, as *Moses* had not to vary from his, I shall beleve his sequell; till then I shall deeme it a true *Independent argument*, and as grosse a *Non-sequitur* as; this, which necessarily followes upon the concession of it.

God shewed and prescribed to *Moses* the expresse pattern or fashion of *Aarons* and his Sons garments, ornaments, under the Law, *Exod. 28.*

Ergo he hath likewise shewed and prescribed the expresse pattern, fashion, and colour, of all Bishops, Presbyters, Ministers garments, ornaments under the Gospel, (most likely in the *Roman Ceremoniall* and *Pontificall*.) If the one consequence be ridiculous, the other must needs be so.

But to quell this your principall Argument, First, *the patterne in the mount* was meant onely of the materials, forme, vessels and utensils of the *Tabernacle*, not of the Government and Discipline of the Iewish church; therefore very impertinent to prove a setled Church-government, Discipline, under the Gospel. Secondly, it was shewed only to *Moses*, the *temporall Magistrate* and chief Ruler of the *Israelites*; not to *Aaron*, or any private Independent Priest or Synagogue of the *Iewes*; yea *Moses* (not they) *was to make, or see all things made according to the pattern in the mount*; Ergo (if there be any consequence from this patterne) not the Independent Minister or congregation, but Kings, chief temporall Magistrates, and Parliaments (the supreme civill Powers, Councils, are likewise (under the Gospell) to prescribe and set up such a church-government as is agreeable to Gods Word: as *Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah, Nehemiah, and other godly Princes, Governours*, with their Parliaments or generall Assemblies did under the Law: And then what becomes of your Independent Ministers, Congregations claimes to this Sovereigne temporall jurisdiction, (a part of Christs Kingly office, delegated onely to Kings, and highest temporall powers) which was never conferred on them? In fine, if there be any such expresse unalterable divine patterne of church-government under the Gospel, I pray informe me, why it was not as punctually, as particularly described in the new Testament, as the forme of the *Tabernacle*, of its materials, with all the services, ornaments, appurtenances of it, and of the *Temple* were under the Law? Nay, why was the *Tabernacle* altered into a * *Temple*, different from

* He should say freer, where the government is left arbitrary.

* Exod. 25. 40.
Heb. 8. 5.

from it? and why did the second *Temple vary from the first, and that in the self same Church and Nation? If these were patterns of the church-government under the Gospel, and yet varied, altered successively in this manner; then by consequence the Government, Discipline under the Gospel is variable, alterable too, and so not fixed, nor immutable.

His second Argument, *That Christ should neither be faithfull as a husband, head, nor King of his Church, if he should give others power to order it as they pleased to their owne civill Government, not setting downe his owne Lawes for them to walke by,* is both a fallacy and absurdity. There is no man doubts but that Christ in the Scriptures (which some of you refuse to heare read in our Churches, though * *publike reading of them be Gods owne ordinance*) hath prescribed to us all necessary Rules and Lawes both for our faith and lives; either in a generall or speciall manner; but that Christ hath punctually and particularly set downe any exact unalterable form of church-government, for all Christian Nations, Churches to follow, under pain of *being unfaithfull in all the former respects*; and that the Independent Modell alone is that very patterne (the onely point in question) remains on your part to make good. A man may be a faithfull husband, King, Master, Father, though he prescribe not distinct particular Lawes, to regulate each particular action of his Wife, Subjects, Servants, Children: * *Let all things be done decently and in order,* (a generall rule for church-government) is sufficient to excuse Christ from these your presumptuous reproaches, and regulate all particulars, though left indefinite.

His third Argument, that *Rev. 11.1, 2. we read of a † measuring of the Temple;* and *Rev. 21.1, 2. of the new Jerusalem comming downe from God out of heaven prepared as a bride adorned for her husband;* Ergo there is a settled divine church-government universally prescribed to all Christians in the new Testament; is no better a prooffe of this assertion, then the *Angel of the Church of Ephesus;* is of our Prelates Lordly hierarchy *jure divino*. He might as well; yea more properly have concluded thence, That the *Altar was measured* as well as the *Temple, Revelat. 11.1, 2.* (referring onely to the * *Jewish* not christian Church, which hath no * *Temple* nor *Altar*;) Ergo we ought to have an Altar, yea and one set form of Altars in all christian Churches under the Gospel: which I hope you dare not averre.

After these three *Independent* Arguments, he pretends my third *Quere* contradicts the first, because I suppose a church-government may be consonant to Gods Word in the generall, which is not particularly prescribed in it: A pretty fancy! As if nothing could be consonant to Gods Word, which is not particularized or verbally enjoyned in it: Are not our materiall churches, garments, temporall Magistrates, Majors, Corporations, Parliaments; Courts of justice; Laws of all sorts, yea Festivals, Covenants, monthly Fasts, &c. consonant to Gods Word, because not literally prescribed in it? Are your private church-covenants, unmixt Communions (as you phrase them,) creations of Independent congregations without the licence of temporall Magistrates, not consonant to the Word in your owne opinions, though no where extant in it? If not, then all your divine pretences for them vanish, and you yeeld your cause: If yea, you must then recant this pretence of a contradiction, till you are able to prove it better then yet you have done.

* Ezra 3.10.
12. Hag. 2.3.
10 10.

* Exod 24.7.
Deut. 31.11.
Iosh. 8.34.
2 Kings 23.2.
2 Chro. 34.30.
Neh. 8.2, 3, &c.
c. 9. 3. c. 13. 1.
Ier. 36. 6. 10. 24.
Luke 4.16.
Act. 13. 15, 27
c. 15. 21, 31.
Col. 4. 16.

† 1 Thes. 5. 27.
* 1 Cor. 14. 40.
† Belike the
Reed by which
he measured it
was Independent.

* Ezech. 40.
& 41.
* Rev. 21. 22.
1 Cor. 9. 13.
14.
Heb. 7. 13.

Having played the *Logicians* and *contradictors* part so well, he next betakes himself to his *Anti-queries* to prove a set church-modell: which are three.

1. *If no prescript forme (of church-government) in the Word, why not Episcopacy (especially regulated and moderated) as well as Presbytery?*

I answer, if you meane it of Lordly Episcopacy, there are abundant pregnant Texts against it, to prove it opposite to Gods Word. If of moderated or regulated Episcopacy, the same with Presbytery: if the Parliament by the Synods advice unanimously establish it, as most consonant to the Scriptures, and most agreeable to the civill Government, I shall readily submit unto it without opposition, and why not you and all others?

2. *If church-government be suited to States, whether Politicians are not more fit to consult about establishing it? Why is an Assembly of Divines called to search the Word about it?*

I answer, that my position is, *That every church-government ought to be suitable to Gods Word, as likewise to the civill State*; Therefore Politicians and Statesmen are fit to be consulted with, to suit it best to the civill State; and an Assembly of Divines, to square it likewise by and to the Word: the true reason why in this our Realme, and all other Christian States (as I can abundantly manifest if need be) Ecclesiasticall Lawes and formes of government have ever been settled by Parliaments, with the advice of Synods, Councells, wherein Statesmen and Churchmen have jointly concurred in their deliberations and votes, using both the Bible and the Law to settle it, and not throwing either of them aside, as incompatible, as ignorant or lawlesse persons deeme them, but joyning both together.

* But very unteasonable that Christ, the Church, State, Synod, Parliament, should be subject to your dictates, not you to theirs.

To his third *Anti-querie* I answer, *That it is more reasonable the State should be subject to Christs rule, then Christ to its direction*: But this *Quere* is quite besides the Question, till you prove infallibly, *That Christ hath prescribed a set unalterable divine government, to which all churches, Nations, States, must necessarily conform; and clearly manifest what this Government is in all its particulars*. Till this be done the sole question is, *Whether christian Princes, Parliaments, States, Synods, under the Gospel, have not a lawfull power to prescribe Ecclesiasticall Lawes and formes of Government, not repugnant to the Word, not to Christ himself, (as you pretend) but to all particular churches, congregations, subjects under their respective jurisdictions? and whether the whole representative Church and State of England in Parliament have not sufficient authority by Gods law to over-rule and bind all, or any particular members or congregations of it, as well as the major part of an Independent congregation, power to over-vote and rule the lesser part, and to order, yea bind any of their particular members?* A truth so clear, that no ratioll man, good Christian or Subject can deny it. As for the latter part of this *Querie*, *That the Saints think Christ is King alone over his Churches, and hath not left them to substitutes, and the politick considerations of men to be governed by*; If he meanes it onely of matters of Faith, or of internal government over the soules of men it may passe as tolerable; but if he intends it of external Ecclesiasticall Government, Discipline, or order in the Church, or State as Christian, hee must renounce his Oath of Allegiance, his late Protestation, Nationall Vow and Covenant, and make *Rom. 13.1, to 6.1. Pet. 2.13, 14. Tit. 3.1. 1 Tim. 2.1, 2, 3.* to be Apocryphall; the Confessions of all

* This Rule holds firm in all Church-assemblies, Synods, Parliaments, elections by suffrages whatsoever.

