

**THE WORKS  
OF JOHN SMYTH**

**W. T. WHITLEY, EDITOR**

**VOLUME 2**

THE WORKS OF  
**JOHN SMYTH**  
FELLOW OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, 1594-8

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME II





Men whose life, learning, faith, and pure intent,  
Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,  
Must now be named and printed heretics.

JOHN MILTON.



THE WORKS OF  
JOHN SMYTH

FELLOW OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, 1594-8

TERCENTENARY EDITION FOR THE  
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
WITH NOTES AND BIOGRAPHY BY

W. T. WHITLEY

M.A., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S.  
Sometime Exhibitioner of King's College

None of the English Separatists had a finer mind  
or a more beautiful soul.

MANDELL CREIGHTON

Cambridge:  
at the University Press  
1915



**The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.**

NUMBER ONE IRON OAKS DRIVE • PARIS, ARKANSAS 72855


Thou hast given a *standard* to them that fear thee;  
that it may be displayed because of the truth.  
-- *Psalm 60:4*

*Reprinted in 2009*

*by*

**THE BAPTIST STANDARD BEARER, INC.**

No. 1 Iron Oaks Drive  
Paris, Arkansas 72855  
(479) 963-3831



**THE WALDENSIAN EMBLEM**

*lux lucet in tenebris*

“The Light Shineth in the Darkness”

ISBN-10: 1579782612  
ISBN-13: 9781579782610

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CERTAYNE DEMAUNDES, ETC. . . . .	321
PARALLELES, CENSURES, OBSERVATIONS (1609) . . . . .	327
Lettre to Mr. Ric. Bernard (1607) . . . . .	331
Lettre written to Mr. A. S. (1606?) . . . . .	547
Lettre written to certaine brethren in S. (1606?) . . . . .	557
THE CHARACTER OF THE BEAST (1609) . . . . .	563
NOMINA ANGLORUM (1610?) . . . . .	681
CORDE CREDIMUS (1610?) . . . . .	682
DEFENCE OF RIES' CONFESSION . . . . .	685
ARGUMENTA CONTRA BAPTISMUM INFANTUM . . . . .	710
PROPOSITIONS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	733
RETRACTATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS . . . . .	751
APPENDIX . . . . .	761
NOTES . . . . .	763

---

### PLATE

Names of the English who applied in 1610 for union with the  
 Waterlander church in Amsterdam. Holograph of John  
 Smyth. *Frontispiece*



Certayne demaundes  
from the auncyent brethren  
of the Seperation





Certayne demaundes, wherto wee desire direct & sound answer, with proof from the Scriptures.

1. Concerning the Kingdom & Priesthood of Christ.

Whither the Kingdom & Priesthood of the old Testament were not distinct & severall, both in person, office, & actions.

Whither the Kingdom & Priesthood of the old Testament were not typical, shadowing out the Kingdom & Priesthood of Christ?

Whither the Kingdom & Priesthood of Christ are not distinct, both in office & action though vnited in one person?

Whither as Christ is both King & Priest, so also the Saynts are not by Christ annoynted to be Kings & Priests vnto God?

Whither the office & actions of the Sayntes in the Kingdom & Priesthood, are not distinct & several, though vnited in person?

Whither the office & actions of the Kingdom in the Old Testament were not of opposition, difference, plea, & strife?

Whither the office & actions of the Kingdom of the Saynts in the new Testament are not of the same nature?

Whither the office & actions of the Priesthood of the Old Testament were not of vnion, concord, & agreem[en]t in Sacrificing.

Whither the office & actions of the Priesthood of the Saynts in the new Testament be not of the same nature?  
Rom. 15. 6.

2. Concerning the Spirit & Spirituall: the Lettre,  
& Literal.

Whither in this phrase & the like (viz: The manifestation of the spirit) the Spirit doth not signifie principally, both the Spiritual & regenerate part of the soule, & the Spiritual matter in the regenerate part.

Whither the manifestation of the Spirit doth import eyther the Spirituall matter which a man bringeth out of a book by reading: or the Spiritual & gracious gestures & motions which a man expresseth in reading & performing other actions.

Whither quenching the Spirit be not to withhold & restrayne the Spiritual matter which by the Spirit of Sanctification is stirred vp in the regenerate part of the soule.

Whither reading wordes containyd in a book doth manifest the Spirit; that is, expresse the Spirituall matter which is in the regenerate part of him that readeth, or rather doth not cleane put it by, leave it, & diverteth to an other subiect & so quencheth it.

Whither the letter doth not properly signifie the literall & ceremonial ordinances of the old Testament, 2. Cor. 3. 6. which began outwardly signifying & conueighing Spiritual matter into the regenerate part of the soule from without?

Whither reading the wordes containyd in a booke be not asmuch & as truly literal beginning outwardly & conueighing matter inwardly as the sacrificing of a beast in the Old Testament?

Whither sacrificing in the Old Testament may not as truly be accounted the manifestation of the Spirit as reading: seing sacrificing did expresse the Spiritual matter Christ Iesus, & was done with a grace by the Preists, even as reading, doth expresse the Spiritual matter of the book Christ Iesus, & is performed with a grace by the reader?

## 3. Concerning, writing, &amp; Reading.

Whither lettres or characters are not invented by the will of man to expresse the articulate sounds of natural speech: & whither the inventors of lettres are not mentioned in historyes?

Whither writing be not the invention of man by the same reason?

Whither reading be not the invention of man by the same reason?

Whither writing & read[i]ng be not things meerly artificial though speaking be natural

Whither writing & reading being meer artificial devises may be properly called Spirituall worship: & whither if reading be Spiritual worship, writing be not so also?

Whither that because the manuarie trade of the butcher & cook in killing roasting or boyling the Sacrifices, of the ingraver in the stones of the brestplate of the Apotecary in the annoynting oyle, of the Mason & carpenter in the hewing of stone & wood, & so co[n]sequētly of the scribe or paynter in writing & reading, were literal & ceremonial eyther worship or actions in the Old Testament, they may now be called Spirituall worship or actions in the new Testament: & whither one rather then another: & why?

## 4. Of the Holy Scriptures &amp; translations.

Whither the holy Scriptures viz: the originals Hebrue & Greek do not conteyne in thē infinite depth of truth: & whither the holy Spirit did not intend by thēs to signifie al the truths, which al the men of the earth, eyther hertefore, now, or hereafter truely collect from thence?

Whither the holy originals do not conteyne more matter thē the Prophets & Apostles that wrote them did conceive?

Whither the Hebrue & Greek tong in their idiomes, words & phrases are not plentifully more comprehensive

& significative of matter thē any other language whatsoever?

Whither as the original Scriptures are the jmage of the mynd of God: so a translation be not the jmage of the original Scriptures.

Whither the jmage can possibly expresse the thing therby signified, fully.

Whither it be possible for any language verbatim without paraphrast to expresse the Hebrue & Greek text of the holy originals fully?

Whither a translation made by the most learned & holy men of the earth doth or can expresse truly & fully the holy ghosts meaning in the originals?

Whither therfor a translation made by the most learned & holy men of the earth be not an Apocrypha writing of an ordinary man?

Whither if any Apocrypha writing may be brought into the worship of God to be read all may not: & whither if some Apocrypha writings must be cast out of the church why not all, yea the translation also?

5. Of worship, & vse of bookes in tyme of worship  
in the new Testament.

Whither prayer, prophesying, & singing Psalmes be the true & only parts of the worship of the new Testament?

Whether reading be eyther prayer, prophesy, or a Psalmes?

Whither reading be lawfull in tyme of prayer, prophesy & singing Psalmes?

Whither reading doth not put matter into the hart of him that readeth, & worship be not the producing of matter out of the hart of him that worshippeth?

Whither the Apostles & primitive Churches did ever pray, prophesy, & sing psalmes out of bookes, after the day of Pentecost, Act. 2?

Whither they did not pray, prophesy, & sing Psalmes as the holy ghost gave them vtterance?

Whither the place 1. Cor. 14. 26. doth not teach that a man must have a Psalmes, have doctryne, that is in his

hart, whence he must produce it by the manifestation of the Spirit?

Whither if a book must be laid aside in prayer, it must not be also in prophesy & singing Psalmes & why?

Whither if a book be retayned in prophesy & a psalme, it may not be so also in prayer & why?

Whither that be two kindes of prayer, prophesy, & Psalmes, one with books, another without bookes: or one sort of prayer without bookes: & two sorts of prophesying & Psalmes: with & without bookes & why: & whither this can be warranted by the Apostles doctryne & practice?

#### 6. Concerning a Psalme.

Whither as in prayer & prophesy one alone speaketh, & the rest pray & prophesy by consent. 1. cor. 11. 4. so in a Psalme one onely must speak, & the rest must co[n]sēt. 1. cor. 14. 16.

Whither in a Psalme a man must be tyed to meter & Rithme, & tune, & whither voluntary be not as necessary in tune & wordes as in matter?

Whither meter, Rithme, & tune, be not quenching the Spirit?

Whither a psalme be only thanksgiving without meter, Rethme or tune, yea or nay?

#### 7. Concerning the Elders or Presbytery.

Whither al the Elders must not be able to teach, & rule as the Apostle saith, didacticoi, & proistamenoι. 1. Timoth. 3.

Whither didacticos that is apt to teach be not expounded by the Apostle, Tit. 1. 9. by three particulars: viz: 1. to teach wholsome doctryne: 2. to exhort: 3. to convince the gainsayers?

Whither Teaching & Ruling be not the two parts of feeding?

Whither feeding that is Teaching, Ruling, exhorting

conforting be not the pastors office, & therfor all the Elders pastors?

Whither the Eldership hath not all their powre from the Church?

Whither the Eldership hath a negative voyce in the church that nothing can be concluded without them?

Whither if most of the Church consent & the Elders dissent, the matter cannot passe against the Elders dissent?

Whither seing the church may depose & excommunicate the Eldership they may not passe other sentences without or contrary to their liking?

Whither may not a man propound his mater to the church without acquaynting the Elders with it in the first place.

Whither in the second degree of admonition a man is not bound to take an Elder for witness?

Whether one Elder only in a church be Gods ordinance & whither if ther be chosen any Elder ther must be chosen more then one?

Whither the seales of the covenant may not be administred, ther being yet no Elders in office?

#### 8. Concerning the Treasury & contribution.

Whither the treasury be not Holy?

Whither contribution be not an action of the communion of the Saynts?

Whither as in other parts of communion so in this, ther ought not to be a seperation from them that are without?

Whither the action of contribution must not be Sanctified by prayer & thanksgiving?

A Recapitulation of the Chapters to be found  
according to their pages

[omitted here]

# PARALLELES, CENSURES, OBSERVATIONS.

Aperteyning :

## TO THREE SEVERAL WRITINGS,

1. A Lettre written to Mr. Ric. Bernard, by Iohn Smyth.
2. A Book intituled, The Separatists Schisme published by Mr. Bernard.
3. An Answer made to that book called the Sep. Schisme by Mr. H. Ainsworth.

## WHEREVNTO ALSO ARE ADIOYND.

1. The said Lettre written to Mr. Ric. Bernard divided into 19. Sections.
2. Another Lettre written to Mr. A. S.
3. A third Lettre written to certayne Brethren of the Separation.

By Iohn Smyth.

Mat. 24. 23. Then if any shall say vnto you, Lo, heer is Christ, or there, beleeve it not.

Vs. 24. For there shall arise false Christs, & false Prophets, & shall shew great signes & wonders, so that if it were possible they should deceave the very elect:

Vs. 25. Behould, I have told you before.

Mat. 7. 15. Beware of false Prophets, which come to you in Sheeps clothing but inwardly are Ravening wolves.

Vs. 16. Yee shall know them by their Fruytes.

Ioh. 10. 1. He that entreth not in by the dore into the Sheepfold but climeth vp another way, he is a theef, & a robber,

Vs. 10. The theef commeth not, but for to steale, & to kil, & to destroy.

2. Cor. 11. 13. For such false Apostles are deceitful workers, & transforme them selves into the Apostles of Christ,

Vs. 14. And no marvayle, for Sathan himself is transformed into an aungel of light.

Printed. 1609.



TO EVERY ONE THAT SEEKETH AFTER  
the truth in sincerity: Salutations.

**N**Ot every thing, Gentle Reader, which a man writeth privately & sodaynly to his frend is fit to be published openly to the view of the world: neyther did I think that this lettre written to Mr. Bernard in private vppon three dayes meditation should have been made publique in print to every mans eye & censure: which had I thought should have come to passe, I would with better advyse & leasure & so with more mature judgment have conceived & penned it. But seing it is justly occasioned through Mr. Bernards importunity in his late published book intituled the Seperatists Schisme, & his slaunderous misconstructions & misreports vp & downe the country behind my back, that this lettre of myne is strongly suspected of error, bitternes, rashnes, vncharitablenes, & imputations of the like nature: & by reason thereof my self falleth vnder the hard & vnknowne, & happily vnderdeserved censure of many well affected to the truth: whereat I cannot but be much wounded, both in myne owne soule inwardly, & in my good name outwardly, which is alwayes better & more to be esteemed then a good oyntment: I thought it much more tolerable to adventure my self, by exposing this vntymely byrth, I meane this sodaynly conceived & penned lettre, to the variable censures of the multitude: thē by burying it in darknes & silence, like vnto one stil borne to superinduce a strong presumption of iustly imputed blame vppon my self by reason of this present lettre: Therefore I doe earnestly intreat every one frend, or other, into whose handes this present writing may come, to esteeme it, as it is indeed, even a sodayne private lettre of one frēd vnto another: & not to respect it as it now falleth out to be a publique writing proclaymed as it were vppon the house top: I cannot nor may not with fidelity alter one sentence or word of it, but as Mr. Bernard hath it copied in his hands, so have I published it word for word without

any the least changd to my knowledg, least Mr. Bernard should say it is not the lettre he had from mee & that his slaunderous collections & aspersiones cast vpon mee in respect of the lettre may be perceaved by them that read this lettre, & compare it with his book, notes, & speeches: And seing necessity enforceth the identity of this lettre without correction eyther of matter or wordes, I beseech the Gentle Reader frendly & favorably to construe all things, & interpret them in the better part. promising that if any eyther error in matter: or tartnes of speech be manifested vnto mee as my sinne, I shal willingly confesse & repent it before the world.

And so vpon hope of a favorable construction I desire to advertise further that Mr. Bernard had in his hands this lettre of myne six or seven monthes before he published this his book intituled the Seperatists Schisme. which book as may be perceaved by this letter, compared therwith, is principally directed in opposition & reprehension thereof: but how litle cause Mr. Bernard had so to doe, may now appeare. For he should have answered before he had opposed: but that which he doth oppose is indeed answered already in the lettre by prevention & anticipatiō that I shal not need to make answer a fresh to Mr. Bernard, he being now twice answered, once before his book was published, & now againe since by Mr. Henry Ainsworth: Only I desire the reader to be advertised that ther are some particulars wherein Mr. Ainsworth hath left mee & the truth in the open playne field to shift for our selves: In regard whereof, as also bicause of Mr. Bernards misaledging & misconstruing divers parts of my letter written vnto him, I have thought meet, not barely to publish this lettre, but parallele-wise to compare Mr. Bernards book, Mr. Ainsworths answer, & this my lettre together, as also to annexe a few animadversiōs & observations aperteyning therevnto, that by this meanes the agreement & difference being discovered, the truth may appeare where it is.

Now although it be a greevous thing vnto me to raise vp adversaries against me with out cause, especially brethren of true Churches: yet seeing I am necessarily interested to defend the truth manifested in myne owne

writings, which I cannot possibly doe but by way of opposition, therfor it commeth to passe that will I, nill I, I must needs answer the opponent, lest I betray the truth which by due order I am particularly called & singled out to defend. Wherfor for more evidence sake I have caused this lettre written to Mr. Bern. to be divided into 19. Sections, & in every Section wher need required, I have made parallels, animadversions, & observations for severall purposes as the reader shal perceave in perusing thē: Finally vpon perswasion of friends & for further cleering of the truth I have annexed two other lettres, the one written to Mr. A. S. a Minister of the Church of England conteyning certayne principall & mayne groundes of our cause which I desire may diligently be considered of every one that is willing to see the truth: the other written to certayne brethren of the Seperation for the confirming & establishing of them in the truth, against the assaults of Sathan transforming himself into an aungel of light therby the better to deceave the simple: & howsoever it be needlesse to publish any thing further for the cleering of the truth of our cause out of those mysts & foggs which subtil disputers & pleaders for corruption have like jannes & jambres those Egiptian juglers cast before mens eyes, that they cannot readely discern a true serpent from a false: yet bicause new adversaries arise dayly with new shifts & cavils therfor it is not amisse to discover their forgeries also that at the length it may evidently appeare that the truth hath devoured error as Moses Serpent did the Enchanters: So desiring every one that loveth the Lord & the truth especially Mr. Ainsworth & Mr. Bernard to judg wisely of my course, & not to take any thing in the evil part which is a strong fruite of the flesh, I cease, wishing the truth may be honoured though men be shamed, Amen.

IOHN SMYTH.

## A LETTRE WRITTEN TO MAISTER

Ric. Bernard Minister off worksop, by Ioh. Smith Pastor  
off the Church at Ganesburgh.