Protestant Churches heterodox; and deny christian Kings, Magistrates, and highest civill powers, to be Christs substitutes, Vicars, in point of Government, (to whom Christ hath delegated his Kingly power) as truly as Ministers are his deputies in point of instruction, admonition, to whom he hath bequeathed his Prophetical office.

2. In his answer to my second *Quere*, he first wilfully misrecites it, then infers † a blind obedience from it to all superiours commands, be they never so unjust or contrary to Gods Word; whereas my Question speaks onely of lawfull decrees, &c. consonant to Gods Word, and to the civill Lawes, Government, and manners of the people; to which every Christian in point of conscience is bound to submit. (without any danger of blinde obedience) by the expresse resolution of Rom. 13. 1, 10 6. 1 Pet. 2. 14, 15. Tit. 3. 1. Ezra 7. 26. Josh. 1. 16, 17, 18. Heb. 13. 17. If any man deny this verity, he must renounce not onely his Christianity, but his Allegiance and Humanity too. But suppose (saith he) the whole Parliament and Synode should erre in commanding a Government that is erroneous or untrue, must we then submit unto it? I answer, first, such an oversight is not to be presumed before it be actually committed; and it is neither * christian, charitable, nor any way of Christ, thus to prejudge their resolutions. Secondly, if the Decrees or Government they establish be not directly against Gods Word, nor pernicious to our soules, though not altogether such as we could wish, yet we ought contentedly to submit unto it without opposition: If contrary to the Word we must then passively submit thereto for the present, and expect a redresse in Gods due time. But if it be such a Government and Discipline, under which we may freely enjoy the sincere and powerfull preaching of the Word, the due administration of the Sacraments, and all other Ordinances of God necessary for our salvation and edification, (as we may doubtlesse do under a Presbytery, and that government our pious Parliament intends to settle) we ought cordially and cheerfully to submit thereto; yea thankfully to embrace and blesse God for it, and can neither waivardly oppugne nor refuse submission to it, without arrogancy, contumacy, and apparent schisme. As for his question concerning my owne and fellow-brethrens sufferings, (which we deeme our Honour, not our Shame) I answer, that none of us suffered for opposing, writing, or speaking against the Bishops legall authority, or any ceremonies established in our Church by Act of Parliament; but onely against their pretended divine right to their Episcopall Lordly power, diametrically contrary to Scripture, Fathers, Councils, the best Protestant and Popish Authors, the * Statutes of our Realm; and against their Innovations in doctrine, discipline, ceremonies, canons, &c. contrary to the Lawes of the land, Articles, and Homilies of our Church; as the Parliament hath resolved, yea all our Books demonstrate, and Dr Bastwicke in direct termes, in the Preface of his *Flagellum*: And therefore it could be neither pride, arrogance, nor schisme, but meer conscience and duty in us, to oppose them in these their usurpations and innovations only, contrary to the Laws of God and the Realme: If he and his would containe themselves within these our bounds, our Church should enjoy more peace, their persons more honour, then now they are likely to gaine, by opposing, prejudicating both the Parliaments and Synods proceedings, though never so pious, consciencious, religious.

3. His pretended contradiction of the third *Quere* to the first, is formerly answered,

2.
† Your party are most guilty of it, who without discovery or proof of your New-way, will have us blindly to submit unto it as the onely way of Christ.

* 1 Cor. 13. 5, 7.

* 37. H. 8. c. 17. 1. E. 6. c. 1. 1 Eliz c. 1. See my Breviate against Bishops Encroachments, &c. The Vnbatchoping of Timothy and Titus. The Catalogue of authors in all ages concerning the parity and identity of Bishops and Presbyters. The antipathy of the English Lordly prelacy. The Queench-coale, &c.

Answered,

swered; I shall onely adde, that things may be consonant to the generall Rules of Gods Word, though not precisely prescribed in it: Yea, *Independent Ladies and Gentlewomen*, (and you I hope) will grant, that their different fashions, habits, colours, attires, are all agreeable to Gods Word, (if *modest*) and warranted by this generall precept *1 Tim. 2. 9. Let women adorn themselves in modest apparel*, though not *particulariz'd* in the Text: So may a church-government or *Dresse* be consonant to Scripture, though not precisely delineated or enjoyned by it.

4. To the fourth he gives no answer at all, but bids me prove it; which I have done already in my *Independency examined*, till it be disproved.

5. Nota. To the fifth, he grants *that Independency will overthrow all Nationall Churches and Synods*; and the *two Independent Brethren* assure us in their *Reply to A.S.p. 111* that *intime it cannot but overthrow all other sorts of Ecclesiasticall governments*: Is it not then a turbulent, dangerous, schismaticall, unquiet (that I say not insufferable) Government, by your owne confessions, which will admit no equall nor corrivall; nor yet any Nationall Church, Synod, Parliament, Prince, or temporall Magistrate, to exercise any Ecclesiasticall, Legislative, or Magisteriall authority over any of their *Conventicles*, members, persons, liberties, estates, much lesse their consciences, as they are Christians? Will any Parliament, State, or Nation, (thinke you) suffer such a Government to take root among them, which will un-King, un-Parliament, un-church, un-Nation them altogether, and make each severall congregation an absolute Monarchy, Church, Republick, Nation, within it selfe, depending on, subordinate wholly to it selfe, as if it and they were no part or members of the publike? The Lord preserve us from such a dividing and overturning Government. As for his *invectives against the Formality, Tyranny, and enslaving of mens judgments in the Presbyteriall way, as inconsistent with spirituall liberty and State priviledges*, they are meere groundlesse calumnies, to draw an *odium* on it, (some of your male-contented party professing they would rather set up Lordly Episcopacy, which they have abjured, then it) whereas these aspersions suit better with your independent modell, which is more *rigid, uncharitable, unsociable, Papall, tyrannicall, Anti-monarchicall, Anti-synodicall, yea Anti-parliamentall*, (as I have elsewhere manifested) then any other church-government whatsoever. As for my pretended *bitter expressions*, they are so suitable to the effects and reall consequences of this *New way*, (as you stile it) that I could not expresse my self in other language without injury to the truth: and if any of my *best Friends, who stood by me in my sufferings, deem themselves injured or reproached by them*; (as you pretend, though none of them have yet complained to me) it is (I hope) onely *scandalum acceptum, non datum*; and I presume my Friends are so ingenuous, as *not to be offended with me for* * *reproving only their errors* with ingenuous freedom, in which I manifest my self their *greatest Friend*, because I neither spare nor flatter them in their mistakes: However, though I really honour all my Christian Friends, as well *Independent as Presbyteriall*, (whom you most scandalously traduce as Episcopall and time-servers heretofore) yet I preferre the * *truth of God, the peace and safety of my Native, bleeding, dying Church and Countrey*, (now much endangered by our unhappy divisions) before all Friends or earthly comforts whatsoever. As for your pretended unsubjected of Pre byterian Synods and Churches to the Parliament

* Lev. 19. 17
Gal. 4. 16. c. 2.
11. 14. Tit. 1.
13, 14. Rev. 3.
13. will justify me herein.
* Pro. 23. 23.
Maximè amica veritas.

in settling Ecclesiasticall matters, I neither know nor plead for any such; and our present Assembly being both appointed, directed by, and submitting all their determinations wholly to the Parliament, (as they are obliged both by Orders, Protestation, Covenant, and professe they ought to doe) armes me sufficiently against any such improbable untrue surmise.

6. To the sixth *Quere* he returns no answer, but plainly yeelds, that there was never any Independent Church in any age or Nation what soever, totally converted to the christian faith, till this present; nor anyone Author that maintained it, till Mr Ainsworth (a Separatist) from whom the Apologists professe their dissent in some things. As for any reverend godly persons who now contend for this new Modell, though I reverence their persons, judgements too in other things, yet I cannot subscribe to them in this new dangerous By-path, which is not yet so beaten as to deserve the name of *Christ's Road-way*. For the new supposed light, discovered in these daies, touching church-government, if you meane it onely of your Independency, (which you borrowed from the Brownists, or Low-coun-try Anabaptists, the first inventors of this Government) I doubt when brought out to the light, and examined by the word of light, it will for the most part prove but *iwilight*, if not *darknesse*: If you meane it of any other light, that is truly such, we blesse God for it, and desire to walke brotherly and unani-mously in it.

In the seventh he grants, that the Law of Nature, which instructs men to unite themselves into one Nationall State, or civill Government, doth likewise teach them to joine themselves into, subject themselves unto one Nationall Church, and to Nationall Synods, Parliaments, in point of church-government; in which every particular man hath his Vote though not in proper person, (since all cannot possibly assemble) yet in their deputies, Knights, Burgesses, or selected Commissioners: and though it be true that Christ hath not given Magistrates such absolute authority over mens consciences as bodies, (as you object) yet he hath enjoyned us to be * subject to the higher powers, and to every Lawfull ordinance of man (not repugnant to his Word) **EVEN FOR CONSCIENCE SAKE**, and **THE LORDS SAKE** too. For my passage, That there is no example of gathering independent congregations, nor of Infidels, but of men already converted to, and settled in the Christian Faith, unlesse derived from the private conventicles of Arians, Novatians, Donatists, and other Hereticks, who yet were not independent among themselves; it is not a bitter speech, (as you phrase it) but a true one, and onely bitter to you because undeniable: For as it was the * common practice of those seducing Hereticks, Sectaries, to gather private Conventicles of their own, and labour to draw other orthodox Christians from their proper Ministers, to incorporate themselves into their private separated congregations, as Historians informe us: So no such practice of alluring and stealing away other Pastors sheep from their proper Shepherd, who first converted them to, and edified them in the faith and grace of Christ, can be produced, but only in these Hereticks and Sectaries, whose practice your Independents imitate. As for those private conventicles (as he phra-seth them) for which he saith I may blesse God, that I was remembered in them with tears, when others durst not name me; as I do really blesse God for them, and those who remembered me effectually in them, so I dare not stile them Conventicles

6.

7.

* Rom. 13. 5.
1 Per. 2. 14.

* Iustinian Co-
dicis. l. 1. tit. 8.
Socrates scho-
last. Eccl. hist.
l. 7. c. 5. l. 5. c.
4, 5, 15, 20, 21
23. l. 4. c. 12,
13. l. 2. c. 33.
* See 35. Eliz
c. 1.

† See 35. Eliz. c. 1. None are Conventicles but Hereticks or Schismatickes, who wholly seperate themselves from our publique Assemblies established by Law.

in an ill tencie, hence not † such by Law, being only lawfull Assemblies of private Christians to seek unto God by prayer & fasting upon extraordinary occasions, which all good Christians cannot but approve: But all these meetings were farre from being then stiled, reputed *Independent Churches*, or having any affinity with them; so as they make nothing for his cause.

To the eighth *Quere* he gives a negative Answer, First in generall, next in particular to some instances. First he grants, *that there was a Nationall Church* (yea Nationall assemblies, Parliaments, determining church-affaires,) *of the Jewes, but these* (saith he) *cannot be a pattern for us now, because the covenant of the Gospell is not made with any one particular Nation, as with the Jewes, but to all Nations that embrace the Gospell, and beleve in Christ; you have no promise nor prophesie of any Nation to be holy to God, but the Jewes Nation, when they shall be called againe.*

* 2 Chro. 15. 8, to 16. c. 34. 29, to 33 8. 29 30. Ezra 10. 3. Neh. 9. 38. c. 10. 1. &c.

To which I reply, first, That Independents have not the least precept or example for any, solemne Covenant made betwixt God and men, *to walke in the wayes of God, &c.* but onely * in the old Testament, and Church of the Israelites, and that no private congregational, but publk: Nationall covenant, prescribed by the supreme temporall Magistrate and Assembly, not by the Priests or private Synagogues; yea the principall precepts, presidents for *publike or private fasts, sanctifying the Sabbath, &c.* you likewise derive from the old Testament and that Church; why then should not their Nationall Church be a pattern for us, and you to imitate, as well as their Nationall covenant, fasting, sabbath-keeping; the Church of God being all one, (as it is a Church) both under the old Testament and new; and the pattern of it under the Law a better president for the Church under the Gospell, (of which it was a type and fore-runner) then the pattern of the Tabernacle shewed in the Mount (so frequent in your Lips and Books) a president for your *Independent Modell*, to which it hath no analogy.

† Psal. 2. 8, 9. Psal. 72. 8, to 18. Psal. 82. 8. Pl. 86. 9. Pl. 65 2. Pl. 67. 2, 3. 4. 5. Isa. 2. 2, 3. c. 9. 2, 23. c. 11. 9, to 16. c. 54. 1, 2, 3. c. 60. 3. to 22. Mich. 4. 1. to 5 Mal. 1. 11. Zach. 8. 2, 2. Agt. 13. 46, 47. 48. Match 28. 19, 20. Mar. 14. 15. Rom. 10. 18, 20. c. 11. 4. Isa. 62. to the end.

2. This reason is most absurd and false, the Covenant of the Gospell extending not onely to particular persons, but to † all Nations and people whatsoever, who are both prophesied and promised to become Christs own inheritance, possession, people, spouse, church, and to be an **HOLY NATION, A PECVLAR PEOPLE &c.** to the Lord, in infinite Texts both of the old and new Testament; which I wonder the Respondent should either not see, or forget, being ten thousand fold more cleare and visible then his *Independent platforme*, which few or none can yet espy in Scripture, History, or Politiques.

1 P. t. 2. 9. 16. * March. 3. 12 c. 13. 24. to 52 c. 25. 32. 33.

2. He adds, *that I cannot shew any Nation, every member whereof is qualified sufficiently to make up a church, which is Christs body, unlesse I will take in Drunkards, Whore-masters &c. to be members of a church, whereas the Word saith, they must be visible Saints, and this cannot be avoided in a Nationall church.*

2 Joh. 6. 70, 71. See Iudges, Samuel, Kings Chronicles, Nehemiah, Ezra, and all the Prophets.

I answer, that I dare not be wiser then my Master Christ, who informes me, *that there will, and must be alwayes in the visible church on earth (be it Nationall, parochiall, presbyteriall, or congregationall) * goats among the sheep, chaffe among the wheat (which must grow together til the harvest, at the end of the world, to wit the day of judgment) & good fish mixed with the bad in the churches Net.* 2. I finde a [a] *Judas, a Devill, among the Apostles, many [b] grosse sinners, idolaters, and corruptions in the Jewish church; many abuses, Epicures, Drunkards, Whore-masters,*

masters, Libertines, unclean persons, and false Teachers, in the churches of Galatia, Ephesus Colosse, Pergamus, Smyrna, Thyatira, and Laodicea; yet the Scripture expressly styles them, *c* the body and churches of Christ and repotes such members (though corrupt ones) of those Churches; who doe not actually cease to be members when excommunicated or suspended for a season, after they are baptized, and profess the Christian faith: nor did any separate from these churches, though they had some corruptions and evill members. For you therefore to separate from, and unchurch such Nationall or Parochiall churches, which have such members in them, is to unchurch all churches both in the old and new Testament and the world it selfe, yea your own churches too. 3. The Scripture is expresse, [d] that many are called, but few chosen and saved; that all must be compelled to come into the church, though they want the wedding-garment: There never was, nor shall be here on earth, any one visible church compacted wholly of reall elected Saints without any mixture of Reprobates; such a church we shall meet with onely in heaven, I am sure you can gather none such on earth. 4. Are there no corrupt or drunken members in your independent churches, but onely reall visible Saints? are there no usurers, oppressors, corrupt dealers, covetous proud, malicious, uncharitable, censorious persons; no apparent hypocrites or dissemblers? yea, are there not many finnes and corruptions in the best, the choicest of all your members; (who cannot depart away, or quite separate themselves from their owne bolome corruptions) as there is and will be in the best of men during their mortality? If your Independent congregations consist of such members as these, of men subject to like passions, finnes, infirmities as others in Presbyteriall churches, what then is become of this your reason and principall ground of *Independency*, or rather, *Separation*, or *Brownism*, its ancient proper title? you may lay it up in Lavahder for another world, but can make no use of it in this, where you cannot so much as dream of a church of reall Saints, without any mixture of corruption.

3. For his answers to that of *Acts 15.* all ages, churches, till this present, have held it both an expresse warrant and president for the lawfulness, usefulness of Nationall and Provinciaall Synods to determine differences in Religion, (which particular churches, persons cannot decide) and making necessary Canons for church-affaires; neither can all his shifts elude it: To his first and second reasons, or rather evasions I answer, it is clear by *Act. 15. 2.* that the church of *Antioch* it selfe could not decide the question, nor *Paul* nor *Barnabas* satisfactorily determine it, so farre as to quiet all parties; and therefore they sent *Delegates to the Apostles and Elders at Hierusalem, there to decide it*: None is so ignorant but knowes, that there are many controversies now on foot concerning doctrine, discipline and church-government, which no particular congregations, (nay hardly an whole Synod and Parliament together) are sufficient to settle and determine; therefore there is a kinde of necessity of Nationall Synods as well as of Parliaments, whence all ages, churches, have used them. To his third reason I reply, that it is evident by expresse words *vers. 2. 5. 6. 7. 10. 19. 20. 24.* that the principall end why the *Apostles* went up to *Hierusalem*, and why this Synod assembled was not to prove the false *Apostles* liars, (as he affirmeth) but to debate and consider **THIS QUESTION AND MATTER**, whether the

c See Pauls
and Johns, yea
Christ's Epi-
stles to them,
Rev. 2, & 3.
1. Cor. 11. 13
to 34. c. 12.
12. 27.

d Mat. 24. 14.
15. c. 26. 16.
Luk. 14. 23,
&c. c. 13. 23,
24.