## The First Section.

Aister Bernard I have sufficient reasons that have moved mee to breake silence in respect  
 M of you, & by this Lettre to attempt a further tryall of your pretended Zeale for the truth & faith of Christ: I have long tyme observed the applause yeilded you by the multitude: Likewise I have taken notice of your forwardnes in leading to a Reformation by publique proclamations in Severall pulpits out of that Text off Daniell. 3. 16. 17. 18. As if you had meant contrary to the Kings mynd to have caryed all the people in the country after you against the Ceremonies & Subscription: afterward having lost your vicaridge of worksop for refusing Subscription or conformity I have observed how yow revolted back & vppon Subscription made to the Prelate of york, have reentred vppon your said vicaridg. Againe I have noted your vehement desire to the parsonage of Sawenbie, & your extreme indignation when you were defeated of it: Further your earnest desire to have been vicar of Ganesburgh, & al this after your subscription: besides I have carefully weighed with my self your Readines to embrace this truth wee professe, First, at Sr. W. Bowes his howse when it was opposed by some adversaries, after that your acknowledging of it before many witnesses at one tyme, & before one or two witnesses at divers tymes, aledging Naamans speech for your continuance in your Ministerie, 2. King. 5. 18. as if therby you meant to reserve libertie to sinne against your conscience. And now of late I have considered your covenant made with one hundreth people, a thing of such note & observation as that the whole country ringeth of it: but alas againe you have revolted from al this truth (only excepting your opposition against the dumb ministers) & have not only rejected it, but set your self against it, hinder divers from it, both in your

pulpits, & writings proclame against it as error & schisme, yea & beginne to justifie all the corruptions of the ministerie, worship & government of the assemblies & all this with a high hand: Al these things & many more I have noted in you, & all the forward professors, yea & the verie enemies also have observed the same. In al which particulars two things may be mynded: your inconstancy: & apostacy: (misconstre not the word) for how can I judg it otherwise seing you have acknowledged the truth, & now reject it & oppose it. your inconstancy in falling of & on so often as you have done: now allthough these general reasons might have moved any of the Prophets & Teachers of our Chu[r]ch for the truths sake, to have delt with you: & to have discovered you to the simpler sort whome you seduce: yet I have attempted it vpon two private groundes wherein I am especially interested to this busines: one is certayne aspersions by you personally cast vpon mee: Another is certayne particular oppositions directed against some of my writings: For the First, you may remember that at Broxtow when you returned from Mr. Hildersham before certayne competent witnesses you vttered wordes tending to this purpose: that in defence of the truth wee professe, I chose out a fitt adversary (viz: Mr. Rich. Clifton) to deale withall, a man that could dive into the depth of my argumnts: & that I refused to deale with you in that respect. This speech savoreth verie strongly of pride, which vice take you heed of especialy: it conteyneth also an vntruth, & manifesteth contempt against a man of better hability then your self in the judgment of them that know you both, besides the wrong that you doe mee, as if I knowing the cause wee testife to be weake & bad durst not adventure it to the trial of your sufficiency & diving wit: but in good earnest Mr. Bernard tel mee: is your dealing vpright in this point? Doe not you remember that you have in your handes & had in your handes at that instant when you vttered those wordes my answer writtē in one Columne, to certayne doubts & objections you made written in another Columne, which I desired you to answer & wherto as yet I have received no answer from you? Surely you may pretend

holines & zeale for the truth, but this dealing & these speeches declare no such matter: yea rather they do manifest the corruptiō of your hart: This your speech & dealing is one reason that moveth mee in Special to deale with you that your mouth may be stopped in that behalf: although it be stopped already sith you answer not my writing that is in your handes: & for Mr. Richard Clifton, I assure my self as you shal find shortly to your litle credit, he wil approve his sufficiēcy to be Superior to your diving witt: A Second reason that in particular leadeth me to medle with you in this matter, is your oppositions against some truths which I have expressed in some of my writings.

Paralleles: Censures: Observations:  
aperteyning to the first Section.

The place of Daniel mentioned in the beginning of this Section is: Dan. 3. 16. O Nebuchadnezzar wee are not careful to answeere thee in this matter: 17. Behold our God whome wee serve is able to deliver vs frō the hote fiery fornace, & he will deliver vs out of thyne hand, o King, 18. But if not, be it knowne to thee o King, that we wil not serve thy Gods, nor worship the golden jmage which thou hast set vp.

This place of Scripture Mr. Bernard handled oft tymes in several places, in so much as every man conceaved that he would have been a ring leader to reformation: For the circumstances being considered, that this Scripture was handled when the King vrged Subscription & conformity throughout the whole land, & when divers of the forwardest preachers were silenced, & himself then endaungered to leese his vicaridg: that then he should thus preach was enough to have brought him within the compasse of petty rebellion, in stirring vp the myndes of the people against the Kings proceedings: besides the shew of the text might aford that he compared the King to Nebuchadnezzar: Subscription, to the Kings commaundement of worshipping the golden jmage: Refusal of Subscription, to the Refusal of worshipping the golden jmage: the parts of Subscription to the golden jmage:

the Ministers refusing Subscription to the three persons that refused to worship the golden image: their Resolution & courage to the Resolution of those three: The Prelates that vrged Subscription & conformity, to the accusers of the Iewes: I would therfor know of Mr. Bernard whither his mynd be now altered from that he held when he Preached these Sermons vppon this text, if yea: then I demaund whither feare of affliction & love of his living & reputation with the world, have not caused that in him: & whither a man should beleeeve him rather now he is a formalist, then before when he was a reformist.

The place of Naaman the Assirian is this: 2 King. 5. 18.

When I bow in the howse of Rimmon to worship, the Lord be mercifull vnto thy Servant in this point.

By this place Mr. Bern. intended to sinne against his conscience for he did acknowledg this truth wee now professe divers tymes, & was vppon the point of Seperation with some of his people with him: yet loving the world & prefermēt as Naaman is thought to doe he chose rather to stay stil in his vicaridge against his conscience, then to leese it & to follow Christ with a good conscience: do you not remember Mr. Bern. what you said to mee & Mr. Rob. Southw. comming together from w: that speaking of the daunger of walking in this truth of Christ we now professe you said you could easely die vppon the tre for the truth, but you could not without great horror think of being burned as the Martyrs were in Q. Maryes dayes? & that all the jorney you were casting how to dispatch your estate & to get away with safety: I speake this to prove vnto you & the world, that you were as forward to the truth of Christ with vs then, as you were before to the cause of the Reformists: & yet as then so now you have wholly & I feare finally apostated from it: the L. be merciful vnto you in these your sinnes: wherevppon this followeth that if ever you come to the truth of Christ wee professe, you can not be admitted into the office of Elder in the Church, but therein you must beare your iniquity, bicause you have apostated fearfully from the truths you did acknowledg, therein giving Suspition of your constancy & faythfulnes for the tyme to come: & whither you be a worthy Minister of your owne Church,

lett the Reformists judg who have betrayed their cause into the Prelates handes so shamefully as you have done: wherefor be it knowne vnto you, first, that wee reject you, Secondly, that the Reformists have just cause to reject you. whither then wil you goe, but to your Ll. the Prelates to whome you have sworne your Can. obediēce, & vnto whome you have now at the last fuly returned as it were a dog to the vomit, & a swine to wallow in the myre.

But your covenant Mr. Bern. is beyond all the endeavors of al the reformists of the land that you should cull out an hundreth persons of so many parishes so far distant to enter covenant together not to heare the dumb Ministers, to watch one over another, to admonish one another, &c. And therevppon to receave the Lords Supper: What? was not the covenant the Church of England large enough, but you must enlarge it thus? Did not your conscience tel you then that the dumb ministry was vnlawful? that you sinned in not admonishing your brethren & therfor went to seek out an hundreth brethren where your proctor or agent could find them? That al your parish were not your brethrē, being not of your covenant though of the covenant of the Church of Englād? or that you had two sorts of brethren, one of a general nature, viz: all the people of the parish? another of a Spiritual nature, viz: Those hundreth persons of your covenant? & yet that you admitted both those sorts of your brethren to all the holy things among you, excepting the particular covenant? I pray you with your logick, or divinity, justifie vnto vs these things. But now all this is forgotten: & the Prelate of york hath so bewitched you with his flatterie, eloquence, & aungels, that your covenant is profaned & cast in the dust, men of your covenant must shift for themselves, you have deceived them like the staffe of reed, & you justifie your wonted speeches, you love the world, & ease with all your hart: & therfor I say vnto you with the Apostle: The love of the Father is not in you: I do therfor Proclame you vnto the whole land to be one of the most fearful Apostates of the whole nation that excepting, Whyte, & Claphā, you have no Superior nor equal that I know or remember, who have thus often confessed &



witnessed much truth, & now not only have fallē from it, but have so childishly & yet most slaunderously written against the cause of the Lord, to blaspheme the name of the Lord, his Tabernacle & them that dwell in Heaven, as if, bicause your sinnes werē not known Sufficently to the world, you would with inck & paper publish them to al men & ages to come, that they might remain in record agaist you vppon the file at the day when the Lord shal recompense every man according to his worke.

But Mr Bernard ther is yet one other thing that I must discover to the world: namely that you have written a book against the Prelates, wherein you have proved by divers arguments that their authority is Antichristian: this book some of your Frends have seē & read & though you durst not print it your self, yet you would have been content a Frend should have caused it to be published vnder the vizard of an vnknowne Auther: is not this so Mr. Bern? then tel mee with what face, or conscience you can Subscribe to the Prelacy, you can plead for the Prelacy: is not this to build that which you have destroyed? Surely all these things compared together do plainly convince, your deep Hypocrisy: & yet in your pulpit & among the simple sort you would seem a brother to the Sonnes of Thunder: but I desire the Lord to open the eyes of his people that they be no longer deceaved by such Pharisaical Hypocrits as your deedes manifest you to be even in the indifferent censure of those that love you best.

Now therfor to conclude this Parallele of your Famous or rather infamous acts: compare your resolution against Subscription & conformity, with your Subscription to the Prelate of york: your acknowledgment of the truth with Naamans presumptiō to sinne: your covenant, with your confirmity: your book against the Prelates, & your book against the Seperation & therevppon it will follow, that you are as changable as the Moone, as mutable as Proteus, as variable as the Chamæleon. And whereas you object aganst me pag. 37. & 73. that before I came to the truth I wrote against it & was distracted to & fro before I saw it cleered to my judgmēt & conscience, I must needes acknowledg it so to be, which was my greater

sinne, & the weaknes of my vnderstanding, but therein the L. hath shewed mercy vnto me, which mercy I desire also for you: but what is this to excuse your slaundering, rayling, scoffing, inconstancy, Apostacy, conformity, subscription, blasphemy, & the rest which you have plentifully discovered to al the world: Shew me, how & when after the acknowledgment of the truth, I fell back as you have done many tymes? that I ever yeilded to the Prelates conformity, or Subscription, after I once withstood it? & amōg the rest of your follyes ther is one vntruth that I did kneele downe & praise God for Satisfaction after doubting, Not so: I remayned doubting alwayes till I saw the truth after I once doubted, but during the tyme of my doubting which was 9. Months at the least I did many actions arguing doubting, but that I ever fel back from any truth I saw I praise God, I can with a good conscience deny it, & you are never able to prove that against me: but the L. wil cut out the tong that speaketh lyes.

#### The second Section.

These oppositions of yours you have written in a lettre which came of late to my sight: which are thus in your lettre.

Touching your oppinions in these things shall I never be perswaded that you doe well in:

1. In Seperating from all the Reformed Churches.

2. In holding that one sinne of one man publiquely & obstinately stood in & not reformed by a true constituted Church doth so pollute it, that none may comm[un]icate with it in the holy things of God til the partie offending be by the Church put out after lawful conviction.

3. In maintayning that its not lawful to heare any ministers amongst vs whatsoever thy be, nor to joyne in prayer with such as feare God among vs.

4. In holding that Princes have no more to doe in Ecclesiastical causes, thē one of you in a particular congregation.

5. That the powre of binding & losing is given to the whole multitude, & not to the principal members therof.

6. that the word truly preached & Sacraments rightly administred are no infallible tokens of a true Church.

7. That a minister may be made without Elders ordinarily I meane for extraordinary courses are not now to be vsed, for ought I see.

8. That such as are not in your way are to be accounted without after the Apostles meaning, 1. Cor. 5. 12.

9. That those which are not of a true constituted Church are no subjects of Christs Kingdom.

10. That an erroneous constitution of a Church is a real Idol.

11. That only Saints as Mr. Smith defineth them by 4 properties are the matter only of a visible Church.

12. That every of our assemblies are false Churches, al our ministers false ministers, our worship a false worship.

13. That a company truly fearing God, if any open wicked joyne with them are not capable to chose them a minister over them.

14. That baptisme is not administred among vs simply into the faith of Christ, but into the faith of the Bbs. or Church of England.

15. That ministers ought only to live of voluntary contribution & not of stipends or any set mayntenance.

16. That our Churches ought to be rased downe, & not to be employed to the worship of God. Al which I do verely beleeve to be errors, & I see not which way men can joyne to you to swallow vp al these as truths into which you doe runne in avoyding our corruptions: & that with such deep condemnation of vs, as is greatly in your behalf to be lamented: but I am tedious, &c.

R. B.

This is your writing word for word: wherein you have taxed mee by name in one particular, & indeed in most of them: it shalbe my part therfor to cleer these matters for your information, that if it be the wil of God, you may see the truth & walk in it, which I vnfeynedly desire of the Lord: or els that you may no longer seduce others from the truth, your corrupt walking being once discovered vnto the simple: my intent therfor is not to take

these points in that order which you have placed them in, but to assume thē in the natural order wherin things vsually among Schollers are discoursed.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the Second Section.

I desire heer to advertise the reader, that these 16. points which Mr. Bern. accounteth error are againe in his book intituled the Seperatists Schisme rehearsed, refined, augmēted changed, as it pleaseth the forger into another order, shape & number which it shal not be impertinent heer to propound for evidence sake, that the Reader comparing these 16. points with those 22. (For so they are in number) may discern the agreement & difference, & so more fully be informed of the whole cause.

The particulars are these following, as they are expressed in divers pages of his booke as pag. 78. the title of them is this.

The Errors of the Seperatists, & the matter of their Schisme.

1. They hold that the constitution of our Church is a false constitution, pag. 78.

2. They hold our constitution a real Idol, & so vs idolaters, pag. 79.

3. That such as are not of a particular constituted Church (to wit such a one as theirs is) are no subjects of Ch. Kingdom. pag. 80. 81.

4. That all not in their way are without, & do apply agaist vs, 1. Cor. 5. 12. Eph. 2. 12. pag. 82.

5. That only Saynts, (that is) a people forsaking al knowne sinne of which they may be convinced, doing al the knowne wil of God: increasing & abiding ever therein, are the only matter of a visible Church, pag 83.

6. That the powre of Christ, that is, authority to preach, to administer the Sacramēts & to exercise the censures of the Church belongeth to the whole Church, yea to every one of them, & not to the principal members thereof. pag. 48.

7. That the sinne of one man publiquely & obstinately

stood in being not reformed, nor the offender cast out, doth so pollute the whole congregation, that none may cōmunicate with the same in any of the holy things of God (though it be a Church rightly constituted) til the partie be excommunicated, pag. 102. 103.

8. That every of our assemblies are false Churches, pag. 109.

9. Al our Ministers say they, are false Ministers, pag. 128.

10. Our worship say they is a false worship, pag. 146.

Divers other opinions they hold which I will also set downe: & they be these, pag. 150. 151.

1. That our congregations as they stand are all & every of them vncapable before God to chose them Ministers, though they desire the means of salv[a]tion. pag. 151.

2. That God in our best assemblies is worshipped after a false manner, pag. 151.

3. That baptisme is not administred into the faith of Ch. simply. but into the fayth of Bishops or Church of England, pag. 152.

4. That our faith & repentance is a false faith & false repentance, pag. 152.

5. That our Ministers converting men to God heere, do it not as Pastors, but as Teachers, pag. 152.

6. That our Church standeth in an adulterous estate, pag. 152.

7. That they cannot say certaynly by any warrāt off Gods worde that any of vs hath eyther fayth, or feare god. pag. 152.

8. That none off our Ministers may be heard, pag. 152.

9. That it is not lawful to joyne in prayer with any off vs, pag. 155.

10. That Ministers may not celebrate marriage, nor bury the dead, pag. 156.

11. That Ministers should only live off voluntary contribution, & not eyther off set stipends or tithes, pag. 156.

12. That our Churches ought to be raced downe, & not to be employed to the true worship of God, pag. 156.

And thus much off this & al other their Brownistical opinions, pag. 157.

This is the Recapitulation of our Brownisticall opiniōs, as Mr. Bern. of his blasphemous vncharitablenes giveth them their denomination: Remember herein that every cōpany of men whome god raised vp in this latter age to testifie for the truth against the man of sinne, hath been intituled with like names, as Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, &c. As in the act: Christiās are caled the Sect of the Nazarits. whēce I for my part should rather gather encouragement in the truth we hold then any discouragemēt, seing no other thing befalleth vs herein then befell al the witnesses of the L. truth in al ages: but let Mr. Bern. & his consorts vnderstand that we chardg them with Antichristianisme, which they can not deny, but which the best & most sincere professors of the land acknowledg, but the truths which he calleth Brownistical, we justifie frō the holy Scriptures, wherein let Mr. Bern. consider whither he doe not wound the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Apostles, Christ Iesus himself, & the Holy Spirit, the author off the Holy Scriptures, & that through our fides. For if these opinions as wee hold them be the truth of God, then is he a blasphemer in a very high degree & I would know whither he that heretofore oft tymes confessed them for truths can now without horrible impiety apostacy & blasphemy, proclayme them Brownistical opinions: see also whither his conscience can be cleer in this.

Now Further I desire the reader to compare these 22. particulars, with the 16. points which I in this lettre have answered, & therby he shal observe two things. First that Mr. Bern. herin chardgeth vs with nothing truly which is not already answered in this lettre, & therfor he needed not againe to have objected these things publicly except he had first published the lettre & answered the particulars therof, but herin it seemeth he thought to bleare the eyes of the world, & to beare mē in hand that he had somthing to say which was vnanswerable, which notwithstanding was already answered as may be perceived. Secondly, that this book of Mr. Ber. is most properly and directly aymed at my lettre, wherin I am

most especialy interested to yeeld answer, & although it be once answered by another: & happily may receive a third answer, yet I cannot overpasse it least seme to betray the truth who am by name singled out to the cōbat? finally seing Mr. Bern. hath published against vs without answer to this lettre, let vs also herin cōsider his fraud & decept, in perverting, misconstruing, adding, detracting, falsely chardging vs following therein the dealing off his Father the Devill, with Christ, & our first parents: For all these evil courses I wil discover evidently to the reader, that Mr, Bern. in the particular Sections of this lettre hath vsed with mee: & so let these be added to his former sinnes mentioned in the First Section, & it wil appeare that he is now manifested by the L. to be one that hath fulfilled the measure of his iniquity.