Gentiles ought to be circumcised? To his fourth, I say, that though this meeting was occasional, yet it is a sufficient warrant for generall meetings, which are usually called, only upon speciall occasions of moment: In it there was a generall assembling of all the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at Hierusalem, (where there were then divers particular congregations, as, our Assembly long since resolved from Acts 2. 6. 41, 42, 46, 47. c. 4. 4. c. 5. 14 15, 16, 42. c. 6. 1; to 9. c. 8. 2, 3, 4. c. 11. 1, 2. c. 12. 12, 13. c. 21. 17, 18, 23, 22. which if Independents deny, then they must prove, that all the Apostles and Elders at Hierusalem were Pastors but of one and the self-same, individuall congregation; and then what becomes of their Independent churches; which have no Apostle, and onely one Pastor, but scarce any Elders in them) who upon this speciall and some other publike occasions met all together, and that not to advise onely, but determine and resolve, as is evident by vers. 6. to 32. c. 16. 4. c. 21. 25. which compared with the Texts of the old Testament in the Margin of my Quere, where we finde frequent Nationall generall Assemblies, Synods, or Parliaments (if I may so stile them) among the Israelites (prescribed, appointed by God, and no wayes contradicted, revoked under the Gospel) determining† all Ecclesiasticall controversies, settling, ordering all church-affaires, matters concerning the Arke, Temple, Sacrifices, Passover, Priests, Nationall covenants, Fasting-dayes, Festivalls, suppressions of Idolatry, false-Worship, Reliques of Idolatry, and the like; are an impregnable evidence of the lawfulness of Nationall Synods, Parliaments, Assemblies, in all Christian Kingdomes, Republickes, upon the like occasions, and that they are endued with equivalent authority; there being no one Text in the old or new Testament, nor any shadow of reason, (but meet shifts or obstinacy of spirit against publike government, order, and authority) to controll it. If any pretend they doe it onely out of conscience, if they will but seriously gage their owne deceitfull hearts, I feare their conscience will prove but wilfulness, having neither precept, president, nor reason to direct it: So as I may truly retort his owne calumny against me on him and his, that his and their owne name, will, or opinion, is their onely argument against this shining truth, which all ages, Churches, have acknowledged, ratified, practised, without the least dispute.

To my ninth Quere, and arguments in it, he returnes nothing worthy Reply, but upon this *Petitio principii*, or begging of the thing disputed; that the Scripture and Apostles have prescribed a set forme of Government in all after ages for the Churches of Christ, which he neither can, nor endeavours to prove; and that Churches in the Apostles dayes were Independent, though doubtlesse all Churches were then subject to the Apostles Lawes, Orders, Edicts, Decisions, though no immediate Ministers or Pastors of them, (as appeares by their Epistles to them) therefore not Independent: so as my arguments hold firme, and his answers weak. As for his retorted argument, That the Scriptures were writ in the infancy of the Church: Therefore wiser and better Scriptures may be writ now; it is a blasphemous and absurd conclusion. they being all writ by the spirit and inspiration of God himselve, the very * *Archieve* of dayes, who hath neither infancy nor perfection, as the Church hath.

To his second, that I would needs make a Nationall Church, State, more perfect, understanding, and wise, then a congregat: onall: I feare not to averre it, since your selves

† 1 Chro. 13.
1. to 14. c. 28.
& 29. 2 Chro.
5. 2, & c. 6. 9, &
7. c. 15. 9, to 29.
c. 17. 7, 8, & c.
c. 20. 3, 4, 5.
c. 24. 4, to 16.
c. 29. 3, to 36.
c. 30. v. 31. c.
34. 29, to the
end. c. 35. 1, to
19. Ezra 8.
Neh. through-
our. Esth. 9.
17. to 32.

9.

† Dan. 7. 9, 13
32.

selves must grant, that the Church under the Law was more perfect then that before it; the Church under the Gospel more perfect then that under the Law; and the Churches under the Gospel, at the end of the Apostles dayes, when furnished with more *divine knowledge, Scriptures, Gospels, Officers, and rules of Faith, Manners, Discipline, more compleat and perfect then at their beginning to preach*: No man doubts, that though *a new-born infant and Christian have all the parts and members of a man and Saint*, yet they have not so much perfection, *understanding, knowledg, judgment, strength of grace, or spirituall wisdom, as grown men and Christians*. An aged, experienced, growne Minister, Christian, is more compleat and perfect then a new converted † *Novice, or Babe in grace*; Ergo a growne and Nationall Church, then one but in the Embryo. Your Independent Churches, in their primitive infancy, when they had but two or three members onely in them, and wanted both Elders, Deacons, and other necessary church-officers (as Mr. *Sympsons* church first did) I am certain in your own opinion were not so complete and mature as you intended to make them afterwards by degrees: a Village is not so complete a Republike or Corporation as a City, nor a City as a † Kingdom, nor a Family as a County, nor a Consistory as a Synod, nor a court of Aldermen as a common-courcell, nor that as a Parliament: Therefore an Independent singular congregation not so complete as a Nationall church, being oft enforced to pray in the aid of other churches for advice, assistance &c. (as your selves confesse) which an whole Nationall Church need not to doe. In fine, *himselſe confesseth, that the Apostles made new rules for government and discipline as occasion served; and that as God fitted occasions, so he made knowne new rules successively by degrees, not at once; and added new Officers, as Evangelicall Bishops, Elders, Deacons, Widowes, Evangelists, Doctors, Pastors, Teachers, (which some distinguish from Presbyters, and define to be severall offices:)* Therefore the infant Church in the Apostles dayes was not so compleat, perfect in all parts, as the multiplied and growne churches afterwards.

My tenth *Quere* he wilfully miscites: as he doth the rest, else he had not the least shadow of exception against it, as I propounded it, and then returns an answer by way of dilemma to it: To which I reply, *That if the Parliament and Synod shall by publike consent establish a Presbyteriall church-government, as most consonant to Gods Word, the Lawes and Reiglement of this Kingdome, Independents and all others are bound in conscience to submit unto it, under paine of obstinacy, singularity, &c. in case they cannot really prove it diametrically contrary to the Scriptures, and simply unlawfull in point of conscience, not by fancies, or remote inconsequences, but by direct Texts and precepts (which they can never doe;)* and that because it is thus commanded, established by *the higher powers*, to which in all lawfull or indifferent things wee are bound to render all chearfull obedience, without resistance, even for conscience sake, by expresse Gospel Texts, *Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3. Tit. 3. 1. 1 Pet. 2. 14, 15.* which I wish you would practise better, and make more conscience of then now you doe. As for his crosse Interrogatories, I answer, 1. That if the Popes Councils command lawfull things to those who are subject to their power they are as well to be obeyed as the *commands of heathen Emperours, Magistrates, Parents, Husbands, by Christian Subjects, Wives, Servants, living under them are.* 2. That there is a great difference between matters

* 1 Cor. 13.
 11, 12. c. 14.
 20. c. 3. 1.
 1 Pet. 2. 2.
 Heb. 5. 12, 13,
 14. 1 Ioh. 2.
 11. to 15.
 Ephes. 4. 15. 16
 † 1 Tim. 3. 6.

† Ezek. 16. 13

10.

* Rom. 13. 1,
 to 7. 1 Tim. 2
 1, 2, 3. Tit. 3. 1
 1 Pet. 1. 2. to
 24 c. 3. 1.
 1 Cor. 7. 1. to
 18. Eph. 5. 2. 2.
 23. e. 6. 1. to
 10. Col. 3. 18,
 to 25.

of opinion onely, and of practise; That his instanced points, *Whether Lordly Episcopacy be jure divino; or their making-out Proceſſe under their owne Names and Seales be agreeable to the Law of the Land.* are matters onely of opinion simply in themselves; and if a Synod and Parliament should have determined the first, and the Judges resolved the last, affirmatively, their resolutions could not binde my judgement absolutely, so farre as to subscribe their opinions as undoubted truths, unlesse they could satisfie my arguments and authorities to the contrary; but yet they should & ought to binde me for the present so far as to submit to their authority & Proceſſe in their own names in things within their legall cognifance: So if the Parliament and Assembly shall establish any Church-government, as most agreeable to the Scriptures and our Lawes, though this binds not all Independents to be simply of their opinion, unlesse the reasons and arguments produced for it be sufficient to convince their judgments, yet it binds them in point of practise and obedience outwardly to submit thereto, and not to separate from it, under pain of *arrogancy, faction, schisme*, unlesse they can clearly manifest it to be absolutely unlawfull and repugnant to the Scripture. As for my own objected challenge to the Bishops & Judges about the *jus divinum* of Lordly Prelacy, and Bishops Proceſſe in their own names; when I made it I was certain I had both † Scripture, Fathers, Councils, Acts of Parliament, the suffrages of all forraigne Reformed Churches, Writers, and our owne learnedest Bishops, Authors in all times against the first; and direct Acts, Resolutions of Parliament, Patents, unanswerable Law-authorities, and Reasons against the latter: Therefore a few Lordly Prelates opinions in their owne case, or the subitane, forced, extrajudiciall resolution of the Judges (not then published) could no more conclude my judgement, nor make me guilty of *arrogancy, obstinacy, or schism* then, than their forced judgments for the lawfulness of Loanes and Ship-money, against expresse Acts and judgments of Parliament, oblige me or others, then or now, not to deeme that taxe illegall: and when you can produce as many good authorities, Reasons from Scripture, Antiquity, Acts of Parliament, Writers of all sorts, against the lawfulness of Presbytery, as I have done against Lordly Episcopacy by divine right Bishops making out Proceſſe under their own Names, Seals, and † Ship-mony, neither of which were ever settled by any former Parliament, and have all bin expressly voted against in this; I shall then excuse you from *arrogancy and ichisme*, but till this be done, (as I presume it will never be) the guilt of both these will stick fast upon you, if you readily conforme not in outward practise to that Government the Parliament shall establish. If they should settle Independency, I am certaine you would then write and preach for universall obedience to it (which you now publicly call for so eagerly without authority or proof of its Divinity, because thus settled) without dispute: therefore by like reason you ought to submit to a Presbytery, or such other Government as shall be resolved on by those intrusted with this care.