### The third Section.

The first point therfor that I wil speak to is your tenth. viz:

10. That an erroneous constitution of a Church is a real Idol.

Heer I would fayne knowe whence you had this position, I confesse I have written some such thing: but neither have I written neyther doe I hold it as you propound: I say that a Religious society framed after the invention of a mā without the warrant of the word is a real Idol: but I do not say that some errors in the cōstitution of a Church maketh that Church a reall Idol: For as in generation every fault in the seed which is the matter, as for example a seed inclined to the gout, or consumption, or stone doth not make a false man, but the partie begotten may be a true man notwithstanding the infirmity of the seed: So in the constitution of a Church not every error, (as if the members wherof the Church is framed have ignorances errors or infirmities in them,) maketh the Church a real idol: For so ther should never possibly be a true Church in the world, seing it is impossible to find men free from error. Therfor this is the ground that I hold, that if either the matter of the

Church be not such as the word teacheth, but a devised matter: or if the forme be not that which the word teacheth, but a devised forme: or if the Church have not the properties which Gods word teacheth, which doe necessarily proceed frō the forme induced vpon the matter: then such a Church I avouch to be a real idol: take a similitude to illustrate it: The seed of an asse & a horse mingled together in generation doe not produce eyther a true horse, or a true asse, but a third thing formally differing from both viz: a mule: even so wicked men joyned with Godly men in a Church, doe not produce a true Church, but a false Church, viz: a reall Idol the church of Antichrist. For this point consider what the holy Ghost writeth: Apoc 18. 2. That Antichrists Church is ther Propheseyed to be a cage of every vncleane & hateful byrd, which might not be eaten or offered in Sacrifice by the Holy people, Deut. 14. 3. 11. againe, 2. Cor. 6. 14. The Apostle willeth the Corinthians not to yoke with vnbeleevers bicause as in the old Testament the Holy people were forbidden to yoke an oxe which was a cleane creature, & an asse which was vncleane to draw the plough together, Deut 22. 10. Even so the faithful may not now yoke themselves to draw the L. plough with vnbelevs, bicause they may have no communion, concord, agreement, fellowship, or part the one with the other, but the faithful who are righteousnes, light of the body of Christ the Temple of God, the Children of God, must come out from the vnbeleevers, who are vnrighteousnes, darknes, of Belial, the habitation of Devils, Apoc, 18. 2, yea & must be seperated from them: & must touch none of there vncleannes. For if they stil stand in confusion with the vnbeleevers, consenting to al ther sines, they in that constitution are not a true Church, but the prayers they offer vp with the prayers of the wicked, comming from that false constitution are taynted with the idolatry of that constitution: but perhaps you wil say that although a false constitution be a sinne. yet it is not Idolatry: you must manifest it to me to be a sin of another commaudemēt if you plead that: otherwise I stil hold it to be a sinne of the Second commaudemēt viz: to worship God in a constitution of an humane



invention, even as it was in the Church of Ieroboams invention: & as it is in a popish parish assembly, & as it is in the English assemblies: now further to prove vnto you that a false constitution of a Church is an Idol: I use these places.

2. Cor. 6. 16. What agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols?

The faithful who have made a covenant with God are heer called the temple of God: & thervnto are Idols opposed: signifying that an assembly of men who are vnfaithfull, (though some faithful mē be among them who are commaunded to come out & to be Seperated) endeavoring to worship God after ther fashion are an Idol: therfor if the temple of Ierusalem now stood, & the Iewes assembled to worship God ther after the fashiō of the Old Testament, that assemblie was an Idol: So are the assemblies of Turkes Idols: So are the assemblies of Papists Idols: as Abbayes, Monasteries, &c. Such are al churches framed of a false matter, or having a false covenant.

1. Ioh. 5. 21. Babes keep your selves from jimages. Zach. 11. 17.

The Apostle who wrote the Revelation forseing through the Spirit of prophecy the abhominable Idolatryes of Antichrist, which would grow vp in the Church giveth the Churches a caution especially to take heed of those Antichristian Idolatryes: now the Idolatryes of Antichrist are not heathenish & paganish, but of another nature, viz: not false Gods, but meanes invented by men to worship the true God in or by: Hence I gather thus:

Whatsoever meanes is devised out of a mans brayne & vsed as a meanes to honour God in or by, is an idol: A devised constitution of a Church is of that nature. Ergo an idol.

For further amplification whereof consider that as a false minister (wherof afterward) is an Idol minister: Zach. 11. 17. So a Church of a false constitution is a false Church that is an Idol Chu[r]ch: & as it was vnlawful yea flat Idolatry for a Priest of Ieroboams devising to offer Sacrifice to the L. So is it also Idolatry to offer vp service to God in a Church of a false constitution.

Col. 2. 23. Mat. 15. 9. wil-worship & vayne-worship is forbidden in these two places: namely, such worship as is offered to God after the wil & precept of man, whose wisdom is enmity to God:

But a false constitution of a Church is after the will & precept of man even invented & devised: so it is forbidden: but wil worship & vayne worship is a transgression of the second commaundement, so: it is idolatry, & so that false Church wherin or wherby it is offered vp to God an Idol.

These things are manifest to him that wil not blindfold himself, I pray you consider of the particulars by mee alledged: & if you find a truth in them embrace the truth & lead on your people with you to the truth: if not, let vs heer from you an answer, that we may see our errors, & wee wil & can reforme: so cannot you so long as you stand as you doe: ther is no way to reforme but to Seperate, as we have done already.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the third Section.

I published a litle Methode not long since intituled, Principles & inferences concerning the visible Church: in the tenth page of the book I write thus: visible Churches constituted according to the devise of men are Real Idols.

Mr. Bern. in the beginning of his third Section chargeth vs to hold,

That an erroneous constitution of a Church is a real Idol: & in his book intituled the Seperatists Schisme pag. 79, hath these wordes: They hold our constitution a real Idol, & so vs idolaters: & pag. 152. of the same book he writeth thus: that our Church (viz: the Church of England) standeth in an adultrous estate: accounting this as an error that wee defend.

Mr. Ainsw. in the answer to Mr. Bern. pag. 172. saith. that a false constitution of a church set vp in stead of a true, what is it better then a very Idol?

Heer let vs consider the difference & agreement betwixt Mr. Ains. & me: he saith a very Idol, I say a real Idol: I cal a false constitution a real Idol, For that in existence

& being it is an Idol: Mr. Ainsw. calleth a falsely constituted Church a very Idol, because it is indeed & truly an Idol: heer is litle difference except it be in wordes: but for the further cleering of my position viz: that a falsely constituted Church is a real Idol: two things must be discovered: 1. what an Idol is: 2. what Real is.

For the first vnderstand that most properly an Idol is contrary to an ordinance apointed by God in matter of Religion: So the Apostle willeth the brethren to keep themselves from jimages or Idols, 1. Ioh. 5. 21. & the Lord himself in the Second Commaundement forbiddeth, vnder the phrases of making & worshipping jimages, al inventions of men in matter of Religion, Exod. 20. 4. 5, Now matter of religion especially subsisteth, in Religious worship, or religious government, For the Saynts are made Kings & Preists vnto God: & as Kings they excercise a regiment, as Preists they performe their Sacrifices Revel. 1. 6, 1. Co. 6. 1-9. 1. Pet. 2. 5. & therein they performe homage to the Lord, & submit their consciences to be wrought vppon. & seing the conscience must bow only to the Lord, & not to man otherwise then in the Lord, therfor in matter of Religion the conscience is not to yeeld to any thing devised by man: but must alwayes have the Lord for the leader & Governor therein: hence then it foloweth that whosoever substituteth any devise of man, any thing taught by the precept of man: Mat. 15. 9. Esay 29. 13. any will worship, or any ordinance of the world in matter of Religion, setteth vp that which is contrary to the Lords ordinance, contrary to the Lords wil, contrary to the Lords wisdome, & I would fayne learne whither this be not an Idol or jmage: So that Idols are of two sorts: 1. A false God, 2, A false meanes to honor or submit, or doe homage to the true God in or by: as a false or devised tyme, place, person, instrumēt, action, & if ther be any thing of the like consideration: therfor a false or devised tyme may be caled an Idol day as 1, King. 12. 33. the month which Ieroboam appointed for the worship of his Calves is called the month which he had forged of his owne hart, that is an Idol moneth & so by consequent the 15. day of that moneth an Idol day. So in the old Testament the place where God was

to be worshipped was the Tabernacle or Temple. Deut. 12. 5-8. & ther for the high places in Iudah also Dā & Bethel in Israel were Idol places bicause they were places forged out of the harts of them that first appointed them: such were al the places dedicated by the hethen to worship their Gods in, which therfor were commaunded to be rased downe. Deu, 12, 2. 3, so likewise a shepheard or minister framed according to the devise of man is called a foolish or Idol Shepheard: Zach. 11. 17: Such were Ieroboams Preists 1. King. 12. 31. & the false Apostles, 2. Cor: 11. 13-15. who are therefor called the ministers of Sathan: In like maner Gideons Ephod: judg. 8. 27. Michaes Ephod, Teraphim & molten jmage, Iudg. 17. 4. 5. The brasen Serpent 2. King. 18. 4. being instruments of idolatry might justly have been called Idol instruments: & so forth for actions. Thus we see the first point what an Idol is, & by consequent that Idols are infinite in nomber, & that they are not only 47. as Mr. Bern. sayth Marlorat reckoneth them: & againe that Mr. Bern. question is answered which he maketh pag. 152. what Idol worship wee Saith Mr. Bern? I answer that Mr. Bern. doth both worship an idol, & worshippeth in or by Idols: The Idol which he worshippeth is a false Christ, who is neither a King to him, seing he submitteth not to his Kingdome & ordinances thereof, nor a Preist, seing he yeeldeth not to his true Ministerie, nor a Prophet, seing he receaveth not the Holy doctryne which he teacheth: but yeeldeth to a Kingdom, Preisthood & Prophecy erected & established according the doctryne & commaundements of men: as shalbe sufficiently cleered heare after & hath been oft tymes already done: The Idols wherein & wherby he worshippeth, is, 1. his owne false Church, 2. his owne false standing as a mēber of the false church 3. his owne false Ministry, 4. his owne false parish Church, or Idol Temple, 5. his service book, 6. his Lords the Prelates, their courts, & ministers wherin & wherto he submitteth. Generally: look how many Prelates, Preists, Deacons, Parishes, Temples, Service books, Surplices, Crosses, Holy dayes, Courts Ecclesiastical, Officers in these Courts ther are in the Land: So many idols there are: that wee may say

as Esay said in his tyme of Iudah, Esay, 2. 8. their land is ful of idols. & so this question of yours Mr. Bern. is answered: Now the second point to be manifested is. What is Real: I opposed Real to mentall as may be seen Princip. Inferenc. pag. 9. & 10. Mental or intellectuall is that which hath his being in the mynd or vnderstanding: as the frame of the English Churches conceived in the mynd, I called a mental Idol: Real is that which hath an existence & being out of the mynd & concept: as the Parish Church of worksop, whereof Mr. Bern. is vicar, is a real Idol, having existence, & being not only in the mynd & concept, but also in deed & truth. Now Real is eyther Natural, or Moral, or Artificial, or Political. Natural as a man, Moral as vertue, Artificial as a howse, Political as a Cittie or common wealth, & whereas I called a falsely constituted Church a real Idol, I intended it a real Politique Idol: For so a Church is a politie, Cittie, or common wealth. Revel. 11. 2. & 18. 2. Wherefore as the true Church is the Holy Cittie the new Ierusalem that commeth downe from God out of heaven: Revel. 21. 2. Even that true Politie & common wealth of Israel, Eph. 2. 12. So the false Church is Babylon, Egipt, Sodom, that Cittie, Politie, common wealth, or Sinagogue of Sathan: & so a Political Real Idol: & therfor the English assemblies being proved to be false Churches, are real Idols. Let vs in the next place consider what Mr. Bern. saith to these things: First he saith the Scripture never taketh an Idol in this sense: I have both in this Section of my lettre, also in this Parallele shewed him already that an Idol is so taken in the Scripture, but for further evidence I use this argument.

That which is contrary to a true Church is an Idol.

A falsely constituted Church is contrary to a truly constituted Church.

Ergo: A falsely constituted Church is an Idol.

The Major is true by natural reason as also by the consideration of the nature of contraries: For as light is contrary to darknes, vertue to vice: white to black: fire to water: So is true contrary to false, & a true Church, to a false Church.

The major is the Apostles owne argument, 2. Cor. 6. 16. his wordes are: what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? whence I reason thus:

That which is contrary to the Temple of God, is an Idol.

That which is contrary to the true Church, is contrary to the Temple of God.

For the true Church is the Temple of God.

Ergo: That which is contrary to the true Church is an Idol.

Herevpon it followeth that seing the Apostle opposeth an Idol to the temple of God as he opposeth light to darknes, Christ to Belial: & seing the Temple of God is the true Church, therfor an Idol in that place is a false Church: now Mr. Bern. with al your learning avoyde this place & I wil yeeld you this particular.

Further, A false Christ is an Idol.

A false Church is a false Christ.

Ergo, a false Church is an Idol.

The Major is vndeniable.

The Minor is proved two wayes: First by the contrary thus:

A true Church is true Christ as may be collected from these two places, 1. Cor. 12. 12 Gal. 3, 16.

Therfor a false Church is a false Christ.

Secondly it may be proved by Christs owne wordes, Mat. 24. 24. ther shal arise false Christs, & false Prophets, that is to say false churches, & false Ministers which professe & teach doctrynes of the Lord Iesus falsely, both of his person & offices as the Arrians, the Lutherane vbiqutists, the Papists, the Anabaptists, &c. Thus you see wee have proved vnto you now this second tyme that a falsely constituted Church is a real Idol. But bicause you cannot soundly answer, therfor blasphemously you scoffe at the doctryne of the constitution of the true Church, wee doe constantly & bouldly defend that out of a Church truly constituted (when a man can & may joyne therto) no ordinance of God can be accepted, neyther preaching, nor praying, nor Sacraments, nor any other religious action. what the Lord accepteth in

secret that we dispute not: but what the word of God teacheth vnto vs to be acceptable that wee speak of.

And tel me Mr. Bernard, can ther be a true ministry, a true baptisme, a true faith, true prayer, true preaching, or administring the L. supper true excommunication in the church that is falsely constituted? did the L. accept of the Sacraments & Sacrifices of the Church of Israel constituted by Ieroboam that author of Idolatry? doth not the Lord say vnto that people in that false Church, Lo, Ammi, Lo, Ruhamah, No People, No Pitie, Hosea, l. 6 9. & is not the Lord as severe now against a Church falsely constituted in the New Testament, as he was against the false Church of the ten tribes in the old Testament? or do you think that the Lord accepteth of a false faith, ministry, baptisme, prayer, preaching, excommunication & the rest? make these things agree Mr. Bern. if you can: if you cannot, cease your scoffing, & give glory vnto God: I demaund of you: do you think that God accepteth the prayers & Religious exercises of the Papists, the Arrians, the Anabaptists, the Familists, or any other heretiques or Antichristians, if not what is the true cause that God accepteth them not? is it not for that ther is not that true communiō of the Saynts there, the true Church, the true spouse of Christ, the Spiritual Temple where God hath prouised his presence? So then it followeth invincibly that a true constitution of a church, that is a true communion of Saynts, is that only lawful religious, society, or communion of men, wherby God wilbe honoured, wherin he wilbe served, & wherto he hath promised his presence & acceptance: & as conventicles are vnlawful assemblies of men in civil states, so are al false churches vnlawful ecclesiastical assemblies & the actions therein performed vnlawful, & so abhominable in the sight of God, the summe of all is breefly thus much.

That communion of men wherto God hath given the covenant: the Holy things the promises, Christ for King, Preist, & Prophett, is only accepted, & their Ecclesiasticall actions only acceptable: But a true visible church, that is a communion of Saynts, joynd together in the true covenant, is that only communion of mē

wherto God hath given his covenant, his promises, his holy things, Christ for King, Preist & Prophet.

Therfor a true visible church, that is a communion of Saynts, & their actions ecclesiastical, as preaching & prayers, &c. are only accepted. & by consequent on the contrary I inferre thus.

That communion of men wherto God hath not given the covenant, the holy things the promises, Christ for King, Preist, & Prophet, is not accepted of God, neither their actions ecclesiastical are acceptable.

A Church falsely constituted (as in the old Testament was the Apostate church of the ten tribes, & in the new Testament is the churches of Antichrist) is such a communion of men, wherto God hath not given the covenant, the holy things, the promises, Christ for King, Preist, & Prophet.

Therfor a church falsely constituted is not accepted of God, neither are their actions ecclesiastical, as prayer, preaching, &c. acceptable in the sight of God.

Herevppon I conclude not as Mr. Bern. blasphemously scoffeth that the Idol or Goddesse constitution, but that the true constitution of a Church which is the Lords Holy ordināce is that which Sanctifieth al ecclesiastical actions: & that a false idolatrous, Antichristian constitution of a church, corrupteth, polluteth, stayneth al the ecclesiastical actions of that false church: So saith the Apostle, vnto the pure al things are pure: but vnto them that are defiled & vnbeleeving is nothing pure. Tit. 1. 15. & this is my welbeloved sonne (saith the Father from heaven) in whome I am wel pleased, Mat. 3. 17. & God heareth not synners, but only the true worshippers: Ioh. 9. 31.

Finally, I avouch that a falsely constituted church is a greater & more abhominable Idol, then any Idol that possibly can be in a true church: For a false worship, Ministry & government may be indeed in a true Church through ignorance & the like occasions: But a true ministerie, worship & government cannot possible be in a false Church: For the true Ministerie, worship, & Government are the Holy things of God, which are not given to false Churches, but only to the true Churches of Christ, the true communion of Saynts: & a false Church



being an Idol doth conveigh her idolatrous & false constitutiō as a poison through all her Ecclesiasticall actions or workes off communion: Breefly therefore to compare True & False: Idols & Ordinances together: Bonum quo communius eo melius: Malum quo communius eo peius: They are two maximes true in nature & experience, & so also in Religion: Truth & ordinances the more common & vniversal the better & more excellent: Falsehood & Idols, the more common & generall: the worse & more pernicious, For example, a true Church better then a true worship, then a true Ministry, then a true government, &c. A false Church worse then a false worship, then a false Ministry, then a false government, &c. For a true Church is the first & most noble & vniversal in Religion, from whence al the rest issue as a streame from the Fountayne: & a false Church is the first, most ignoble & general qualifying al the ecclesiasticall actions of the Church with her owne falsehood & idolatry: Therfor I am bould to pronounce your false & idolatrous Church constitutiō to be worse then your false Ministerie, worse then your false worship, worse then your false government, &c. & on the contrary, our true constitution to be the most honorable & beautiful ornament of our Church: more glorious then our true Ministerie, worship, & government, sith these latter issue & do flow from the former as from the spring or Fountayne. A true man may have a wooden legg, an eye of glasse: So a true Church may have a false ministry & worship, or government. A man carved out of wood, cannot possiblie have any truth of a man in him, but al his parts & limmes are wooden, evē as the jmage is of wood: So a false Church can have nothing true in it, but al is false, idolatrous, vsurped, for what agreement hath Christ with Belial? These things are playne enough to them that will vnderstand.

#### The fourth Section.

Your ninth position followeth, viz:

9. That those which are not of a true constituted Church, are no subjects of Christs Kingdome: This you hold error, & I hold it truth which I wil manifest vnto you most evidently,

The true Church in the Scripture is called the house of God, Heb. 3. 6.

The Temple of God which the L. inhabiteth, & wherin he walketh. 2. Cor. 6. 16.

The household of fayth, Gal. 6. 10. the body of Christ, Eph. 4. 15. 16.

The Kingdome of heaven of Christ & of God, Eph. 5. 5. Mat. 3. 2. Luk. 19. 11. 12. Act. 1. 3. Further this true Church is but of one shape, forme, fashion, or constitution: Eph. 4. 4 The body that is the Church is one, that is of one shape: For one in that place signifieth vnum specie, not vnum numero, for ther are many Churches in number, but one true Church in the frame or constitution: Let this therfor be set downe for an invincible truth that the true visible Church is the Kingdome of Christ, wher Christ the King only ruleth & raigneth in his owne lawes & officers & over his owne subjects: & al those that wil not be subiects to this King in this his Kingdome he accounteth his enemies & wil have them slayne before his face Luk. 19. 27. Hence then it followeth that those that are not members of a true constituted Church, are not subjects of Christs Kingdome: which you say is error, wherin you see you give the Holy Ghost the lie, imputing error vnto the word of truth: But you wil say if men be not subjects of Christs Kingdome, ther is no salvation for them: I deny that: wil you condemne al the Iewes, Turkes, Papists in the world? yet I say they are no subjects of Christs Kingdome which is the true visible Church: I pray you therfor be as good to vs, as you are to your selfe in that censure: wherfor we must remember to distinguish betwixt the visible Church which is Christs Kingdome, & the Catholique Church which is invisible. The visible Church hath in it a visible communion, visible & sensible ordinances for men to walk in a visible fayth expressed in the outward declarations thereof in confession, & profession of the truth, this visible Church must we joyne to & live in, this is the sheepfold wherin Christ foldeth his sheep, into this sheepfold both sheep & shepheard must enter by the dore, & not clyme vp another way as theeves, & robbers doe: Of al those that live & continue in this true visible

Church we are bound to beleve holines, fayth & election in particular. Eph 1. 1. 4. Now the Catholique Church which is invisible is the comprehension of al the el[e]ct in al ages & places: whose persons are vnkowne to vs, & such secreat things the L. hath reserved to himself, & concealed from our knowledg, & therfor we are not to search after them, but must walk in that way which he hath taught in his word wher so much of his wil as is fit for vs to know is revealed: now I would have you manifest to me two things concerning this point: one is that the Catholique Church is Christs Kingdome, another is that al that are out of the visible Church are condemned: I for my part hold the contrary, viz: First that the visible Church truly constituted is the only Kingdome of Christ, which he at the day of judgment shal give vp into the handes of his Father, 1. Cor. 15. 24. & that therfor they who are not members of Christs true visible Church are no subjects of Christs Kingdome: & Secondly, notwithstanding that ther are many who are no members of the visible Church, & therfor no subjects of Christs Kingdome, who notwithstanding aperteyne to the L: Election, & are within the compasse of the Catholique Church, out of which ther is no salvation, Now Mr. Bern. if you have any thing to object against this truth, let vs have it I pray you that we may receive instruction & reformation from you: you assume great dexteritie in diving into mens arguments, I pray you dive into the bottome of this point & discover the error therof if you be able: iff not, lay your hand vppon your mouth, & give glorie to God, & confesse your ignorance & errors.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the Fourth Section.

In this Section Mr, Bern. saith that it is error to hold: that those that are not of a true constituted Church are no subjects of Christs Kingdome.

In his book intituled the Seperatists Schisme pag. 80. & 81 He affirmeth the same thing in these words: viz: That such as are not of a particular constituted Church

(to wit, such a one as theirs is) are no subjects of Christs Kingdome.

Mr. Ainsworth answering Mr. Bernard, pag. 173. vseth these wordes:

Neither is this position set downe in our wordes (to my knowledg:) if therfor Mr. Bern. were not a caviller, he would not have reckoned this among our errors

Although Mr. Bern. oppugneth this truth, & Mr. Ainsw. forsaketh the defence therof, yet I stil defend it as the vndoubted truth of God. First, therfor I wil expound the true meaning thereof: then also answer Mr. Bern. cavils & cautions.

I say not therfor as Mr. Bern. ignorantly & vaynly & captiously conceaveth, that whosoever is not actually a joyned member of a true visible Church not living in communion with that church, is no subject of Christs Kingdome, but I say thus: they that are not of a true constituted Church are no subjects of Christs Kingdom: now it is one thing to be in a true church as a member therof actual[ly] walking in presence & cōmuniō therewith, another thing to be of a true church which one may be eyther as yet actually vnjoyned or being a joyned member actually & yet absent in regard of bodily presence. That one vniointed actually may yet be of a true visible church, I declare by divers particulars: as first, one that by violence is deteyned from a true constituted church yet may be of it in desire, wil, affection & purpose though actually vniointed, the Lord accepting the wil for the deed when it cannot be performed. Againe when as yet ther is no true visible church established actually? a man may be of it, in that he would be joyned vnto it, if it had any real existence, so the Martyrs in Q. Maryes dayes may be said to be of a true visible church, both for that they would have actualy joyned to the true cōstituted church if it had beē established, as also for that they in wil & purpose desired so to do, although violently they were deteyned by imprissonment: Further they that are of the true faith which is professed in the true Church may be said to be of that true church: which faith is not a thing invisible, but visible & sensible: as namely a man Separated from all false churches, & professing the

true visible faith of the church, holding it vnlawful in regard of some corruption which he seeth in the true church, to joyne therevnto may yet be said to be of the true church. Lastly, if some brethren though but two or three walk to gether in holy communion, they are a true Church: & although perhaps they have not solemnly entred covenant, yet ther communion in holy exercises is a declaration that they have contracted together, though weakly & corruptly yet truly. So that these particulars being wel weighed may sufficiently informe you of my meaning: but Mr. Bern. you have in your book quoted this point otherwise then I have propounded & expounded it in my lettre, & that in two particulars, viz: 1. in saying, a particular constituted Church: 2. in adding these wordes: Such a one as theirs is: For ther is asmuch difference betwixt a true constituted Church, & a particular constituted Church, as ther is betwixt a man, & this man or that man: the one is species: the other individuum: & it is evident that a man may be of a true constituted Church, & yet not of a particular constituted Church as may be perceaved by the 4. particulars before mentioned: Againe in adding these wordes, viz: such a one as theirs is: after a scoffing vp[b]rayding & disdainful manner he seeketh to draw into hatred & abomination the true Church of Christ: but the tyme wil come when the Lord wil reward every man according to his workes.

In the second place let vs consider of Mr. Bern. cavils & cautions which are 4. in number. pag. 81.

First, he saith the Scripture never setteth forth any of Gods people by this marke: say you so Mr. Bern? is not the Scripture plentiful in declaring vnto vs that the L. addeth dayly to the Church, such as should be saved: Act. 2. 47. that they that gladly receaved the word were baptized & added to the Church, & continued therin: Act. 2. 41. 42 doth not the Apostle teach that ther is one faith, one body, one baptisme, one Lord, & but one? Eph. 4. And that they that are not of this faith, body, baptisme, Lord are without the faith, without the body, that is the Church, without the true baptisme, whitout this true Lord & King Iesus Christ? & so are none of

Gods people visible, none of Christs Kingdome, none of Christs body, none of his faith, & baptisme? Are not true faith, prayer baptisme, the Lords Supper, the true church plaine & pregnant demonstrative proper adjuncts of Gods visible people? & how can you with any face of truth or a good consciēce of your judgment & knowledg say, that to be of a true visible church, is no note of Gods visible people? but you say further that he synneth which doth not live in a true cōstituted Church ordinarily, when he can & hath meanes offered: nay we say further then so: that he synneth that doth not seek meanes to live in a true constituted Church, & not only he that vseth not meanes offered so to doe: wherfor we say that which you say & more also: but I pray you, what meaneth your ordinarily living in a true constituted church: doe you hold that ther are two sorts of mēbers & conversers in the true church some ordinary & some occasional or extraordinary? & do you think that to be of a true chu[r]ch, & to live in a true church are one thing? we say that members of true churches are al ordinary & of one kind & consideration: & further we say, that it is one thing to be of a true church or a member of a true church, another thing to live in the true church: & a man may be a member of a true church potentialy & actualy, as I have already declared in the 4. former particulars. But al this is nothing to that which I affirme, for I say thus: that he which is not of a true visible Church, is no subject of Chr. Kingdom, that is he is not vnder the visible dominion & Lordship of Chr. in his church which is his Kingdom: I do not say that he is invisiblie none of the L. people: for a man may be one of the L. people in election & grace invisiblie, & yet not in the true visible church which is Ch. visible Kingdom: againe take an instance to exemplifie the mater: al we that are of the seperated churches in these contryes are of the common wealth of England, & therfor subiects of the King of England our Sovereigne Lord on earth, though we are not actualy vnder the execution of his lawes, courts, officers, by reason of banishment, & that we may submit to Chr. ordinance, &c. So a true seperated Christian is a subject of Chr. visible politie & Kingdom, which is his

church, eyther actually or potentially, although by banishment that is by vnderdeserved communication, by imprisonment, by other occasions he be actually absented & seperated from the presence therof. wherfor Mr. Bern. I doe in this section indite you before the L & the world, as one that of purpose & so maliciously perverteth my meaning & slaundereth this excellent truth of God: doth not your consciēce tel you may you not read it in the copy of my lettre that I distinguish betwixt Gods people, which are of two sortes, visible subjects of Ch. visible church which is his Kingd. & invisible ones known only to the L. certaynly & particularly? further this doctryne of myne you say is contrary to 4, places of Scripture, pa. 81. the first place is Gal. 3. 7. 9. the Apostles wordes are these. They which are of faith are the children of Abrahā. vs. 7. & they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham: which scripture proveth my doctryne or rather the L. truth. I say: that faith heer is oposed to the works of the law, & that faith signifieth a visible faith: For the Apostle Iames saith, Iam. 3. 21.-24. Speaking of the same matter, viz: of Abrahams faith that it was made perfect by works: for if Abrahams faith had not been manifested by his workes, it had been invisible, & it would not have been discerned by mē: & therfor in the same place vs. 14. the Ap. speaketh directly of a visible faith: this place of the Ap. therfor confirmeth my assertiō plainly that they that are not of a true constituted Church, are no subjects of Chr. Kingd. bicause they do not by their workes shew their faith: but if they have faith they have it with God, & not with man, who can judg only by the fruites.

The second place is, 1. Ioh. 3. 14 where the Apostle speaketh thus: Wee know we are trāslated from death to life, bicause we love the brethren? Who are the brethren, are not they that cal God Father? who can cal God Father but they that have Christ for their Lord & Mr. for their Elder brother? To whome is Christ Lord & Mr. but to them that are subjects of his Kingdome? So that this place also maketh most evidently for the confirmation of this truth of God which I defend. But you Mr. Bern. dreame of an invisible faith, of an invisible Kingdome, of an invisible brotherhood or consanguinity:

whereas Christ saith directly, that they which doe the wil of God, are his brethren & of his Fraternity, Marc. 3. 35. & what have we to do with things invisible, hidden, & secreat, Deut. 29. 29. I avouch that you cannot prove to me by any rule of Gods word certaynly, that those that are not members of a true constituted Church, are subjects of Christs Kingdome invisible as you I am sure intend it: Further, what is the love of the brethren wherof the Apostle speaketh? is it not a visible love testified in the performance of the visible duty & of love: Christ saith Ioh. 14. 15. if ye love me keep my commaundements: obedience is the true touchstone of the love of God, & 1. Ioh. 3. 17. whosoever hath this worlds good, & seeth his brother need, & shutteth vp his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? So the visible dutyes of brotherly love are the true touchstone of brotherly love: but the principal visible dutyes of brotherly love are the dutyes of admonition, consolation, supportation, patience. 1. Thes. 5. 14. Exhortation, edification, vs. 11. among thē admonition is most excellent. Mat. 18. 15–17. compared with Levit. 19. 17. they therfor that altogether omit these visible dutyes of admonition in the degrees thereof enjoyned by Christ & the Apostles, how can they be said to love the brethren? but al they that live out of a true constituted Church wholly omit the visible dutyes of love to the brethren, seing they neyther know, nor have brethrē vppō whome they may exercise these dutyes: Therfor this place of the Apostle is pregnant & invincibly strong against you.

The third place is 1. Cor. 1. 1. Now what wordes Mr. Bern, intendeth in this place I can not conjecture except they be these: viz. in the second verse: with al those that cal vpon the name of the L. Iesus Christ in every place: whence it may seem he would gather that ther were some subjects of Christs Kingdome, & not of a constituted Church. I do verely think that seing these persons that were absent frō the Church of Corinthus, did call Iesus Christ Lord they did therfor acknowledg him for their Lord & King, & therefor did apertayne to his Kingdome which is his visible Church: happily they might be some brethren which did not dwel in Corinth, but in some



villages about Corinth: & that this is so the place aforesaid evidently: For he wrote both to the Church that was in Corinth, & to the brethrē that were in other places which were no doubt of the church of Corinth, Els, how did that Epistle in the contents of it concerne them, For seing the Apostle writeth this Epistle to them they had to doe with the matters wherof he taxeth the church, for he taxeth them al indifferently, seing he writeth indifferently vnto them al. Herevppon it followeth that eyther these persons that were in other places were mēbers of the Church of Corinth: or els if they were no members off that church, the Apostle in vayne doth direct his Epistle to them taxing them off the corruptions off that Church: Except it be said that the Apostle doth hereby interest other churches to deale with the Church of Corinth, for their corruptiōs, & then Mr. Bern. gayneth nothing by it neither, seing therby he confesseth that these other brethren were members of other true constituted churches.

The third place therfor is nothi[n]g to the purpose.

The last place is 2. Thes. 3. 15. & count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.

To passe by what some think of this place, I say vnto you Mr. Bern: that it hath not so much as a shew for your purpose: The Apostle speaketh in this verse negatively & affirmatively. For he teacheth that they ought not to reckon of an excommunicate, as they account of an enemy, but they are to admonish an excommunicate as they doe admonish a brother: Therby teaching vs that an excōmunicate is in a midle condition neyther an enemy nor a brother, but one that is vnder the censure of the church, as a meanes ordeyned by God for his reformation. how wil this place prove that an excommunicate is a member of Christs invisible Kingdome? or if it should prove that some excommunicats are members of Christs invisible Kingdome, how can you prove that this or that excommunicate is so? do you know the Lords Elect certaynly, & particularly, that are out of the church? Or what doth this assertion of yours, & this place of Scripture against my assertion? who say, that such as are not of a true constituted church, are no subjects of Christs Kingdome: viz. Of the Kingdome which he shal

give vp into the hands of his Father in the day of his final judgment,

In the third place Mr. Bern. asketh what may be said of wickliffe, Hus, Luther, Bucer, Melanchthō, the Martyrs, Gods people in England, of Lot, Iob, the people in captivity in Mordecay his tyme: wherto I answer as I have already done: That Iob was a member of a true constituted church, & so a subject of Christs Kingdome, So was Lot, so were the people of the Iewes in captivity, though violently deteyned from the Holy land, Cittie & Temple: & therfor Mr. Bern. in these three demaundes gaineth nothing except the estimation of ignorance & folly be gaine: to that of the Martyrs, Hus, Luther, & Gods people in England, I say two things: eyther that in affection & desire they aperteyned to the true visible church being seperated from the false church: or that they were of the invisible church, & of the invisible Kingdome which is vnknowne to man, & the members therof vnknowne: disprove you this if you can.

In the last place you demaund, whither Christs Kingdome be not Spiritual & invisible also? Ioh. 18. 33. & 10. 16.

The two places of Scripture quoted by you do not prove that Christ hath an invisible Kingdome, & so invisible subjects knowne to vs, For Ioh. 18. Christ saith my Kingdome is not of this world, that is to say: it is not begunne, continued, & perfected by worldly meanes: So Christ expoundeth himself, afterward saying my Kingdome is not from hēce: my subjects would fight for mee vs. 36. meaning that his Kingdome is neyther erected nor supported by worldly meanes as by sword, speare or shield: in respect whereof the Apostle saith Rom. 14. 17. The Kingdome of God is not meate nor drinck, & 2. Cor. 10. 3. 4. Though we live in the flesh, yet we do not warre after the flesh for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal The second place is Ioh. 10. Wher Christ saith not as you dreame very ignorantly & childishly, that he hath an invisible Kingdome, but that he hath sheep of two sorts, some of the visible Church of the Old Testament, which is one fold, some of the visible Church of the New Testament, which is another fold: of the Iewes and

Gentils: both which sorts of people shal in Christ Iesus, the partition wal being taken away, be joyned, & made one that so ther may be one sheepfold & one shepheard, but what is al this Mr. Bern. to disprove the truth of my position? Again to answer your demaund, I say that Chr. Kingdome is Spiritual & invisible aswel as outward & visible: For when we say that Christs Kingdome is visible & sensible, we do not deny that it is also invisible & Spiritual: neyther are these two contraryes to be oposed, as excluding one another: For as a man is not only the body which is visible & sensible, but cheefly & principally the soule which is invisible: & as the true Sacraments are not only the outward Elements, but the inward grace also, & that most especialy: So the visible Church which consisteth of men, is not only the outward communion, but especially & cheefly the inward & Spiritual fellowship which the Saynts have with Christ, & one with another: The Apostle therfor saith both that ther is one body & one Spirit: Eph. 4. & that al that are baptized are baptized into one body, & al that communicate are caused to drinck into one Spirit, 1. Cor. 12. 13. And as the Saynts are members of Christs body, of his flesh, & of his bones, Eph. 5. 30. So they that are joyned to the Lord are one Spirit: 1. Cor. 6. 17. we grant you therfor Mr. Bern. that Christs Kingdome is Spiritual & visible, but we deny that Christs Kingdome is only invisible, or only visible: he that doth plead to me that he is a member of Christs visible Kingdome, & yet cannot shew vnto me his fayth by his workes, I say vnto him as Iames saith: What avayleth it him? o thou vaine man: shal thy fayth save the? thy fayth is dead: & he that shal plead with the Lord in the day of his judgment, that he hath prophesied in Christs name, & by his name cast out Devils, & wrought many great workes, given his body to be burned in the fire, given al his goodes to the poore, hath spoken with the tongs of men & aungels, wanting true inward love & faith the Lord wil say vnto him depart thou worker of iniquity, I know the not: al this outward shew was hypocrisy: & thou art but as sounding brasse, & a tinckling Cymbal. Therfor as the Apostle saith: glorifie God with your body and Spirit,

for they are Gods: 1. Cor. 6. 20. he that is only an invisible member of Christs kingdome, is but half a subject of Christs Kingdome at the vtmost, though it be the better half: & he that is only a visible member of Christs Church, he is vnto vs truly & fully a subject of Christs Kingdome, though vnto the Lord he is but half, & so the worse half, & so as good as nothing: Let the Lord judg in secret what he pleaseth in mercy, but wee must judg in visible that which we see visible, & therfor to conclude this Parallele: I say he that pleadeth himself to be a true subject of Christs Kingdome by his invisible fayth, yet standing in confusion with the world in the false Church, worship, ministry & Government, let him be what he may be vnto the Lord, to me he is eyther an Antichristian or Famelist: & he that wanting true faith only in secret knowne to the Lord, is yet a mēber of a true Church though I must needes say vnto him thou art holy, faithful, & Elect, yet the Lord wil cal him an Hypocrite, & a worker of iniquity in the day when he will bring vnto light every secreat thing whither good or evil: Therfor my position standeth firme notwithstanding al your cavils, that he that is not of a true constituted Church is no subject of Christs Kingdome.