To my 11. *Quere* he gives only a negative answer and then declaims against Presbytery without ground or reason: But because I have proved the truth of what he denies in my *Independency examined* and in some following pages, I shall not trouble you with any further proof, except these two particulars: 1. That *Independency* is in reality meer *Separation* and *Brownism*, lately christened with this

† See my Catalogue, &c. The unbishoping of *Timothy* and *Titus*. A Breviate, and Antipathy of the English Lordly Prelacy.

† See my humble Remonstrance against Ship-money.

new title, to take off its *odium*: and if so, I doubt not but it is a nursery of schisms, Sectaries, &c. 2. That we finde by wofull experience, what bloody divisions, waeres schisms, the toleration but of one Religion and Sect in our Realms contrary to that established, (to wit Popery and Papists) hath produced in all our Dominions, to their imminent danger, and almost utter ruine; what then will the free permission of many Independent different forms of Churches, Sectaries do? will it not produce many more troubles, dangers, wars, schisms, then we have hitherto felt? Yea, if every man ought to have freedom of conscience, to vert what opinions; & set up what Governments he deems most conformable to the Word in his own private fancie, you must indolge Papists this liberty as well as others: and then how soone will they over-tun us for the future, how justly can we take up armes to suppress them for the present? Consider seriously of these and other publike mischiefes of your way, and that liberty of conscience you so much contest for, (which in truth is nothing but meere lawlesnesse, or licentiouinesse, to do * *what seem's good in your owne eyes, as if there was no King in Israel*, without respect to the publike peace or weale) and then happily you may in time discern, recant your error.

* Deut. 12. 22.
Judges 17.
6. 1. 21. 25.

To my twelvth *Quere* he onely answers, that I fall a *jeering of my brethren*; (a palpable untruth) and that I put a *nick-name on them, to make them odious*; to wit, the title of Independents, which they disclaime; not answering one syllable to the substance of the Question. To which I reply: First, that the title of *Independency* (of which you are now ashamed) was at first assumed, approved by your selves, and many of your party doe still owne, though some disclaime it, of purpose to evale the titles of *Separatists* and *Brownists*, with whom you really concur in practice: Besides, you very well know that this title was imposed on, and owned by you long before I writ; therefore I could not father this brat upon you. But if you be offended with this name, I desire you in your next Pamphlet to discover to us your owne Christian name, with the true title of your party, and the government you plead for as the only way of Christs institution (all which you have hitherto concealed) and then (God willing) I shall give you a further answer to this cavill, or retract this title; till then I must informe you that it most proper for your party, who will have every of your owne private congregations a complete absolute corporation, exempted from, unsubjected to, independent on any other be it a Nationall Synodall Provinciall, Parochiall assembly, Parliament or Kings themselves in any Church-affaires: You must therefore still retaine this *Title*, whiles you maintaine such Paradoxes both in opinion and practice as justly appropriate it to you, *Conveniunt rebus nomina sepe suis*, being never more exactly verified then in this your suitable name.

12

But you object, first, *That you are accountable for your actions to every neighbour Church, that shall in the name of Christ require it.* Secondly, *That you stand not independent from, but hold communion with all other Churches, both in the Ordinances, and in asking counsell and advice mutually.*

To the first I answer, 1. That if you are accountable for your actions to every particular neighbour Church, then why not much more to a Synod or Parliament, whose ecclesiasticall jurisdiction over you or your Churches is denied by you?

you? Secondly, if you are thus accountable to every neighbour Church, doe you intend it of Parochiall, Episcopall, or Presbyteriall Churches, as well as Independent; or of Independent onely? If of Independent onely, as I suppose you doe, then you appeale onely to Churches of your owne partie, frame, judgment, and make one of them subordinate, accountable to another, but not to any other Church; which is an apparent schisme, separation from all other Churches, and contradicts your second objection: If of all other sorts of Churches as well as Independent, you must either grant them true Churches of Christ, and then you have no ground to sever from them; or if false, or no true Churches of Christ, (as you in truth repute them) then by your own principles they are no competent Judges of Ecclesiasticall affaires, nor you accountable to them. Thirdly, How (I pray) doe you hold your selves accountable to every neighbour Church? by way of subordination, or correction? that I am certain you will deny: or only by way of voluntary information and satisfaction, when required, which I conceive you mean? If so only, then this is properly no account at all, or but arbitrary at most, which you may deny if you please; and if you erre or prove faulty, this neighbour Church can but admonish, not enforce you to correct your errors or injustice: and so this will prove but a meere mockery in stead of an account.

To the second I answer, *That if you stand not Independent from other Churches, but hold communion with them in Ordinances, and in mutuall counsell and advice, Then 1. why doe you separate from them as no true Churches, and oppose their way of Government with so much bitterness? Secondly, why doe you refuse to administer Baptisme and the Lords Supper to those who are their members, in your Churches, unlesse they be professed members of some Independent Congregation? Thirdly, why do you not follow their advice, counsell, or the Parliaments, Synodes, and submit thereto; who now earnestly dissuade you from your way of separation, division, in these distracted times? the end of demanding good counsell and advice being but to follow, not reject it, where there is humility, ingenuity, or sincerity in those who aske it. You must therefore either disclaime these objected concessions, or become more tractable for the future. 4. You tell us in the next succeeding lines, *That neither I, nor Synods, nor this Synod, are infallible, but as subject to errors as others; and that never † more dangerous errors have been confirmed then by Synods: and therefore men are not bound in conscience to their decrees upon penaltie of sinne, arrogancy, &c.* But pray Sir, may not you and your Independent Ministers Churches erre as well as others? Is infallibility annexed onely to your private Chaires, conventicles? If not, then why may not your new-minted *Way* be a meere erroneous *By-path*, and no way of Christ as well as other waies, and you erre herein as well as Synods in other things? Why will you have the major vote in your congregationall decisions to over-rule and bind the rest to obedience, (as your practice and opinions intimate) since the major part may possibly be mistaken, as well as the lesse dissenting? Shall nothing binde in any Churches, but what is unanimously voted *nemine contradicente*? or shall one or two dissenting voices over-rule the rest, or not be bound by the most? or where all consent, may not all yet be in an error, and not discern it, through selfe-love to their*

† Yea, never more dangerous errors refused, suppressed, then in the 4. first general Councils, and some Synods since, as that of Dort, and other Protestant Synods in the *Harmony of Confessions*: Where therefore they determine rightly, you must submit unto them; where they confirm apparent dangerous errors, there you may vary from them when proved such.

owne wayes and opinions, till others of contrary judgements diſcover and convince them of their error? Away then with this ſond argument and evaſion; Synods and Parliaments may erre in ſome things, Ergo they muſt binde us in no thing: Is this good Logicke or Divinitie? Good Miniſters may and doe erre ſometimes in ſome points of Divinitie, Ergo wee will beleve them in none, no not in thoſe things in which they doe not erre. Will you throw away all the Apple becauſe one part of it only is rotten? or reject Communion with the beſt of men becauſe they have ſome infirmitie? Deal then with the Eccleſiaſticall decrees of Synods and Parliaments as in wiſdome, in conſcience you are bound to doe: Where they are juſt, equall, not oppoſite to the word, embrace, ſubmit unto them; when erroneous or contrariant to the expreſſe word (not to your own fancies, inferences or opinions) you may differ from them in judgment, but you muſt patiently ſuffer under them in point of praſtiſe & obedience (if meerly practical) till a further ſeaſon, and not diſturb the Churches peace by oppoſition or ſchiſm: which is as good, as reaſonable Chriſtian advice, as that you conclude with unto me, which I heartily with your ſelfe had firſt followed, who have more deſamed the wayes of Chriſt and uſed more perſonall unchriſtian bitterneſſe then I am guilty of. You wiſh indeed, *O that a ſpirit of love were maintained among thoſe that are brethren: though they differ in judgment, muſt they needs differ in affection?* I lay the ſame. But *O then why ſeperate you from us, yea paſſe uncharitable cenſures on us as if we were not your Brethren?* One Kingdom one City, Houſe, doth now, on e heaven ſhall hereafter, contain us both: why not then one church government, one Church Militant, as well as one Triumphant? If you deem not your ** ſelves more holy* then your brethren or be not ſwelled up with *ſpiritual pride* (as your ſtiling your ſelves *† Men of rich anoynting from God, the moſt religiously affected, and beſt conſcienced people of the land, the moſt precious men, &c.* with your ſeparation from us, and harſh cenſures of us, make moſt men ſuſpect) then why reſuſe you to cloſe with us now, as you have done heretofore? Could our Miniſters, Churches, when more corrupt, convert, regenerate, edifie, ſave you, and yet not now ſo much as hold you, when more refined and reformed? If yea, then let us both ſhaſe hands without any more encounters; if nay, then fairely chalke out your yet concealed independent way and platforme in all its ſeverall lineaments, and beautifull native colours; produce your ſeverall punctuall Scriptures, Arguments, to maintain it, (there being none of them extant in theſe your *Observations* for ought I can find) that ſo I may ſee the frame and grounds of this new Fabricke, in as large or narrow a Modell as you pleaſe: and then doubt not but an Anſwer ſhall be given to what ever you modestly ſet forth, (if worthy anſwer) in caſe it be not ſatiſfactive; or elſe a friendly embrace thereof, if agreeable to the Spirit and Word of truth, by him who hath learned *Pauls* peremptorie reſolution, *2 Cor. 13.8. We can do nothing againſt the truth, but for the truth;* in which reſolution (God aſſiſting) I reſolve to live and die.