#### The fifth Section.

In the next place followeth your eighth position which you account error, viz.

That such as are not in your way are to be accounted whithout after the Apostles meaning, 1. Cor. 5. 12.

I take it to be most evidently true vppon the former groundes, that seing the true visible Church is Christs sheepfold, his Kingdome, his howse, his household or family, his Temple or Tabernacle, his body: That therfor al those that are not within this sheepfold this kingdome, howse, family, Temple, body, are without: For they are either within or without, but they are not within: so: they are without: Now for the Apostles meaning in that place of the 1. Cor. 5. 12. I do also take it to be manifest that he aymeth not only at the grosse Idolaters in paganism, but at al manner of vnbelevers, that is both Iewes & Gentils that did not embrace the faith: now these persons were of 4. sorts, 1. persecuting pagans, 2. civil

pagans, 3. persecuting Iewes, 4. the Iewes that were Zealous & vnreprovable in the law of Moses, (as was Paul) & yet refused Christ: Such as the Apostle speaketh of Rom. 10. 1. 2. 3. Who have the Zeale of God, but not according to knowledg who sought to establish their owne righteousnes & did not submit to the righteousnes of God: al these 4. sorts of persons were then without the true visible Church of the Apostolique institution, which is called the Kingdome of God: Now whereas you say wee doe account al without that are not of our way, I answer two things. First, that all the members of every true Church in the world wee doe account within. Secondly, that al the members of false Churches wee doe indeed account without: & therefore we doe account your particular Church at worksop to be without: For it is not the true constituted Church of Christ, & therfor it is a false Church, & therfor without according as the holy Ghost testifieth, the court that is without the Temple cast out: Apoc. 11. 2. Now you know that in the old Testament al sorts of people good & bad came into the vtter court: but now in the new Testament, Iohn by vision was commaunded to cast that vtter court out & not to measure it, bicause it is given to the Gentils who shal tread the Holy Cittie vnder foot: & now only the true visible Church, which is the Temple of God: 2. Cor. 6. 16. consisteth of a holy people which must come out from the vnrighteous & vnbelevers that are Belial even without the yoke of the L. ordinances: & must be a Seperated people: And must have no fellowship nor agreement with vnrighteousnes, nor touch any vncleane thing: & such a people the L. promiseth to receave to be his owne people & no other: I avouch therfor that seing your parish Church wherof you are parish preist consisteth of a confused rowt even such a people as came into the vtter court in the old Testament, that therfor by the commaundement of the Lord your parish church must be cast out & not measured. & therfor it is without & so are all such assemblies as yours is: what say you Mr. Bern. now? either justifie your Church or forsake it: Let vs heer what answer you make to this matter: for I gesse it toucheth your freehold very neerly: but I proceed.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the fifth Section.

In the beginning of this Section Mr. Bern. imputeth to vs to hold that such as are not of our way are to be accounted without after the Apostles meaning, 1, Cor, 5. 12.

In the book called the Sep. Schisme, pag. 82. Mr. Bern. saith, This is one error of ours, that all not in our way are without. And that wee do apply against them. 1. Cor. 5. 12. Eph. 2. 12.

Mr. Ainsw. confutation of Mr. Bern. pag. 173. saith: we hold that al not in the way of Christ, are without.

In the midst of this fifth Section I expounding what wee hold, saying thus: All the members of true Churches wee account within: & all the members of false Churches without: & al that are of Christs visible Church, which is his Sheepfold, Kingdom, Family, Temple, Body, are within, & al that are not within this true visible Church, are without.

Hereby it appeareth that in this particular ther is no difference betwixt Mr. Ainsw. & me indeed & truth.

Mr. Bern. I do wonderfully mervayl at your boldnesse, that you dare so contrary to all truth, & contrary to my expresse wordes in this Section thus impute vnto vs: I say, and so al of vs say: That the members of the true Churches whatsoever, are within: & therefor not only our particular Churches that Seperate from the English assemblies, but all other true Churches that separate from the false wayes of Antichrist, & walk in the true faith of Christ, are within: al false Churches & the members of them, are without: Ther is one only faith & truth, Eph. 4. 5. as in the Old Testament so in the New the true church ministerie, worship, & government is but of one kind: al the Churches or assemblies of the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, Ishmaelites, Israelites, Samaritanes, & the rest were false churches, had a false ministry, false worship, & false government, & only the Iewes had the true Church, Ministerie, Worship, & Government with them: So in the New Testament al Churches or assemblies of men whatsoever professing

Christ (as Abbayes, Monasteries, Nunries, Colleges, Cathedrals, Seminaries, Rectories, Parishes, &c.) & not Seperated from the Antichristians & worldlings, are false Churches, & so without: only the Seperated Churches are the true Churches, & are within: you should have answered this Section of my lettre Mr. Bern. before you had printed your book, if you had dealt ingeniously & plainly: but seing you cānot answer (for I take it so bicause you doe not answer, for your book declareth that ther is no wil wanting) let vs see what you object, your objections are three.

First, the two places of Scripture, 1. Cor. 5. 12. Eph. 2. 12. you say are ment of such as never made so much as an outward profession of Christ Iesus at al: your argument is this: No Scriptures directed against pagans, can truly be applyed against Antichristians.

These places are directed against pagans: viz: Eph. 2. 12. 1. Cor. 5. 12.

Ergo these places cannot be truly applyed against Antichristians.

I deny your Major Mr. Bern. & you have not proved it at al: Let the reader judg whither your speeches be oracles that they must be believed, bicause you vtter them: but herin your fraud and evil conscience or palpable ignorance appeareth, that you leave out your Major, which you should have confirmed, & propound only your minor: For that these places are vnderstood of Pagans I deny not, but that they are only to be vnderstood of pagans, & that they cannot be vnderstood of Antichristians I deny it: & I prove the contrary evidently to your conscience, & the conscience of al men after this manner.

That which the L. hath taught vs to doe, we may lawfully doe.

But the Lord hath taught vs to apply against Antichristians places of Scripture directed against pagans,

Ergo: places of Scripture directed against pagās may by vs be applyed against Antichristians.

The Major is evident, The minor is proved by the consideration of these Scriptures, Revel. 11. 8. & 18. 2. 7. 21. where the holy ghost applyeth against the Antichristians,

matters & Scriptures spoken literally of Sodom, Egipt, & Babylon, which were all pagans.

Againe, if Antichristians be in condition eyther equal to or worse then pagan, thē by proportion, Scriptures directed against pagans, may be applyed against Antichristians.

But Antichristians in the Lords account are in a condition equall, yea worse then pagans:

For so Christ saith, Mat. 11. 22, that it shalbe easier for Tyrus & Sidon, & the Sodomites then for Chorazin, Bethsaida & Capernaum, & Ezech. 16. 44–52. Iudah, Sodom, & Samaria are sisters in sinne & punishment, & Iudah hath justified Sodom.

Therfor, Scriptures directed against pagans may be applyed by proportion eyther of equality or superiority against Antichristians.

Now for your further instruction in this point Mr. Bern. consider that in the new Testament the phrases, speeches, titles, priviledges & benefites of the Church of the Iewes, considered as the true Church are ordinarily applyed to the visible Church of Christ in the new Testament: & contrariwise the phrases, speeches, titles, priviledges, & judgments pronounced agai[n]st the Gentils in the old Testament are customably applyed against the false Churches & Antichristians in the new Testament: Hence it is that the true visible Church of the new Testament is called the holy Cittie, Temple, Tabernacle, the new Ierusalem & the like, & the false Church is called the Gentils, Egipt, Sodom, Babylon, &c. the reason whereof is bicause that the Church of the Iewes was a type of the Churches of the new Testament, so the assemblies of the Gentils were types of the false Churches of Antichrist: as you may see through the whole book of the revelation in divers particulars: which point if you had eyther vnderstood or attended, you could not thus frivolously have objected to vs this one particular, that speeches vnderstood of pagans may not be applyed against Antichristians: I pray you what vse do you make of the prophesies of the old Testament against Nineveh, Babylon, Elam, Madai, & the rest? What vse can you make of the judgments threatned & inflicted vppon the Gētils if



not this that Christ & the Apostles make, Mat. 11. 22. 24. & 12 41. 42. 2. Pet. 2. 5-7. 15. Iude. 7. 11. Heer I know you will say that you are not Antichristians, & so though these places may be applyed against Antichristians, yet not against you: that particular wee will see afterward in his proper place: in the meane tyme thus much we have gayned that places of Scripture directed against pagans may as wel be applyed against Antichristians, as places of Scripture spoken to the true Church of the Iewes may be applyed to the true Church of the new Testament.

Secondly you object that wee cannot prove, laying aside the forgeries of our owne braynes, that this scripture phrase without, may be applied vnto you as to a people with out. VVell wee wil lay aside our owne devices & so let us trye what wee can doe.

Arg. 1. Churches that are in condition equal or worse then assemblies of pagans are without. Revel. 11. 2.

Antichristian Churches are in condition equal or worse then assemblies of pagans. Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.

Againe. 2. False Churches are without.

Antichristian Churches are false Churches. Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.

Againe. 3. Dogs, Enchanters, VVhoremongers, Murderers, Idolaters & they that love or make lyes are without. Revel. 22. 15.

Antichristian Churches are assemblies of such persons,

Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.

Againe. 4. The habitation of Devils, the hould of al foule Spirits, cages of every vnclane & hateful byrd, are without.

Antichristian Churches or Babylon are such. Revel. 18. 2.

Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.

Againe. 5. The vtter court which must not be measured by the goldē reed, but which is given to the Gentils that persecute the Holy Cittie, is without.

Antichristian Churches are that vtter court,  
Revel. 11. 1. 2.

Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.  
Agaïne. 6. The Serpent & his seed or aungels are  
without, Revel. 12. 9. 10. Gen. 3. 15.

Antichristian Churches are the Serpent, his  
seed, & aungels.

Ergo: Antichristian Churches are without.

Now Mr. Bern. I have proved by playne Scripture,  
that Antichristian assemblies are without: & I know you  
wil not denye it: but you wil plead that your Churches  
are not Antichristian assemblies, & therfor you account  
that one of our errors pag 109. viz: our 8. error as you  
summe thē: that position therfor: viz: your Churches  
are false Churches shalbe proved vnto you fully in the  
Paralleles, Censures, Observations aperteyning to the 10.  
section of this lettre, whither I referre the reader desiring  
him for his information & satisfaction in that particular  
to read that Section before he proceed any further in  
reading, lest it should be thought that I deceave & shift  
of thys mayne point, which is indeed the cheef & most  
principal of our cause & Seperation.

The third thing that you object is, that God Almightye  
hath witnessed that you are his people: by giving you  
his word, & Sacraments, by effectual conversion, by his  
strange & miraculous delivering you: these things Mr.  
Ainsworth hath answered most fully, & hath stopt your  
mouth for ever that you shal never be able to mutter any  
more in this matter: & therfor I wil spare my paynes.

Nevertheleste I advertise you of one thing that we  
do acknowledg that the Lord hath his people among you,  
whome he calleth to come out from among you & to be  
Seperated, & to touch none of your vncleanes. 2. Cor. 6. 17.  
Saying vnto the faithfull that are among you. Goe out  
of Babylon my people, that ye be not partaker of her  
sinnes, & that ye receive not of her plagues, Revel. 18. 4.  
& that they may be the better perswaded to come out  
from you & to be Seperated the Lord threatneth a woe,  
a fearfull woe to them that worship the beast or his  
jmage, or that receive his mark in their forehead or right  
hand. Revel. 14. 9. & al this the Lord performeth by our

testimony. Yet neverthelesse we say that your assemblies Ecclesiastical are false Churches that they are Babylon, Egipt, Sodom, where Lot & the Lords people are kept captives: & by reason of the presence of Gods people with you, therfor it is that you have those many deliverāces which you have, even as the Lord gave Paul the lives of al that Sayled with him in the Ship: Act. 27. 24, & whereas you plead you have the word, Sacraments & conversion, I say it is but as the thief hath the true mans purse, & as the false Church of Ieroboam had, & as the Samaritanes, the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, & Ishmaelites had circumcision & the Sacrifices by vsurpation: which by continuance of tyme were at the last worne out among them: even so you see Mr. Bern. that Gods people, the sincerest preaching by the forwardest among you, & the conscionable practise of the truth by the best professors, & the reformation which the reformists so long have sought is almost expired & out of date in the Land: The Prelates, Subscription, Conformity, Declining to Popery, & a Linsy wolsey Religion prevayleth in the Land: & you your selfe among the rest have lost or forsaken your sincerity, & are become a Tymeserver, a Newter, a Temporizer, & then what els but an Hypocrite? & except the Lord be mercifull vnto his people among you, it is likely to come to passe among you as among the Samaritanes, Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, that the Holy things of God which by violence & vsurpation you have invaded wilbe eyther overwhelmed with Egiptian darknes, or vtterly banished out of the nation: & I would fayne know whither even at this present, ther be not a thousand parishes in the Land, wher ther is no more true profession of Christ then among the Antichristian Papists.

Finaly, to conclude this Parallele: whereas you object that wee like it that you call vs brethren, but we wil not so account you nor admonish you as brethren: I answer that we like it to be counted brethren by you, nor for that wee are so vnto you: but for that hereby wee would judg you out of your owne mouths: that whereas you account vs Brownists, Schismaticks, Heretiques, Traytors, &c. you may hereby perceave your wicked

slaunders, that thus intitle vs, & yet account vs your Brethren: For other wise as we detest your Church, ministry, worship, & Government as Antichristian: So also wee have in abomination your brotherhood, which is Antichristian: also wee abjure to be brethren to your Lords the Prelates, to your vice Lords the Archdeacons, Chancellors, Comissaries, Officials of their Courts, to the damned crew so termed in the Land, to your Church Papists, to the adulterers, Theeves, Murtherers, VVitches, Conjurers, Vsurers, Atheists, Swaggerers, Dronkards, Blasphemers, & infinite sorts of sinners impenitent in your Churches, yea & take the forwardest preachers & professors of the nation wee vtterly dislike their brotherhood visible standing members of the assemblies, visible joyned in communion with the forenamed Antichristians & abominable persons in one & the same body: nay wee goe further: we reject the fraternity of those that deny themselves to be ordinary members of your Churches, & yet are so extraordinarily: that refuse communion with you continually, & yet reserve liberty to heare, & communicate occasionally: For seing they hereby are made one with your Antichristian body & wicked members therof, being vnseperated from them, we cannot acknowledge our selves their brethren, lest we joyne light & darknes, Christ & Belial, the Temple of God & Idols together: wherefore neither are we your brethren, nor you our brethren visibly: neither do wee delight so to be called in these respects, but only as you have heard, that we may be wel reported of by them that are without, & that we may heape coales of fire vppon your head, whē you acknowledg vs brethren, & yet slander vs so shamefully. & this shal suffice as concerning this Section.

#### The sixth Section.

Your eleventh position followeth to be considered of which is this.

That only Saynts as Mr. Smyth defineth them by 4. properties are the matter only of a visible Church: This you hould error: I hold it the most certayne truth of Gods word as these Scriptures doe evidently prove: Rom. 6. 4. 5. 8. 11-22. 1. Pet. 3. 11. 2. Pet. 3. 18.

1. Iohn. 2. 19. Apocal. 3. 5. compared with Roman. 1. 7. Eph. 1. 1. 4, Revel. 11. 2. & 22. 14. 15. & 18. 2. compared with Deut. 14. 2. 3. 11. 2. Cor. 6. 16. compared with 1. King. 5. 12.

The 4. properties wherby I describe saynts are these though you mention them not in this your note: 1. To forsake all knowne sinne, 2. to doe all the will of God knowne. 3. to grow in grace. 4. to continue to the end: For the further cleering of this point consider that al the members of the true visible Church of the Apostolique institution are persons who are to be accounted, holy faithful & elect: now if they be elect, I hope they wil continue faithful to the end: but you wil happily object that many fal away by Apostacy: true & then they are fit to be entertayned in your churches as some of ours have been: of them I say as the Apostle Iohn saith, if they had been of vs they would have continued with vs: Therfor they were none of vs: For although they were in the outward communion, yet they were not of the true visible Church, but were only Hipocrites, & as superfluous excrescences in the body no natural true parts of the body: For as in the natural body an eie of glasse is not indeed a true part of the body, though it occupie the place of a natural part: So an Hypocrite or one that continueth not to the end possesseth only a rome in the visible Church, & is not indeed a true member. You wil demaund then why we receive Hypocrites among vs: wherto I answer we cannot discern an hypocrite, & therfor we are to judg of men according to that we see measuring them by the word of God: That which is concealed from vs wee are not to prie into: VVherfor our judgment must alter & chang as occasions varie: & so the Scripture speaketh of a righteous man forsaking his righteousnes, Ezech. 18. 24. VVhereas in truth the gifts & calling of God are without repentance, Rom. 11. 29. Breefly therfor to deliver vnto you the truth I hold concerning this point:

1. The visible Church consisteth of an outward & inward communion.

2. The inward communion is knowne only to God: So are the members therof.

3. The outward visible communion is seen & discerned by men: So are the members thereof.

4. VVee are to judg men for the present to be both of the inward & outward communion if they manifest to vs an outward visible faith.

5. Iff afterward men Apostate finally then wee chandg our mynd & say they were never of vs for had they been of vs they would have continued with vs.

Now Mr. Bern. I pray you answer vs this which wee thus justifie out of the word if you can: if you cannot yeeld to the truth & embrace the faith, & wee shal rejoyce for you & with you.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning to the sixth Section.

Mr. Bern. in his book intituled the Seperatists Schisme, pa. 83. hath these wordes, viz: Their fifth error is, that only Saynts: that is a people forsaking al knowne sin, of which they may be convinced, doing al the knowne wil of God: increasing & abiding ever therin, are the only matter of a visible Church.