Certaine brieſe Animadverſions on Mr John Goodwins Theomachia, in Juſtification of ſome paſſages in Mr Independency, Examined, Unmaſked, &c. and of the Parliaments Eccleſiaſticall power.

IT is not my intencion to repeate or refute all the unreaſonable offenſive paſſages in the *Epistle or Body of this Treatiſe*, which tacitly

* Theſe are the true grounds of all ſeparations. Eſa 65.5. Luk. 18.10, to 16. lude 18. 19. witneſſe the *Novatians, Donatiſts*, of old: The ſeverall orders of Monks, Nuns, Eremites, Anchorites, in the Church of Rome, and their new order of Jeſuits, each of them pretending more ſanctity and ſtrictneſſe then another, and ſo ſevering in their different orders, habits, Monasteries, rules, covenants, one from another. *† Mr Goodwins Theomachia p 24, 25. The Reply of two of the Brethren paſſim.*

ly reflect upon the present Religious Parliament and Assembly, raising need-
 lesse feares and jealousies of them both (in matters of RELIGION and
 Church-Government) as if they really intended * to increase our misery and
 bondage, by rejecting and oppressing truth; to conjure all mens gifts, parts indu-
 stric into a Synodical Circle; and that there is almost as little hope of gathering
 grapes from thornes, or figges of Thistles, as of having the joy of our faith holpen, or
 encreased, or any decrease, but rather increase of evils by them; the resolutions of
 Councells, and Synods themselves upon the matter and just account, being but the
 fruits, or puttings forth of the learning and judgment of a very few men, not alwayes
 of the most conscientious &c. I shall only select some few particulars worthy con-
 sideration; to fill up my vacant Pages.

First, it may be justly questioned, whether the maine doctrine profecuted in it
 (b) That it is the greatest imprudence under Heaven, for any man or ranke of
 men whatsoever to appeare, or so much as to lift up an hand, or thought, against
 any way, doctrine or practise whatsoever clayming origination or descent from
 God, till we have securitie upon securitie, evidence upon evidence, yea all the
 securitie that men in an ordinary way are capable of, and foundations as cleare
 as the noone day, that such wayes, Doctrines and practises, only pretend unto
 God as the Author of them, and that in truth they are not at all from him, but
 either from men, or from baser Parentage; that they are but counterfeites and
 pretenders only, and stand in no relation at all, but that of enmitie and oppositi-
 on unto God; and that we are not to act the value of one haire of our head a-
 gainst them, untill we see their condemnation written with a beame of the
 Sunne, by the finger of God Himselfe; untill he hath disclaimed or renounced
 it from Heaven, either by giving such wisdom unto men, whereby to detest
 the vanitie of it, or else hath quite rased it out of the flesh and Tables of the
 hearts of his servants, &c. Be Orthodox or tolerable? For these ensuing reasons.

1. First, because it opens a wide gate to the reviving of all old, the spreading and
 propagating of all new Heresies, Errors, Schismes, Sects and opinions whatsoever,
 without the least timely opposition or prevention, to the endangering of infi-
 nite soules, and disturbance of the Churches, Kingdoms peace. For there is * no
 Hereticke, Schismaticke, or Sectary whatsoever, (though never so pernicious, grosse
 or detestable) but pretends his way, doctrine, practise, opinions to be the way and truth
 of Christ, clayming their origination and descent from God, yea, * producing perving
 the Scripture it selfe to justify them, as the * Devill cited and wrested Scrip-
 ture to tempt Christ: yea, our Saviour and the Scripture informe us, that ma-
 ny false Teachers shall arise, and doe great Miracles, Signes and Wonders, inso-
 much that they shall deceive many, yea the greatest part of the World, and if it were
 possible the very Elect; * That Satan and his Ministers also transforme themselves
 into Angels of Light: That false Teachers usually come to seduce men in sheeps
 clothing, with all deceivablenes and craftines, whereby they lye in waite to deceive;
 and adviſe us frequently to beware of such, and not admit them into our houses, &c.
 And must we therefore not speedily oppose, resist, avoyd, suppress them or any of
 them now, because they thus pretend they are of and from God Himselfe; but stay
 till we see their condemnation written with a beam of the sun by the finger of God him-
 selfe, and till he hath disclaimed, renounced them from Heaven, by some visible judg-
 ment or destruction? I. Arianisme, Pelagianisme, Socinianisme, Anabaptisme, or
 any

* Epistle to
 the Reader, &
 p. 11. 33. 44.
 to 52.

o Page 18. 22.
 52. and else-

Camaliell
 Himselfe no
 Apostle, nor
 Christian,
 from whose
 words you yet
 take your text
 as Gospell,
 was not alto-
 gether of this
 opinion.

* See Epiph-
 anus, Basil,
 Augustine, and
 all the Bookes
 of or against
 any Hereticks
 and Secta-
 ries.

* Matth. 4. 6.
 * Mit. 24. 11.
 23. to 27. c. 7.
 15. 2 Cor. 11
 13. 14. 15.
 Ephes. 4. 14.
 2 Thes. 2. 9. 10
 Rev. 13. 2. 10
 18. 2 to 10.
 11.

any anciently exploded *Heresies*, or *Schismes* should revive and sprout up among us (as some have lately done) should wee use such indulgence as this towards them, because they pretend *their origination and descent from heaven*; and their opinions not disputable only, but warranted by the Scripture? Alas what confusion what inundation of heresies, schismes, and monitrous opinions would this presently introduce into our Church to its destruction, ruine, if such a Paradox were once admitted?

Secondly, Because it is contrary to these expresse précepts and presidents both of the Old and New Testament, which you may peruse at leasure, *Deut. 13. 1. to 18. Levit. 19. 17. Joshua. 22. 9. to 24. Psalme. 119. 104, 128. 2 Kings. 23. 8. to 27. Jer. 4. 30. 31. (a pregnant place) c. 14. 14. to 18. cap. 23. 13. to 23. cap 27. 15. to 19. c. 29. 8, 9. Ezra. 13. throughout Matthew 7. 15. cap. 24. 11. 23. 24. 25. 26. Mark. 13. 5, 6. 22, 23, 24. Acts 13. 6. to 14. cap 15. 1. to 33. cap. 17. 11. Rom. 16. 17. 18. 2 Cor. 11. 13. 14, 15. Galath. 1. 6, 7, 8, 9. 10. c. 2. 4. to 18. (a noted place) c. 3. 1, 2, 3. Ephes. 4. 14, 15. Phil. 3. 1. 2, 3. Coloss. 2. 8, 18. to the end, 1 Thes. 5. 21. 2 Thes. 2. 1. to 16. c. 3. 6. 7. 1 Tim. 4. 1. to 7. chap. 1. 20. chap. 5. 20, 21, 22. 2 Tim. 2. 16, 17, 18. 23, 24, 25, 26. c. 4. 1. to 6. Titus. 1. 9. to 15. chapter 3. 9. 10, 11. 2 Pet. 2. 1. 2, 3. c. 3. 17. 18. 1 Ioh. 4. 2, 3. 2 John 10. 11. Jude 3. 4. &c. Revel. 2. 14. 15. 20, 21. compared together. (f) Paul would not give way to false Apostles *Gal. 2. 4. to 18. NO NOT FOR AN HOLLRE*, that the truth of the Gospell might continue among the Galatians, and resisted Peter to his face, as soone as ever hee walked disorderly, and gave the least countenance to false Teachers, though a chiefe Apostle; and did not demur upon the matter; yea the Churches* of Pergamun,* *Rom. 19. 15 and Thyatira, are sharply blamed for suffering some among them to hold the doctrine of Balaam, and the Nicolaitans; and to suffer Jesabell the Prophetesse to teach and seduce: And shall we permit them, now, without restraint?**

Thirdly, Because it is contrary to these received unquestionable Maximes of *Divinitie, Policie, and Morality. Principijs ob stare: Venienti occurrere morbo*, to withstand the very beginnings of Errors, Heresies, Mischiefs, Schismes: to crush these Cockatrice in the shell; rather to keep then cast them out, *Turpius ejicitur quam non admittitur hostis*. All wise men hold preventing Physicke best for their bodies, states, and why not for their souls and Churches? since, *Sero medicina paratur, cum mala per longas invaluere moras*.

Fourthly, Because contrary to the (h) Policy, practise of most Godly Magistrates, Princes, Ministers, Churches in all Ages, Nations, which never indulged such liberty to opinions, new wayes, practises, especially to new Church-governments, Schismes, and Conventic'es, (which he here pleads for) set up only by private spirits in opposition to the publick established Church-regelment. Indeed in some matters nearly of opinion which are not dangerous or schismaticall, some latitude may and must be left to men; but matters of Government are such tender things, as differences & varieties therein cannot be tollerated in one and the selfe same Church and State without infinite inconveniencies and disturbances, especially where every Church shall be *Independent*, subject to no other Canons, rules, but its own peculiar arbitrary Dictates.

2 It may be questioned, whether the *Independent* way he there so earnestly pleads for, be the way of Christ, or not? since he neither discovers to us what it is, nor produceth any one text to prove it *Christ's own way*, nor one example to warrant it in any age: but gives us good grounds to suspect it none of his without much scrutiny.

1 For first, he confesseth, (i) that *this way is every where spoken against, even by some that would be thought prime men and pillars in the temple of God; and insinuates; that the Parliament, Assembly and generality of the (k) Ministers and people of the Realm, are bent against it; Therefore being a new way, never yet heard off in the world in any age, or Church of Christ, and thus generally opposed by our whole Church and State even in these times of Reformation; we may (l) justly suspect it is no way of Christ, till we see its approbation written in a beam of the Sun with the finger of God himself, and till he hath justified and owned it as his, from heaven.*

2 He tacitly acknowledgeth, it a (m) *Government set up by a few private men, not only without but against the authority & commands of the Parliament and supream temporall Magistrates; yea, which not only denyes but oppugnes the temporall Magistrates, Parliaments, Synods directions or coercive power in Ecclesiasticall affairs; directly contrary to the Scriptures, as I have largely proved by many Texts, in my (o) Independency examined. Only I shall adde, that not only the Kings and temporall Magistrates of the Israelites; but even heathen (p) Kings and Princes (as Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Darius, Nebuchadnezzar, the King & Nobles of Nineve &c.) enacted good and wholsome Laws, for the worship, honor and service of the true God, and to further his people in the building of his temple; who thereupon were enjoyned to * pray for their prosperity, as the marginall Scriptures evidence. Yea, (r) Paul himselfe even in matters of Religion pleaded his cause before Festus, Felix, King Agrippa, and at last appealed unto Cæsar an heathen Emperor, herein; yea he enjoyns all Christians (s) to pray even for heathen Kings, Magistrates, and to submit to all their lawfull commands for conscience sake, to whose judicature and tribunals, (t) Christ himselfe and his Apostels willingly submitted themselves upon all occasions when brought before them, without demurring to their jurisdictions. Therefore Christian Princes & Magistrates, who were long since predicted to become nursing Fathers to the Church under the Gospel, have much more power and jurisdiction in Church-government and affairs within their own Dominions.*

3 For that it appeats to be away that will breed infinite confusions, disorders, by confounding (v) *the bounds of parishes, renting Congregations, families, and most relations assunder; & giving way to every sect to chuse Ministers, erect Churches of their own without controle, in point of position (thou!h their practise be quite contrary where they have power, they admitting no other kind of government but Independency in New-England, and excommunicating, or banishing those who will not submit unto it;) a government inconsistent with Royalty, and the civill government; and so none of Christs, who never erected any Church-government to clash with or controle the civill.*

4 Whereas he pretends, that (x) *persons of one family or parish may be members of severall Churches, without any inconvenience, schisme, or distraction; as well as members of severall companies and trades; and therefore Independency is no occasion of divisions.*

I answer, 1. That (y) *two cannot walke peaceably and lovingly together unlesse they are agreed, especially in matters of Religion; and those who in point of conscience cannot communicate or agree together in one Church, will never questionlesse accord well together in one family, bed, parish, kingdom, as experience manifestts.*

2. There is a great difference between severall trades and Halls in one City, parish, kingdome, and severall formes of Church-government, in these particulars which occasion unity in the one, but schismes in the others 1. All trades societies hold one another lawfull, usefull, necessary, agreeable to the lawes of God and the Realme without

without dispute; & so they breed no contrariety of opinions or disaffection: but each different Church deems the other unlawful, & in no way of Christ, so as they cannot with safe conscience joyn or communicate together: and therupon they sever one from another. 2. Every severall trade and society, even in their very trade is subject to the general Government, Laws of the City & Realm wherein they are, to which they appeale and have recourse upon all occasions of difference, none craving an exemption or Independency from the whole Corporation, Parliament or supream Magistrate in matters which concern their government, but deriving their Corporations Charters, Laws and priviledges from them: which subordination keeps them all in peace and unity. But Independent Churches deny any subordination, subjection to the Ecclesiasticall Lawes and Edicts of Parlements, of temporall Magistrates or Synods, and will be regulated, obliged onely by their own peculiar Edicts: which must needs occasion infinite Schismes, and disorders: therefore the cases are far different from one the other.

Thirdly, Christians, as Christians, are all of one and the self-same society and profession, as those of oue Trade or Calling are; therefore they should have all but one common Church and government, as these Trades have: To set then the comparison upright, we must state it thus; If some of one Fraternity in London (suppose the *Merchant-taylers, Sadlers, Mercers,* or the like) should fall out among themselves, and one would have one forme of government, another another, and thereupon divide themselves into severall conventicles and petty meetings in corners, not at their common hall, and one chuse one Government, Matter, or Warden, another another, and so sever the company, and continue independent; this (no doubt) would prove an apparent schisme, and seminary of infinite divisions, to the distraction, destruction of the whole Company and Fraternity. This is the true state of your *Independency*; yea Mr *Goodwins* present case in his own Parish, miserably divided, disordered by his *Independent way*: which hath induced him to refuse to administer the Lords Supper, (yea Baptisme to some children of Parishioners) for a yeares space or more, though they offer to be examined by him; esteeming them none of his Flocke, (preaching but seldome to them, though he receive their tithes :) and instead thereof to gather an *Independent congregation* to himselfe, out of divers Parishes and his owne, to whom hee prescribes a Covenant ere they be admitted members of it; preaching, praying, administering the Sacrament to them alone in private conventicles, neglecting his Parishioners: which hath engendred such discontents and rents in his Parish, even among the well-affected and truly religious, that he must either desert it or his *Independent way*. What schismes and discords this *New way* hath raised in other Parishes, is so well knowne to the World, that I need no other evidence to prove it a schismaticall *By-path*, and so no way of Christ the * *Prince of peace*, * *Esa. 9. 6.* who prescribes nought else but precepts of peace and unity to his Churches, *See my twelve Questions p. 7, 8.* and is most offended with their schismes.

Finallie, I cannot thinke this way a way of Christ, because I finde it a Pioneer and underminer of *Parliamentary authority*, devesting Parliaments of all manner of jurisdiction in matters of Religion and church-government; witness the passage of the *Two independent Brethren*, recited in my *Independency examined*, p. 3. (which certainly weares a *Maske* as yet, since she never appeared *bare-faced* to the world, not one of her Patrons hitherto presenting us with her

in her native colours, or lineaments) whose guilt this *Author* by his explanation, to make it good, rather aggravates then extenuates. He writes, "That the Brethren in the mentioned period and expressions, reflected onely upon the generalitie of the Land, who according to the Lawes, yea according to the principles of all reason and equitie have the right of nominating persons unto Parliamentarie trust and power, but HAVE NO AVTHORITY OR POWER FROM CHRIST IO NOMINATE OR APPOINT WHO SHALL BE THE MEN THAT SHALL ORDER THE AFFAIRES OF CHRISTS KINGDOME, OR INSTITVTE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS CHVRCHES: These are that secular root, out of which the Brethren conceive AN IMPOSSIBILITY that a spirituall extraction should be made; that is, THAT A LEGITIMATE ECCLESIASTICK POWER SHOULD ACCORDING TO THE MIND OF CHRIST, OR ANY PRECEPT OR PRESIDENT OF SCRIPTVRE, BEE BY THEM CONFERRED VPON ANY MAN. And this IMPOSSIBILITY conceived by them they onelie illustrate and declare by that parallel expression in *Job, Who can bring a cleane thing out of an uncleane? &c.* But to hold, that the persons so elected as hath been said, have a power by vertue of such nomination of election to enact Lawes and Statutes in matters of Religion, and to order under mulcts and penalties how men shall worship and serve God, as it is a meanes to awaken the eye of jealousie upon them, and so is seven times more destructive unto, and undermining not onlie of their power, but of their honour; peace, and safetie also, then any thing that is found in the way so ill intreated; so it is a setting of a power upon the electors of such persons, I meane the promiscuous multitude of the Land, yea of a greater power then ever Iesus Christ himselfe had, at least then ever he exercised; For as *dare Regem*, argues a greater power then *esse Regem*; as hee that buildeth an house hath more honour then the house, *Hebr. 3. 3.* so to nominate and appoint who shall have power to umpire in matters of conscience and of God, to determine what shall be preached, and what not; what shall be beleevd, and what not, is a branch of a greater root of power, then the exercise of the power that is committed to others in this behalfe. Now though Iesus Christ had a power, and was authorized by God to be a Law-giver himselfe unto his Churches and Saints in their spirituall Republique, yet it is hard to prove, that he ever he invested any other with such a power: His Apostles themselves were no Lords over the faith of the Saints, nor had they anie power or authoritie to impose any thing upon men, as † necessarie either to be beleevd or practised, but what they had in expresse commission and charge from Iesus Christ himselfe to impose upon such termes, &c.