In this Section Mr. Bern. saith thus, It is an error to teach: That only Saynts as Mr. Smyth defineth them by 4. properties, are the only matter of a visible Church.

Mr. Ainsworth: confutation of Mr. Bern. pag. 174. Saith that he denyeth this position & disclaymeth the errors which Mr. Bern. gathereth from them referring him to them that hold it: then Mr. Ainsworth sheweth what he holdeth, that Saynts by calling are the only matter of a true visible Church: yet that many be called, & few chosen.

Let the reader consider the exposition that I have given to this position in this section of my lettre & then let him give his verdict: the exposition is summarily thus much: viz that seing the visible Church consisteth of an outward & inward communion, they that are only of the outward visible communion as hypocrites, are no true members of the visible Church, but only in reputation & account before men.

Now I demaund of Maister Bernard againe with what face or good conscience he durst thus abuse the VVorld, to

publish this position barely without my exposition, or not to answer that which I brought for the confirmation thereof, but nakedly to set it downe & then only to object against it: Herein you bewray to mee a mynd willing to hyde the truth, & to deceave the VVorld, & to draw the Lords truth into detestation: which whither it be not the quality of a false Prophett, I leave to the judgment of the Godly mynded: And whither hereby you doe not verifie Christs speech, that you come to rob, kill, & to destroy, & that therfor you are a thief & a robber, Ioh. 10. 1. 10.

But bicause you are so importunate with your objections & reasons, let vs heer what they are,

First, you say my description of Saynts, is a proper description of the invisible members of Christ Iesus, & that it excludeth Hypocrites from being true matter of the visible Church: I answer two things: namely, 1. that an Hypocrite may performe al these 4 properties mentioned in the description of Saynts for he may, 1. Forsake all knowne sinne, 2. doe al the knowne wil of God, 3. grow in knowledg & grace. 4. continue to the end: & yet be an Hypocrite to the Lord in secreat: doe you think Mr. Bernard that all that die thus qualified in the estimation of men are indeed saved with the L? I confesse to mee they are vndoubtedly saved, but are they so to the Lord? make a direct answer to this particular, & you shal be compelled to see & confesse your folly. 2. I answer more properly thus: when I define Saynts I must define them not as they are in shew for the present, but as they are indeed & truth: Now truth is so eyther before men or before God: before men that is true somtyme which is false before God: & before God that is true somtyme which is false before men: That is true before men which is proved by two or three witnesses. Mat. 18. 16. He therfor is a Saynt before men in truth, that continueth to the end in faith repentance & the fruites thereof: He is a Saynt before men in shew & appearance for the present, that for the present bringeth forth fruites worthy amendement of life. For a righteous man may forsake his righteousnes: Ezech. 18. 14. I am not therefore to define a Saynt as he is in shew for the

present, but as he is indeed for ever in the judgment of men: neither do I define a Saynt as he is in the Lords knowledg which is not revealed to men, but as he is revealed to be judged by the word of God: I wil declare this by instances for your further information & satisfactiō: Stephen: Demas: Tertullus: Stephen continued to the end: Demas embraced the world & fel back from the truth: Tertullus never came to the truth for ought that is revealed: I say, Stephen was a true member of the visible Church who continued to the end: Demas was no Saynt nor no true member of the visible Church indeed, but only in shew: Tertullus was no Saynt nor true member of the visible church so much as in shew or appearance: what Tertullus was in secreat to the Lord I dispute not, nor regard not: what Demas was, what Stephen was in the Lords counsel it doth not apertheyne vnto vs: we must judg according to that we see & know: I say still with the Apostle continuance is a true propertie of a Saynt & member of the visible Church indeed & truth, & of the ful & compleat communion thereof, 1. Ioh. 2. 19.

Your second Objection & reason is that by this my definition of Saynts, or the matter of the visible Church so determined, I exclude the members of the visible Church of the old Testament, as Hezechiah, David, Iehosaphat, Moses, &c. VVho committed & suffered knowne sinne: yea & the Corinthians, 2. Cor. 12. 21. Also the Churches of Asia. Revel. 2, 20. 21. VVho did not amend, & yet were Saynts & true matter of the visible Church.

I answer: First to that of the old Testament objected by you, I say you bewray therein great ignorance of the true nature & constitution of the Church of the Old Testament, as also of the ministry, worship, & government thereof, which were al typical & ceremonial: Know you therfor Mr. Bern. that ther is as much difference betwixt the Old Testament with the ordinances thereof, & the new Testament with the ordinances therof, as ther is betwixt the signe & the thing signified: betwixt the ceremony & the substance: the type & the truth: the shadow & the body: Literal & Spiritual: the lettre & the Spirit. For in these & the like Phrases doth it please the



Holy Spirit in the Scriptures to discover vnto vs the differences of these two Testaments, & the ordinances thereof: you cannot plead, bicause in the Old Testament there were Sacrificing Preists, therfor ther must be such in the New Testament, neyther can you plead, for that they had one high Preist in the Old Testament, therfor ther must be one Pope or Patriarch over the Church in the New Testament: To reason thus were to bring in Iudaisme, & to disanull the blood of Christ. Therfor if you wil reason aright as you ought to doe, you must frame your reason from the Type to the Truth after this manner. This was a Type figure shadow, ceremony, signe, literal ordinance in the old Testament, therfor we must not have that type, figure, shadow, ceremony, signe, literal ordinance in the new Testament, but we must have the thing typed, figured, shadowed out, signified thereby: as for example: In the old Testament they had a visible Tabernacle, Temple, Cittie, wee must have a visible Church, which is indeed the true Tabernacle, Heb. 8. 2, & 3. 2-6 The true Temple, 2 Corinth. 6. 15. the Holy Cittie, Revel. 21. 2. 3. In the Old Testament the materiall Temple was made of material stones: in the New Testament the visible Church is made of living & Spiritual stones, 1. Pet. 2. 5. in the old Testament the people that offered sacrifice were a holy people literally, Deut. 14. 2. 3. in the new Testament the people that worship God must be holy indeed & spirituallly, 1. Pet. 2. 5. 9. the same may be said of the sacrifices, sacrificers or Preists & of al other ordinances of the old testamēt: hence it foloweth by a necessary consequence that the constitution of the church of the old testament was a ceremonial constitution: the worship of the old testament a ceremonial worship: the ministry a typical ministry: the government a typical government: the people a typical people: the land or country a ceremonial country. & so forth of the rest by proportion. This being propounded & confirmed thus as the vndoubted truth of God discovereth the vanity of your reason: I say vnto you that David, Iehosaphat, & the rest of the Godly in the old testament though they did suffer known sin in the land, yet were the true matter of the

typical Church being typically or ceremonially cleane: For to the constitution of the typical Church ther was not required true holynes, but ceremonial cleanenes: & although it was signified vnto them of the old testament, & necessarily required of them for their acceptation befor God that they should be truly, holy, & sanctified: (for never was any accepted before God without true inward holines) yet it was not necessarily required of them to the constitution of their Church, for to make them true matter or members of that typical Church, or to fit them to that typical cōmunion which was the proper cōmunion of that typical Church, & of that typical service. Hence it is that as in the old testament a Saint was a typical Saint, so an hipocrite was a typical hipocrite: & a wicked man was a typical wicked man, & therfor excommunication was typical: Nomb. 5. 2-4. & 12. 14. Hence also it foloweth that lawfully they might have typical communion in typical worship that were typically cleane or saynts typically though they were wicked indeed: For their real wickednes did not polute their ceremonial or typical Church, worship, & communion, although it did polute their owne consciences & workes. Their ceremonial vncleanes did polute their ceremonial communion: Their moral vncleanes did not so: If their communion had been moral & Spiritual, then their moral vncleanes had defiled their cōmuniō: but their cōmunion being only ceremonial & typical, their polution was only of that kind: therfor you shal never find that in the old testament the L. chardgeth thē for cōmunion in their typical service with wicked men, howsoever the wicked men thēselves are sharply reprov'd for their wickednes. Besides the nature of their worship being wel weighed doth instruct vs thus much: For their worship was reconciliation & repentance to acceptation: but our worship is of another nature, viz: Sacrifices of praise & thanksgiving after repentance, reconciliation, & acceptation. For they did worship to repentance, we do worship from repenta[n]ce: therfor they might & did worship therby to reconcile thēselves to God: we being reconciled to God & accepted in Christ do proceed to offer vnto the L. the calves of our lips, the best grace we have: with vs men first

declare their repentance, & then we receive them into our communion to worship with vs: with them first men were received into typicall communion, & then they were trayned vp to repentance & faith in Christ by the typical sacrifices of that typical communion: Their worship began outwardly in the lettre, & proceded inwardly to the Spirit, so did their cōstitution, ministry & al: our worship beginneth inwardly in the Spirit, & proceedeth outwardly to the lettre: Therfor our constitution, ministry, worship, & government, is contrary to theirs: & therfor Mr. Bern. if you had knowne or observed this, you would not have objected these things of the old Testament for the joyning with & suffering of open knowne sinne in the new Testament, & the communion thereof: For how can these things agree, except you wil make the New Testament, the Old Testament: & abolish Christ, & sett vp Iudaisme againe.

But I would fayne know how you can prove that these holy mē did suffer opē known sinne, or suffering it were not defiled therby? defiled I say not in their communion which was typical, but in their consent which was Spiritual. But this point I must thus leave wayting for your answer: For I avouch that either the sinnes which they suffered were not knowne: or if they were knowne they were defiled by them: & so not repenting of them, al their worship was defiled to themselves, but yet being ceremonially cleane their communion in ceremonial worship was not vnclane vnto others. & if you doe object vnto me that their Spiritual communion was polluted vnto others: I answer that their moral or Spiritual communion was invisible, & so could not pollute others: & ther visible communion was typical & ceremonial, & that only polluted others: For such as was ther communion, such was ther pollution: Ther communion visible being typical did only polute typically our communion visible being moral or Spiritual doth pollute vs moraly & Spiritually. Now I doe confesse vnto you, that by ther typical Church, ministry, worship, & government, Spiritual things were signified both for them & for vs: For them the morality or Spiritual signification was double, viz: 1. that the Lord required

that they should be that indeed which was typed vnto them, els they could not be accepted. 2. That in them they ought to see as in a glasse the glorious condition of the Church, ministerie, worship, & government of the new Testament, which were shadowed out by those ceremonies: For vs the moral or Spiritual signification is, that except we be correspondent, in our constitution, ministerie, worship, & Government, to those types of the old Testament, our constitution, ministerie, worship & government, is either jewish, or paganish, & therfor Antichristian: Herevpon thus may I reason against you most soundly & therin you Mr. Bern. shal have your mouth so stopped as that you shal never be able to reply, or once to mutter against the truth any more except you have a cauterized conscience, viz.

If in the Old Testament ther visible typical communion was typically polluted by typical & ceremonial vncleannes vncleansed: Then in the New Testament our Spiritual visible communion is really poluted by moral vncleanenes vncleansed, that is, sinne vnrepented of.

But in the old Testament, ther visible typical cōmunion was typically poluted by the typical & ceremonial vncleannes vncleansed.

Therfor in the new testament our visible Spiritual cōmunion is really poluted by moral vncleannes vncleansed, that is sinne vnrepented of.

The major cannot be denied for it is a just analogie & proportion from the type to the truth, from the shadow to the substance.

The minor is evidently confirmed by these places of Scripture, compared together. Nomb. 19. 13. 20. Hag. 2. 14. Act. 21. 28. 29.

Againe: If in the old Testament the persons ceremonially vncleane during the tyme of their vncleannes, were excluded from the tabernacle or the host of Israel: then in the new Testament persons morally vncleane by impenitency, during the tyme of ther impenitency, must be excluded from the communion and fellowship of the true visible Church.

But in the old Testament persons ceremonially vncleane during the tyme of their vncleannes were excluded from

the tabernacle or host of Israel, as may be seen: Nomb. 5. 2-4 & 12. 14. 15. 2. Chron. 26. 21.

T[h]erfor in the New Testament persons morally vncleane by impenitency, during the tyme of ther impenitency, must be excluded from the communion of the true visible Church.

But I shal have better occasion hereafter, namely in the 8. Section, to manifest this particular, whither I referre the reader.

Breefie I answer concerning David his suffering of Iobas murther: The Kings of Iudah suffering the brasen Serpent to be worshipped, & the high places: Moses giving the bill of divorce: that eyther they knew them not to be sinne, or if they knew thē that they were polluted therwith by consent: but yet ther typical communion was not defiled therby if they were ceremonially cleane: they therfor being typically Saynts were true matter of the typical Church, & for the Church of Corinth, & the Churches of Asia, I answeare that they were not impenitent in sinne, & so were Saynts: For know you that not sinne but impenitency in sinne maketh mē a false matter of a church: making saynts no saynts Now how can you prove that either the Corinthians or the Churches of Asia were impenitent after once & twice admonition? I think it passeth your skil to prove that, & therfor I think this second objection of yours to be idle & of no value.

Your third objection & reason is that the places of Scripture which we bring declare what men ought to be not what men are: & you say we cannot conclude from the places of Scripture we bring, that bicause men are commaunded so to be, therfor if they be not so they are none of Gods people.

To this objection & reason I answer: that hereby you confesse, that the L. requireth that al the members of the visible Church should be Saynts: whence I also conclude that seing they ought so to be, therfor if they be not so they are otherwise then they ought to be, & so by consequent, if the Church be framed of those that are not Saynts, it is framed of another matter then the Scripture appointeth: & I would know if that be not

a false matter. Moreover I avouch flatly contradictory vnto you that if men be not as God commaundeth, they are none of his people: but you are to know that true repentance is the true tryal of a Saynt, or of one of Gods people: & impenitency is an evident declaration that the partie therewith affected is none of Gods people: Therfor you must observe the difference betwixt the commaundements Legal, & Evangelical: The commaundements legal require absolute obedience in the highest degree therof: The gospell requireth true & vnfeyned repentance in the best degre we can aford: I would not have you think that wee imagine men should be framed in obedience absolutely according to the exactnes of the law, For wee are not vnder the law: no: wee only hold that men must in vnfeyned desire & endeavour yeld obedience to the law, & repent of al that wherin they are defective: & this is the obedience of the gospel which is acceptable, for wee are vnder grace: wherfor Mr. Bern. if you doe conceave that we intend the most perfect obedience of the law as a proper adjunct or formall difference of a Saynt, you are very grosse in your apprehension: if you conceave that we entend that men should be absolutely according to the gospel in faith & repentance, or els to be none of Gods people, then your conceipt is true & fit, but your objection is frivolous & ridiculous: For then men either are so or none of Gods people, & this doth our places of Scripture which we quote, prove, for any thing you yet have manifested to the contrary: when wee see you manifest otherwise, you shal receive answer, in the meane tyme you have discovered yourself to be but a wrangler.

Your fourth objection & reason is, for that Saints in Scripture are not so called, 1. eyther for soundnes of knowledg, 2. or internal pure affection, 3. or holy practise of their duty alwayes: But, 1. For their outward calling to Christianity, 2. For their profession of faith, 3. in respect of their baptisme, 4. in regard of the better part, 5. or in respect of the visible signes of Gods favour, 6. & Gods good pleasure.

I answer you thus: you deny three things & affirme six: I doe peremptorily deny your three negatives: &

I constantly affirme that sound knowledg, pure affections, & continual obedience are most pregnant and convertible properties off true Sanctification.

Soundnes of knowledg is a proper note of life Eternall. Iohn. 17. 3. Heb. 8. 11. & so a true note of Sanctification. Tit. 1. 16. & that which you bring of Christs Disciples, being ignorant of many things (which we acknowledg) is nothing for your purpose: For you speak not of perfect knowledg, but of sound knowledg, & that Epithete doth not argue the quantity or perfect measure, but the quality or true condition of knowledg which I do avouch by the former groundes to be a true convertible signe of sanctification, & so of a Saynt.

Pure affection also is another true token of Sanctification. Matt. 5. 8. 1. Tim. 1. 5, Tit. 1. 15. which pure hart or affection is not a hart voyde of sinn, but of hipocrisy, & for that you object of Paul, Rom. 7. 18. 21. it is nothing to overthrow his pure affection: For though he had sinne, yet he knew nothing by himself, whereof he had not repented.

Continuall practise of Holy dutyes, also is a true signe of a Saynt, or a Sanctified person, Psal. 119. 101. 102. 106. 112. And although Ecclesiastes saith that ther is no man without sinne, yet that hindreth not, but that some may continually practise their dutyes, sith this is the summe of al, that by repentance & faith which are the continual practise of the Saynts, a man doth alwayes performe his duty: & the speech of Ecclesiastes is the sentence of the law, not of the gospel.

But heerin is your monstrous fraud and abhominable dissembling manifested, that vnder these doubtful termes of sound knowledg pure affection & practise of duty allwayes, you would bleare mens eyes that they should not see the truth: VVhat doe you think that any of vs would be so absurd as to say that perfect knowledg, love, & obedience, without any imperfection or fault are the signes of Sanctification? And yet wee say, that sound knowledg, a pure hart, and continual practise of Holy dutyes are the most infallible tokens of true Saynts, and men truly Sanctified: But you are wholly transformed as I perceave into vayne jangling.

In the next place I doe acknowledg that your six affirmatives are somthing to the purpose: But nevertheless you have mingled much chaffe with the wheate: wherefore breefly in all that which you write page 85. 86. 87. 88, Concerning this matter I doe observe these particulars: Namely, 1. That although an outward calling, profession, and baptisme to the faith be part of the signes of Saynts: Namely, visible markes outwardly: yet they must be thus qualified, els they are nothing but pictures, or images, resembling & shadowing Sanctification superficially: For they must be true & inward also: True calling, profession & baptisme: & inward calling, profession, & baptisme, are the infallible tokens of Sanctification and Saynts: The inward must be discerned by the outward, the truth must be judged by the word: He that is so called, so professeth, is so baptised as the word teacheth: that is to say: He that is called and Seperated from the VWorld, Antichristianisme, & all false wayes knowne vnto him: he that professeth that true faith, taught in the New Testament of Christ, which is but one: he that is baptised into that true faith, after that true manner Christ hath prescribed, I must needs say that he is truly called, truly professeth, is truly baptized, and so he by reason of his outward true calling, true profession of the true faith, and true baptisme is discerned & judged to be inwardly called, inwardly to have faith, to be inwardly baptized, & that truly. A company of men thus called, professing, & baptized, are Saynts: But if half or but some of them only be thus, & the rest impenitent & obstinate in sinne, it cannot possibly be that they should joyntly together be a true Church: being light & darkenes, righteousnes & impenitency, Christ and Belial: or being joyned together, those former called, professing, & baptized, doe forsake their righteousnes, & partake with the wicked in their sinnes, and so shal receive of their plagues: How then can that mixt company be called Saynts, yea they are al accessory to fearful sinne before the Lord, & before men judging according to the rules of Gods word, which is the touchstone of al truth: & according wherevnto all our judgments must be squared, as by a canon & rule of direction.