The summe of this large passage is, that there is not onelie an improbabilitie, but absolute impossibilitie, that the Parliament should have any power at all to enact Lawes and Statutes in matters of Religion, church-government, Gods worship or service, because the people who elect them have no such power, and so an impossibilitie of deriving any such authoritie to them; and to affirme the contrarie, is not onely to awake the eyes of jealousie upon them, but exceedingly destructive to, and undermining of not onely their power, but honour, peace, and safetie also. Whether this be not directly to undermine

* Pag. 48, 49, 50. This he more fully expressed in a Sermon in February last.

Note.

Gamaliell & your Text never taught you any such Anti-Parliamentary Doctrine.

Note.

* The people having power to elect Princes, Magistrates, Ministers, Parliaments, Synods have likewise authority to nominate such who by the rule of Gods Word may limit these particulars, though not by their owne bare authority, without or against the Word.

† Every Magistrate, Parliament, and Synod, have power to declare and enjoin what is necessary to be beleevd, practised, by or according to Gods Word, not without or contrary to it.

the authority of Parliaments and temporal Magistrates in all church-affairs and matters of Religion, contrarie to your late Covenant and Protestation, and that in the most transcendent manner that ever any have hitherto attempted in print, let all wise men judg: I am sory such *ill passages* should fall from so good a pen.

But to give a short Answer to this *extravagant discourse*: First, this objection might be made against the *generall Assemblies, Parliaments, Kings of the Israelites, who [a] were chosen by the people*, yet they made Lawes and Statutes concerning Religion, and Gods worship, with his approbation, without any such exception, as I have elsewhere proved. Secondly, God himself (as I formerly touched) used the ministry, assistance of *Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Darius*, with other heathen Princes and Magistrates, for the building of his Temple, and advancement of his worship, for which they made *Decrees, Statutes*; notwithstanding this objected reason reflects more upon them and their electors, then on such who are Christians by external profession. Thirdly, most Christian Kings and Magistrates in the World, (even those who claime to be hereditary, as the yet continued formes of their Coronations and instalments manifest) come in by the peoples election, as well as such members of Parliament who are eligible, yet you cannot without disloyalty and absurdity, deny them authoritie in matters of Religion and Church-government. Fourthly, your selfe doe not onely grant, but argue, [b] *That every private man hath, yea ought to have power to elect and constitute his own Minister*: and no doubt you will grant, that private men have power likewise to set up independent Congregations, which have authority to prescribe such Covenants, Lawes, and Rules of Government, Discipline, Worship, as themselves think most agreeable to the Word: If then they may derive such an Ecclesiasticall authority to independent Ministers and Churches, why not as well to Parliaments and Synods likewise by the selfe same reason? Fifthly, It is cleare by sundry instances in Scripture, and your owne Text, that God doth oft times make use of *unsanctified persons*, and the rude multitude, (whom you so much undervalue) to advance his glory, propagate his Gospel, promote his Worship, vindicate his Truth, and edifie his Church: He can poure a spirit of prophesie upon *a Baalam, a Saul, a Gamaliel, a persecuting High-Priest*; he can make a [d] *Judas* an Apostle, yea *send him to preach* and build his Church, as well as a *Peter*: Wee read in the Evangelists, that none were so forward as the vulgar [e] *multitude* to beleeve, follow, professe Christ, and embrace the Gospel, though many of them did it out of sinister ends. Therefore they may well have power to chuse such persons who shall and may make Lawes to promote the Gospel, and Government of the Church of Christ. Sixthly, those who have no skill at all in Law, Physick, or Architecture, have yet judgment and reason enough to make choice of the best Lawyers, Physitians, Architects, when they need their help. Those who are unfit, or unable to be members of Parliament themselves, (as most of the electors are) have yet had wisdom enough in all ages, and especially at this present, to elect the most eminent & ablest men for such a service: Those who are unmeet to be Kings, Magistrates, Commanders, or Ministers, have yet skill enough to chuse able persons for such offices, & power to delegate to them such Parliamentary, Royall, Magisteriall, Pastorall authority, as is necessary for their severall offices, which those who elected them never had actually, but onely originally or virtually in them, not to use, but derive them unto others: why then may not our free-holders, who

a See my Appendix to the power of Parliaments and Kingdomes 122. to 131. † Twelve considerable Questions p. 4, 5. Independence examined p. 2, 11, 12.

b Page 25, 26

c Num. 22, 29
 c 23, & 24.
 1 Sam. 10.
 Act. 5. 4 to
 40. Joh. 11 49,
 10 53.
 d 1oh. 6 70, 71
 Mar. 6. 7. to 14
 e Math 5, 1.
 c. 13, 1, 2. c. 8.
 18. c. 9 35. c.
 14, 14, 19. c.
 11 32, 33. c. 21
 8, 9, 10. Luk.
 6. 17, 19 c. 8.
 44, 45. Joh. 6.
 2, 5. Mar. 13.
 12, 37. Luk 13
 17. c. 18. 43. c.
 21. 38. c. 22. 1.
 Joh. 7 47 43.
 & c. 8. 2.
 Act. 2. 47.
 have

have voices in electing the members of our Parliaments, and the Commonalty of the Land, (whom you scandalously terme, *the vilest and most unworthy of men*, though there be a degree of vulgar people viler and unworthier then they in all respects, who have no votes in such elections) have sufficient authority in them to elect and nominate such fitt persons, who by virtue of such nomination or election shall have right and power to enact Lawes, Statutes, in matters of Religion, Worship, and Church-government, not disonant from Gods Word, to which themselves and others by Gods owne ordinance mult submit? If the common people, who neither are nor can be Parliaments, Emperors, Kings, Judges, Magistrates, Ministers have yet a lawful power to make others such by their bare election & to give them such authority and power as themselves never actually were or can be possessors of, then why by the self same reason may they not likewise delegate a lawfull Ecclesiasticall legislative authority in church-affairs, to their elected Parliamentary and Synodall Members, which was never actually in themselves, as well as *Mr Goodwin* delegate the power of determining who should be fit persons to receive the Sacrament, and to become members of his independent Congregation, to eight select substitutes, which was never actually vested in himselfe, nor transferrable thus to others by any Law of God or man? why may not a man bring an ecclesiasticall or spiritual extraction out of a scornfull root, (contrary to your Paradox) as well as a *R. gall, Magisteriall, Parliamentall, Ministeriall* extraction, out of a meere popular or servile root? or the best strong waters out of the vilest Lees; the richest Minerals out of the courtest earth? the most orient Pearles out of the basest Oysters? In one word, the very choice *these your vilest and most unworthy of men* have made this Patliament, may for ever refute this childish reason, the corner-stone of your *Independent* fabricke, fastned together with independent crochets, unable to abide the test. Therefore notwithstanding this your reason, our present Parliament may and ought in point of right & duty, to make binding Lawes for regulating church-government, restraining heresies, Chiimes, innovations, erroneous doctrines, unlawfull conventicles, and for settling the purity of Gods worship and Religion, notwithstanding this objection; and with as much reason, justice, raise, and establish a new church-government, suitable to Gods Word and the civill State, as reforme or repeale the old, (which grew to burdensome and offensive) till Independents can shew us better grounds against it then any yet produced: and informe us, why our whole representative Church and State should not of right enjoy and exercise as great or greater ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, over all particular persons and Churches, who are Members of our Church and Realme, as any independent Minister or Congregation challenge or usurp unto themselves, over their owne Members (this being the true state of the question, and not *whether one particular Church, or parish, hath superiority or Jurisdiction over another: as some mistake it*) without yea against both Law & Gospel, for ought they yet have made appeare? I shall say no more in so clear a case, but refer the Author to the high Court of Parliament, (whose undoubted priviledges he hath presumptuously undermined by the very roots) to crave their Pardon, or undergo their justice for this and other his *Anti-parliamentary* passages, diametrally contrary to his, our, their late *Nationall Vow and Covenant*, which they cannot without *highest Perjury* permit any wilfully thus to violate in the most publike manner.

* This he confessed, and it appeared by a writing before the Committee of plundered Ministers.

* Oras well as himselfe extracts many Spiritual Doctrines out of Gamaliels Secular Speech in these very sermons.

(*) Therefore your principall Argument; that the seven particular Churches in Asia had no Jurisdiction one over another, (being under different civil Dominions, and not members of the selfe same Christian Republike,) Ergo the whol Parliament and Church of England have no Jurisdiction over particular parish Churches or Independent Congregati- ons in England; is a meere Independence.