2. The better part, visible signes of Gods favour and presence, Gods good pleasure & acceptation, are excellent respects in the Church: But they are not demonstrative proper adjuncts of saynts sufficiēt to cause a mixt company to be al saynts in definition: But you speak of a mixt company one way, & wee vnderstand a mixt company another way: You define a mixt company to be of men that are truly Sanctified and men openly wicked & profane: I for my part doe abhorre to call such a Company Saynts: Nay I should rather and that truly call such a mixt Company a false Church, and all of them visiblie Antichristians: Neyther doe I any whitt quayle that you say all divines say so: I know ther is one, namely Iohn the divine, & the rest of the Apostles that teach the contrary: & if the divinity of your divines be contrary to the divinity of the Apostles & Iohn that worthy divine I reject it, I abhorre it, I wish it cast to the bottomlesse pit, from whence it came: For know you Mr. Bern. that the worser part somtyme giveth denomination to the thing. If a peck of wheate be intermingled with an hundreth quartar of chaffe, it is not a heape of wheate, but of chaffe: if a pint of wine be mingled with a gallon of lees, it is the lees of wine not wine: you know in Logick *conclusio sequitur deteriorem partem*. Now a company of wicked men having some few Saynts known only to the Lord among thē (for being mingled with the wicked in Spiritual communion, they cannot be judged Saynts by the rule of Gods word to man particularly & certaynly) as your assemblies of England are, cannot be al caled Saynts in any colour of truth: For then al the men of England are Saynts, seing they al are joyned together into one Ecclesiastical body, which I suppose you cannot nor dare not say the Scripture ever intended so to give them denomination: but you must vnderstand that we acknowledg the visible Church a mixt company in the Lords account & estimation, & in our general comprehension: For so wee learne that the visible Church consisteth of wheate & tares, Mat. 13. The Lord he knoweth that the Church hath Hypocrites in it, & we are informed so by the scriptures ther were but twelve Apostles, & one of them was a Devil: but

eight persons in the Arck, & cursed Cham was one: but so are persons in the beginning & Runagate Kain was one: but stil we deny that open wicked impenitent persons can be called Saynts, bicause of the communion & presence of some elect ones who are only known vnto the Lord, being of one ecclesiastical body with the wicked.

Neither can a wicked company be called Holy or Saints truly in respect of the visible signes of Gods favour or presence, For then the Papists, Anabaptists, Familists, Arrians, & other Heretiques should truly be caled Saints, seing they have the word & Sacraments among them: & Exod. 3. 5. the ground was caled Holy: & Mat. 4. 5. Ierusalem is caled the Holy cittie, typically not truly, as I have expounded vnto you before: in respect whereof also the Lord is said to see no iniquity in Iacob, nor transgression in Israel, Nomb. 23. 21. seing that people at that present was typically Holy & so typically without imputation of iniquity in respect of their typical communion.

And for the Parable, Mat. 13. of the wheate & tares I doe constantly avouch that though you & al divines with you doe expound it of open wicked impenitent persons, & Saints, supposed in communion together, yet the parable is wrested from the true purpose of Christ, who doth not intend to teach that, for then he should teach contrary to himself, who by the parable of the Leaven declareth that one wicked persone defileth the whole lump, Mat. 13. 33. compared with 1. Cor. 5. 6. Exod. 12. 18,

And whereas in the conclusion of this point, pag. 88. you would prove that, bicause the auncient Church of the Seperation have (as you say) wicked men among them: therfor the parable Mat. 13. is truly expounded in that sense of a mixture of good & bad: I say for that point as the parents of the blind man said, they are auncient enough, lett them answer for themselves.

And thus have I ended this parallele with you Mr. Bern. & concerning Mr. Ainsworth who renounceth this Holy truth of the Lords, which I have thus clered, I say hereby he renounceth the faith in this particular, & renounceth

the Apostles testimony, who saith, they went out from vs, they were not of vs, for had they been of vs, they would have continued with vs, 1. Ioh. 2. 19.

### The seaventh Section.

Now followeth your fifth position which you also perswade your selfe to be an error, and which being wel expounded I account the vndoubted truth, viz.

5. That the powre of binding & losing is given to the whole multitude, & not to the principal members therof: These are your wordes.

I hold & maintayne out of the word that a cōpany of faithful people Separated from al vncleanenes & joyned together by a covenant of the L. are a true Church: yea though they be but two or three: So Adam & Hevah were a Church: so Lot, his wife, & his daughters were a Church: So Noah & his family in the Ark were a church: So the twelve men at Ephesus were a Church, Act. 19. 7. So in Q. Maries dayes the Martyrs seperated were a Church, if but two or thre of them lived together: That this is a truth, I prove vnto you thus.

2. Cor. 6. 16–18. with whome God maketh his covenant to be ther God, & whome he receaveth to be his people, they are a Temple, that is a Church vnto him, vs. 16-

But two or three faithful people comming forth from the vnbeleevers, & being Separated, & touching no vncleane thing, are Gods people, & God with them maketh his covenant, & they are his sonnes & daughters, & he is their Father, vs. 16. 17. 18.

Therfor two or three faithful people are the Temple and Church of God.

The Premisses are evidently delivered in the Scripture: therfor the conclusion foloweth necessarily.

Mat. 18. 20. wher two or thre are gathered together into my name, ther am I in the mids of them.

In the mids of whomsoever Christ doth dwel & walk, they are a true Church of Christ: Even his Temple, Tabernacle, & habitation: as

these Scriptures teach being compared together, Mat. 28. 20. 2. Cor. 6. 16. Levit. 26. 11. 12.

But among two or three gathered together by love, & into the name of Christ by faith, Christ is present to dwell & walk, Mat. 18. 20. 2. Cor. 6. 16. compared together.

Therefore two or three faithful people are the Temple & Church of God. I could alledge other Scriptures: but two or three witnesses are sufficient.

Remember for this point that the covenant made with Adam, Ab[r]aham, Isaac, Iacob, & al the faithful, is made with any faithful people in the world, as if two or three faithful people should rise vp in the dominions of the Turk, or Pope, or Iewes, or Pagans, & joyne together to walk in the faith, the Lord maketh his covenant with them, he is their God, they are his people, they are his Temple, he walketh ther, he is their Father, they are his sonnes & daughters, Christ is their King, they are his Kingdome, even a Kingdome of Preists, &c: & therfor whersoever in the Scripture the covenant is made with any, it is to be vnderstood as made with Abrahams childrē according to the faith, & therfor with two or three faithful people any w[h]ere in the world.

This being premised as the ground of our whole cause, & we having departed from al the profane of the Land, & having seperated & touching no vncleane thing, 2. cor. 6, 17 We are Gods people, his temple, his Church: he dwelleth & walketh among vs, & he hath given to vs, & made with vs his covenant, Heb. 8. 10. & although we were but few in number, yet the Lord chose vs to be his.

Wee being now the Church of God, wee have the powre of the L. Iesus Christ given vnto vs: For we have himself our owne by title & possessiō, & vse, & that by vertue of the covenāt God made with vs: for so God is our God & our Father, only in Chr. & through him: & al the promises of God in Christ are yea & Amen: Christ therfor is ours: Christ he is our King & our Preist, & we are his Kingdome: & we have his powre, that this is so I prove vnto you by these Scriptures.

Marc. 13. 34. Christ ascending vp into Heaven (for that is his going into a farre country as may be perceaved by Luk. 19. 12. with Mat. 28. 18. & Eph. 4. 8.) gave authority to his servants leaving his howse that is his Church, according to his bodily presence: now what authority is this that Christ gave vnto his serväts? that is evident by other places of scriptures, 1. Cor. 5. the powre of our Lord Iesus Christ which the Corinthians had that is the powre of admonition & excommunication, the powre of binding & losing, a powre to administer Christs Kingdome, & al the ordinances therof.

Mat. 16. 19. The powre of binding & losing is given to Peter.

Ioh. 20. 23. The powre of binding & losing is given to al the Apostles.

Marc. 13. 34. The powre of Christ is given to his Servants.

1. Cor. 5. 4 The powre of Christ is in the hands of the Corinthians.

Now let vs make collections & gather instructions out of these places, & the truth wil most evidently appeare.

The Pope saith out of the 16. of Mathew, that the powre of binding & losing is givē to Peter & his successors the popes of Rome: & that al the Bbs. & Preists in the world, & the whole Church vniversal receaveth binding & losing from him.

Nay say the English Prelates out of the 20. of Iohn Christ gave the powre of binding & losing to al the Apostles & their successors the Lord Bbs. of Englād, & that al the Preists, & people in the Land, receive binding & losing from them in their severall dioceses.

Nay say the Presbyterians of England out of Mat. 18. 17. The powre of binding & losing is given to the E[l]dership, & the people they are bound or losed by the Presbytery: For by the Church they vnderstand the Presbytery.

Nay say we, the powre of binding & losing is given to the body of the Church, even to two or thre faithful people joyned together in covenant, & this we prove evidently in this manner.

Vnto whome the covenant is given, vnto them the powre of binding & losing is given.

The covenant is given to the body of the Church, that is to two or three faithful ones: For God is their God, & they are his people.

Therfor the powre of binding & losing is given to them.

Againe. Vnto whom Christ is given for King, vnto thē the powre of Christ the King is given, as being his deputies & lieftenants.

But Christ is given for King vnto the body of the Church, even to two or three faithful people, who are his Kingdome, & howse, & cittie.

Therfor vnto them is given his powre, that is his powre to bind & lose.

Finally. Vnto whome the covenant & Christ is given, vnto them al the promises are given, for al the promises are conteyned in the covenant, & in Christ, as these places prove, 2. Cor. 1. 20. Psal. 133. 3. Act. 2. 39. Gal. 3. 14. 15. 16. & the powre of binding & losing is one of the promises, & is a part & parcel of the covenant, Mat. 16. 19. Ioh. 20. 23. Mat. 18. 15-20.

But the covenāt & Christ & al the promises, are givē to the body of the church even to two or three faithful ones.

Therfor the powre of binding & losing is given to them also.

But ther are certayne objections which must be answered in number three.

Ob. 1. One is that Christ speaketh only to Peter & to his Apostles, & giveth the powre only to them therfor, Mat. 16. 19. Iohn. 20. 23. Mat. 18. 17.

For answer thus much.

The place Mat. 16. although it be directed to Peter personally, yet it is intended vnto all the Disciples of Christ: For vnto them is the powre given, that have the faith and made the confession ther mentioned: But the faith & confession of faith is of al the Disciples,

& spoken by Peter in behalf of them al: & therfor the powre is by promise given to al,

The place Ioh. 20. 23. importeth plainly that Mary Magdalene, & divers other of the Disciples were present when Christ spake vnto them: for they were assembled together in a howse, the dore being shut, & it was the L. day: & not the Apostles only, but the rest of the Disciples were assēbled in al likely-hood for the Sanctification of the L.-day: yea further Thomas was absent, & so the promise of binding & losing could not be made to him at that present, & afterward it was not made to him, & so by consequent that one of the Ap. had not the powre givē him by ther reason which plead it to be given to the Apost. only. The place Mat. 18. 17. doth not prove that this powre was given to the Presbyterie, for that place importeth that it was given to the Church, now the Eldership is not the Church, but a part of the Church, & it must be proved that the word Church doth signifie the Eldership (or els this place wil help nothing), as I am sure cannot be showed out of the word: besides the circumstances of the place teach that Christ intēdeth the powre of binding & losing to be given to every brother, for so he saith, if thy brother sin: & lett him be vnto the: & take two or three witnesses: & where two or three, &c. I am in the midst of them.

Finally, It cannot be denyed but admonition aper-teyneth to every brother, & why should not excommunication: For their is powre to bind & lose in two or thre witnesses toward a brother, & why not powre to bind & lose in the body of the Church, if the whole Church be but two or three: or some smal number.

Now for the vtter overthrowing of this concept of the powre given to the Presbyterie only, consider that the twelve were not yet Apostles, only they were nominated to be Apostles: they were invested in their office at the descending of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost: which I prove vnto you evidently. Eph. 4. 8. 11, when Christ ascended he gave gifts vnto men, viz: the gifts of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors & Teachers: For Christ receaved his Kingdome when he ascended. Luk. 19. 12. For Christ obteyned a Kingdome by his death, & he

received his Kingdome, when he went into that farre country: & Christ by his sufferings entred into his glory: So that Christs Kingdome in regard of the outward regiment & ordinances thereof beganne at the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles were endued with powre from on high Luk. 24. 49. Act, 1. 8. & it shal end at the day of judgment, 1. Cor. 15. 24. 25. Seing therfor that they were not yet Apostles, but only Disciples, the powre given to them was given to them as Disciples, not as Apostles: & therfor all Christs Disciples may justly in al ages challendg that powre of binding & losing: For a conclusion therfor in a word, the commaundement of binding and losing is given to every brother, so the promise & powre of binding & losing is givē to them also: as the forsaid places do evince. & as the charter of a corporatiō is frō the King & al the offices have powre from the corporation, so the Church hath powre frō Christ, & the Eldership from the church & as the body hath powre from the head, & the parts of the body have their powre from the body: So the church which is Christs body, hath powre from Christ, & the Eldership a part of the body hath powre from the body.

Ob. 2. A second objection is this that if the powre of binding & losing be givē to the body of the Church, then powre of preaching & administring the seales of the covenant: truth: we confesse it: & the church being a corporation committeth powre to administer to such officers as Christ hath apointed to his church, viz: to the Elders or Bishops: stil reserving powre to correct her officers by the same powre of binding & losing in admonition & excommunication, the benefit wherof doth as wel perteyne to the Elders as other of the brethren, except it be said the Elders are to be exempted from censures, & so to want those meanes of Salvation which the brethren have, which is a pitiful condition, & a lamentable priviledg.

Ob. 3. A third objection is that the benefit of binding & losing, of the word & seales of the covenant is given to the church, & al the members, but not the powre of thē: wherto thus much may be answered, viz: that the Church, viz: two or thre faithful ones have as is



said the covenant, Christ, the promises not only in vse, but in title & possession: & the faithful have as good powre & title or interest to the covenant, Christ, & the promises, as a freholder hath to his lands & possessions. Esa. 9. 6. Vnto vs a sonne is given: the church is the spouse of Christ, & so hath powre to Christ the covenant & promises: the Church is the body of Christ, the body hath a real possession, title, & powre to the head & all the helps therof: For the faithful are flesh & bones of Christ, Eph. 5. 30. these things are manifest to them that wil vnderstand: & if any man be ignorant let him be ignorant.

But it may be Mr. Bern. you wil say that powre to bind & lose are no properties of the Church, but only priuiledges: For shame say not so: Surely this plea argueth that either you got litle Logick in the vniversity, or that you have forgot it, or if you remēber it you either carelesly neglect it, or wilfully pervert the vse of it to seduce your followers: I pray you tel me in good sooth what difference is there betwixt a priuiledg & a propertie: Is not a priuilege according to the notation of the word *privata lex*: a private law wherin one person or state is interested. The King hath certaine priuiledges or prerogatives as to pardon condemned persons, to dispence with his law, a negative voice in parliament &c. I would faine know of you, whither these be not properties, such as the Kings & Queenes of the nation only have title to & no other: but consider wel with your self what relation ther is betwixt a priuiledg & the person that is interested in the priuiledg: Is it not the relation of the subject & the adjunct? A priuiledg therfor is an adjunct to the priuiledged person: Now al adjuncts are either proper or common adjuncts: but a priuilege is not a common adjunct, as I am sure you wil confesse, or els you want reason: therfor it is a proper adjunct: If it be a proper adjunct it is a propertie, & so your distinction is senselesse & vnschollerlike. you may aswel say that pepper is hot in working & cold in operation, as to say that the true Church may be without her priuiledges, but not without her properties: Therfor I doe heer before the L. attach you as a deceaver of the people in teaching

thus contrary to al learning & true vse of reason, that the powre of the Lord Iesus Christ given to the church, one part wherof consisteth in binding & losing is only a priviledg & not a propertie of the true Church: & that the true Church may want it: It is as impossible for the true Church to want Christs powre, as for a man to want reason: Mr. Ber. answer now or els yeeld to the truth you cannot for shame denie the one of them.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the seaventh Section.

In this Section I write & prove, that the powre of binding & losing is given to the whole multitude, & not to the principal members therof.

Mr. Bern. in his book intituled the Sep. Schisme, pa. 88. calleth it the A. B. C. of Brownisme to hold: That the powre of Christ ther is, authority to Preach, to administer the Sacraments, & to exercise the censures of the Church, belongeth to the whole Church, yea to every one of them, & not the principal members therof.

Mr. Ains. answering Mr. Ber, pa. 174. Saith that Mr. Ber. may put this opinion, if he please in the Criss-crosse-row of Bernardisme, he himself being the first that ever he heard to vtter such a position: & afterward pa. 175. 176. 177. 178. Expoundeth what that auncient Church whereof he is teacher holdeth concerning it.

Wel: Let vs handle these things largely, & to ful satisfaction: & herein I professe befor the Lord, & befor the whole world, that if I do not prove evidently my assertion that the powre of binding & losing is given to the whole multitude, & not to the principall members therof. I wil acknowledg the Churches of England, yea the Churches of Rome yea & the Greek Churches also to have a true ministery, & to be true churches of Christ For if the ministerie, & the holy things with the ministerie, come by succession from the Apostles handes, through the churches of Rome & the Grecians, & that ther are no ministers, but such as are made by thē & frō thē successively, our whole cause of Seperation lyeth in the dust & we must disclaime our Schisme which we have made, & our heresies

which we hold: but if it be proved that the true ministerie commeth not by succession from the churches of Rome or the Grecians, & that the holy things are not given to the ministry by successiō, but are givē first to the body of the church, the faithful, yea though they be but two or three, & that both the ministerie and all the powre that the ministerie hath doth flow from the Fountayne Christ Iesus, through the body of the Church to the Presbytery, then is your Church & ministerie false, so are the Churches of the East & West much more: & then we & those Churches only which raise vp their Ministerie from the Election, aprobation, & ordination of a faithful people, are the true Church of Christ having the true Ministerie of Christ, & you with the rest of Gods people in Babylon must separte & joyne together, & walk in the Lords ordinances as we & other true Churches doe, or els woe be vnto you from the Lord: Therfor in this particular I would supplicate the Kings Majestie my Soveraigne Lord on earth, the Lords of the Parliament, the Gentlemen that susteyne the person of the commons in the nether howse, al the learned men of the Land, to consider & to search out this point: For it being thoroughly cleered may breed peace & infinite good to the whole nation: whereas it being suppressed, choked, darkened, & neglected draweth with it al the contentions and controversies amongst them that professe Christ in the whole earth: For my part Mr. Ber. I wil endeavour according to my poore hability to discover what I have conceaved, and doe vndoubtedly beleeve from the Scriptures, and doe make the beginning of my inquisition after this manner which I desire the gentle reader to weigh & consider of with his best attention. Christs visible church which is his Kingdom, hath in it a spiritual powre and jurisdiction by the confession of al that professe Iesus Christ: which powre is of two sortes: 1. The powre of Christ himself, who is the Lord & King of his Church. Mat. 28. 18 and he is the Fountaine of powre, being the head of the Church which is his body, Eph. 1- 22. 23. For as the head is the Fountaine of life, sense, motion, & powre to the whole body, & as the Mr. of the howse is the original of al oeconomical

powre: So is Christ the original of al spiritual life, sense, motion, & powre to the Church which is his body & family: This is evident: & in regard of this powre which is inherent in Christ, the church which is Christs Kingdome may truly be termed a Monarchie, Mat. 23. 8-11. Ephes. 4. 5, Iam. 4. 12. This powre which Christ hath in himself cannot passe from himself to any other: For as his preisthood is eternal, & not passing frō him to another, Heb. 7. 24. so may it as truly be said of his other offices, & particularly of his Kingdome & Monarchicall powre: Neverthelesse 2. The Lord Iesus hath ordeyned & appointed a certayne order to be observed in his absence in the true visible Church, & hath delegated a certaine powre & authority to his Servants & subjects for the preserving of that order, & for the execution of those ordinances: This delegated powre & authority is mentioned Marc. 13. 34 1. Cor. 5. 4. This delegated powre is avouched by the Papists to be in the Pope, by the English Prelates to be in the Lord Bbs. & Archdeacons: By the Presbyterians to be in the Eldership: by the brethren of the Seperation to be in the body of the Church primarily and fundamentally: For if the Pope, Prelates, Presbytery, or Body of the Church do say that the powre which is in Christ Iesus is in them, they doe blaspheme most fearfully robbing Christ of his honour & Regal powre, & make themselves even Christ himself: The Pope therfor is not Antichrist for that he vsurpeth that regal powre which is proper to Christ: neither are the Bbs. of England Antichrist for vsurping that proper kingly powre which is only in Christ: nor the Presbytery Antichristian for challengng the powre Monarchical of Christ: but they are al Antichristian for vsurping the delegated powre of Christ which he hath originally given to the body of his Church which is his mysticall body.

This delegated & Ministerial powre which the Pope, Bbs. & Presbytery challengd, they say commeth to them by succession from Christ: The Pope he saith Christ hath given this ministerial powre to Peter only & his successors the popes of Rome: The Bbs. say Christ hath given this delegated powre to al the Apostles, & the Apostles have given it to the Bbs. their successors. The

presbyterians say that Ch[r]ist hath given this ministerial powre to the presbytery, or Eldership, & they conveigh it successively to the elders succeeding to the worldes end in the Church: Al these three opinions are equally Antichristian, for they al of them establish succession which is Iewish, & so Antichristian. For in the old Testament the preisthood was conveighed by succession: Heer therfor I will prove vnto you by vndeniable arguments, that the powre of Christ is not given eyther to the pope, Bbs, or presbytery, but primarily it is given to the body of the Church.

#### First Argument.

If Christs ministerial powre be given by succession to the pope, Bbs, or presbytery primarily, then the ministerie is before the Church: Seing that ther must needes be a ministry before ther be any powre of Christ, this consequent is infallible.

But the ministerie is not before the Church, but after the Church: For it ariseth out off the Church, as a part off those Holy things which God hath given to his Church.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre is not given to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery primarily: but to the body of the Church.

They that affirme the ministry to be before the Church must needes hold that a minister is no relative to a Church, but that a man may be a minister, & have no flock to attend on, yea that ther may be & is a ministry when & where ther is no Church: or that the chardges of other men are his chardg: or that the world is his chardge: they must also maintayne that all grace floweth from the ministerie to the Church: that the ministerie is a more excellent ordinance then the Church: that the Church hath no powre to make ministers, but that the ministers have powre to make both ministers & churches: & that ministers are properly by their office Apostles over the whole world for the converting of men, & planting of Churches: & the like absurdities.

## Second Argument.

If Christs ministerial powre commeth by succession to the pope, Bbs. & presbytery: then the ministry of Rome is a true ministerie, and al they that are made ministers by the pope and his clergie, are true ministers: Then it is lawful to joyne with the true ministerie of Rome, and then whosoever are ordeyned and not by a precedent ministry are falsely ordeyned, and so are false ministers.

But the ministerie of Rome is no true ministry, and they that are ordeyned by the pope and his clergie are no true, but false ministers: and it is vtterly vnlawful to joyne with the ministerie of Rome by the confession of al the Protestants, and ministers may be ordeyned truly without ministers by the confession of the sincerest reformists.

Therefor Christs ministeriall powre commeth not by succession to the Pope, Bbs. or Presbytery primarily: but to the body of the Church.

## Third Argument.

If Christs ministerial powre commeth by succession to the pope, Bbs. & presbytery: then the Lord hath absolutely bound men to sinne, seing that wee must needes joyne to the sinnes off the Ministers, otherwise men cannot possible have & enjoy the holy things of God: For it is the ordinance of God, that wee should vse the holy things: & this assertion doth avouch that we must have thē from the ministry: & therfor let ther sinnes be what they wil, we must have them from their hands, & so must joyne to them in al ther sinnes.

But the L. hath not bound vs necessarily to joyne to other mens sinnes, seing he hath commaunded vs to Seperate from them, & this were to lay our sinnes vppon the Lord most blasphemously.

Therefor Christs ministerial powre commeth not by succession to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery primarily: but to the body of the Church.

## The fourth Argument.

If Christs ministerial powre commeth by succession to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery: then the Lord hath made the Ministers Lords over the Church, so that the Church can not have or enjoy any of the holy things, any of the L. ordinances, except they wil agree or consent them, vnto for ther Holy things are in ther powre.

But the L. hath not made the Ministers Lords over his Church which is his inheritance but they may have & enjoy his owne ordinances even al the Holy things contrary to the wil of wicked ministers.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre commeth not by succession to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery primarily, but to the body of the Church.

## The fifth Argument.

If Christs Ministerial powre commeth to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery, then the presbytery may excommunicate the whole Church: Then the Bbs. may excommunicate ther whole dioceses or provinces, then the pope may excommunicate the whole church vniversal on earth.

But the L. Bbs. of England say the Pope cannot excommunicate England: The Reformists hold that the Prelates cannot excommunicate their diocesses, & by consequent & just proportion the Presbytery cannot excommunicate that particular Church whereof they are Presbyters.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre commeth not by succession to the Pope, Bbs. or Presbytery primarily, but is given to the body of the Church.

## The sixth Argument.

If Christs ministerial powre commeth by succession to the Pope, Bbs. or Presbytery: Then the office of the Deacons & widowes are lost sith succession in them is interrupted & lost: for as in the old testament a Preist came of a Preist, a Levite of a Levite, so an Elder maketh

an Elder, a Deacon ordeyneth a Deacon, a widow must ordeyne a widow.

But the office of the Deacon & widow is not lost, for none of Gods ordinances are perisht, but may be had, or els Gods truth & mercy to his Church fayleth, who hath said that he wilbe with his Church to the end of the world.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre commeth not by succession to the Pope, Bbs. or Presbytery primarily, but is given to the body of the Church.

### The seaventh Argument.

That doctryne which destroyeth it self is false.

The doctryne of succession, viz: that Christs ministerial powre commeth by succession to the pope, Bbs. or Presbytery, destroyeth it self.

Therfor the doctryne of succession is a false doctryne.

The minor I manifest thus: If the papists say truly that al ecclesiastical powre floweth from Christ to the Clergie th[r]ough the pope, then why doth the college of Cardinalls make a pope by Election? & why doth not one pope make another pope before his death? Therfor Election overthroweth the succession of the popes office: For the pope cannot both give Christs Ministerial powre to the Clergie of Rome, & take the same ministerial powre from the Cardinals by Election: but when the pope is dead, then is Christs ministerial powre dead also in the popes person: & thus doth successiō overthrow it self in the pope: & by consequent in the rest: For Christs ministerial powre being once interrupted in the pope, can never be recovred againe, but is vtterly lost: & so the Church is abolished: For if the presbytery be lost the Church is lost: if the bbs. be lost, the presbytery is lost: if the pope be lost the bbs. be lost: if the pope be dead the pope is lost: if the pope be lost, Christs ministerial powre is lost: for if it be said that the pope hath his powre by Election from the Cardinals thē succession is destroyed: & so you may see evidently that succession destroyeth it self, seing Election must needes be interposed: Therfor indeed ther is no true



succession, but that of the old Testament, viz: by descent & genealogie: & this succession which is pleaded for by ordination of precedent presbytery, bbs. pope is mans invention & destroyeth it self, & therfor is a meer Antichristian devise.

But heer certayne objections must be answered for the further manifestation of the matter of succession, & for satisfaction therein.

#### The first Objection.

Although the Ministeriall powre of Christ be not given to the pope, & so perisheth not with him, yet it is given to the bbs, who are the Successors of the Apostles in that Ministeriall powre, and in the dispensation of it to the Ministerie and Church: Seing therefore that ther is a certayne and vndoubted Succession of bbs. from the Apostles dayes hetherto, one ordeyning another successively, therefore though succession be interrupted in the Pope whose ministerial headship we renounce, yet it is continued in the Bbs. who are the Apostles successors in dispensing this ministerial powre to the ministerie & Churches.

#### Answer to the first Objection.

This objection dependeth vppon an vncertainty, viz: That ther hath been a succession of Bbs. one ordeyning another successively frō Peter, Paul, Iames, through the Church of Rome, & the Greekes: & therfor I answer, that except they can shew the courte rowles (that I may so speak) of the vndoubted successive ordination from Peter, Paul, Iames, &c, I shal say vnto al the Bbs. of England, as Nechemjah said to the Preists, that could not shew ther succession from Aaron by Genealogie. Nehem. 7: 64. 65. Bicause their successive ordination is not found, they shal be put from their Bishopricks, & they shal not administer in the Bbs. office til their arise vp one as with Vrim & Thummim to divine vnto vs, the truth of this matter: For we wil not beleeve the records of the Church of Rome, who also are defective in

this particular, for though they have the succession of Popes, yet not of other Bbs.

Further the vanity of this objection appeareth in this, that hereby they are vrged for the justifying of this Antichristian devise of succession by ordination to go to the throne of Antichrist, the popedome, to fetch their ministerie thence, as if the true ministerie off Christ could be in the false Church of Antichrist: hereby also they do acknowledg Rome to be the true Church, their Sacrificing Priesthood a true Ministerie, orders a true Sacrament, the Eucharist a true propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick & dead, prayers for the dead, & a thousand such abominations, which are necessary dependances therevpon: They must also acknowledg themselves Schismaticques from the Church of Rome, & are never able to answer the popish bookes, & the petitions of the Papists to the King, who object these and the like things against them.

#### The Second Objection.

Although the pope & Bbs have not Christs ministerial powre given to them by succession, yet the presbytery may have that powre by delegation from Christ, when ther shal arise a company of true faithful teachers, who standing out against the popedome, & prelacy, & al the abominations therof: also renouncing al the corruptions of their ordination, & refining both the doctryne of faith, & the true calling of ministers, from the drosse of Antichristianisme, doe yet notwithstanding retayne the truth which they in the feare of Antichrist had, as in the faith, so in the ministry: For Antichrist had not vtterly abolished, but only corrupted the Lords ordinances.

#### Answer to the second Objection.

This objection dependeth vpon the former grounds, namely, that the Church of Rome is a true Church though corrupt, having a true ministerie though corrupt, &c. of the rest: For otherwise how can they plead ther ministry to be true from the Bbs. except they do acknowledg also the Bbs Ministry to be true receaved frō the Popedome: & the popish ministerie to be true,

for otherwise they must maintaine that a true ministerie commeth from a false ministerie, which is as impossible as to bring light out of darknes: So that this Objection is also answered in the former already, & needeth no further answer: yet neverthelesse I say vnto the point that al the refining of the world can not bring a true ministry out of a Sacrificing Priesthood: Or a true presbytery out of a false Antichristian prelacy: For as it was impossible for the preists of the Old Testament to ordeyne true Ministers of the New Testament: So much more is it impossible for the false popish Sacrificing preisthood, to ordeyne true ministers of Christs true Church: For the Sacrificing preisthood of Aarons Family was the Lords ordinance sometyme, but the popish Sacrificing preisthood in the mayne substantial parts therof, is not only mans device, but infinitely impious & blasphemously derogating from the honour & dignity of Christs Sacrifice & preisthood which is aparabatos intransitive, Heb. 7. 24. & according to the order of Melchisedech: & seing the popish Sacrificing preisthood is in the very essence of it false: how can the English prelacy, preisthood, & Deaconry, which issued from that Romish preisthood, be any other but a sacrificing preisthood? & although the English prelates have cast away that essential Sacrificing property (or forme rather) of the Romish preisthood, & have reduced it to a better temper, yet that wil not serve the turne: for al that they have in their prelacy, preisthood, & Deaconry, they had frō Rome or els where: If from Rome then their prelacy, preisthood, & Deaconry is absolutely Romish & no other: if elswhere then their Succession is gone: If both from Rome & els where let them declare that Ridle vnto vs.

#### The third Objection.

The presbyters may have ordination or imposition of hands from the Romish preisthood, & yet not their office: For that may come from heaven, or by some extraordinary meanes, even as the Lord raised vp some men extraordinarily in these last tymes to restore the truth of doctryne, & to reduce things to the Apostolique primitive institution as amongst others, Hus, Luther, & the rest.

## Answer to the third Objection.

It is straunge that a man shal have imposition of hands from one, & his office from another: Besides it is contrary to the nature of Succession, wherein the partie that ordeyneth giveth the office & ministeriall powre to him that is ordeyned: for that is the thing that is pleaded, that Christs ministeriall powre commeth by Succession through ordination of precedent presbyters: It contradicteth their owne ground therefore to say, that imposition of hands is from a popish preist, and the true office from some other meanes: But let vs inquire what that other meanes may be: To say that Christs Ministeriall powre is from heaven, is not denied, but the question is: what is the instrument or meanes which Christ hath appointed to conveigh that Ministeriall powre vnto man kind? And who are they that first receive it from Christs hand out of heaven: Or what is proton dektikon the first subject of this ministerial powre: We say the Church or two or three faithful people Seperated frō the world & joyned together in a true covenant, have both Christ, the covenant, & promises, & the ministerial powre of Christ given to them, & that they are the body that receive from Christs hand out of heaven, or rather from Christ their head this ministerial powre: you say: not so: but this ministerial powre commeth by succession from the ministry which is the first subject of this powre, & that al this powre is derived from man to man, from the Apostles hands through al the Preists hands of Rome, & the Prelates hands of England to you Mr. Bern. & your line & pedigree of Preisthood is lineally descended from Peter or Paul, &c. to you through so many generations of popish preists, as have succeeded from Peters person to your person: Even as Annas & Cayaphas descended lineally from Aaron: only this is the difference, that the succession of Annas & Cayaphas was by genealogie or generation, yours is by succession of ordination or imposition of hands: & therfor bicause you see that you fal vnder this foule absurdity, that your Preisthood must be of necessity of the same kind that the popish preisthood is, you have invented a new trick to say that

it commeth from heaven extraordinarily with Hus & Luther, and the rest of those glorious witnesses which the Lord in these last tymes raised vp to the destruction of the man of sinne: VVhich if it be so: Then say I: shew your succession from Luther, Hus, Prage, &c. Or els Nechemiah will putt you from your preisthood.

#### The fourth Objection.

But every King in his dominions is appointed by Christ to be a head ministerial to the Church, & al the Preists of that country do receave their ministerial powre from the King by the ordination of the Bbs. vnto whome the King hath committed the dispensation of that powre: so that the King being the Lords Lieftenant in his owne dominions, hath this ministerial powre from Christ, the Bbs. from the King, the Preists from the Bbs. the Church from the Preists.

#### Answer to the fourth Objection.

If the King of every country hath Christs ministerial powre given to him immediately from heaven, & that the Clergie of that nation have Christs ministerial powre from the King, then these consequents folow: which are intolerable absurdities.

1. The King of every country is a person civil & Ecclesiastical, having al civil & ecclesiastical powre & that immediately from Christ.

2. The King of every country can preach, administer the Sacraments, exercise Spirituall jurisdiction, excommunicate, &c.

3. The King of every country can make & ordeyne Ministers.

4. The King of every country is a Pope or Patriarch in his owne territories and Dominions.

How these points wil agree with the Analogie of faith let every man judg, & so give sentence whither this objection conteyne any the least shew of truth in it, yea or nay.

Now what authority the Lord hath given every King in his owne dominions I leave to be descussed in his proper place, viz: in the 15. Section of this lettre to Mr. Bern.

## The fifth Objection.

But the ministry is now extraordinarily raised vp: For as in the first planting of the Churches the Lord Iesus vsed the extraordinary ministry of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, to publish the Gospel to the world, & to plant Churches, so after the Apostacy of Antichrist, in the restoring of the truth the Lord vseth the same extraordinary ministerie not indued with those extraordinary gifts which they had, but apointed by the L. for the same purposes, viz: the planting of true Churches & the revealing of his truth.

## Answer to the fifth Objection.

First the Ministers of England, & namely you Mr. Ber. among the rest, do not chalendg to be Apostles, Prophets, & Evangelists, but you say you are true presbyters, or Pastors of particular true visible Churches, & therfor this objection helpeth you nothing, if it were yeilded you:

Secondly, you cannot maintayne your ordinary ministerie as succeeding by ordination from these supposed, Apostles, Evangelists & Prophets, for then you must acknowledg the prelates of England to be Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, whereas they doe chalendg no such thing. But only maintayne themselves to be ordinary Bbs. the ordinary Successors of the Apostles, neither do they intend to make you ministers as Apostles but as Bbs.

Thirdly, ther is none of the Reformists that ever I heard of that vndertake as Apostles Prophets, Evangelists, to ordeyne Elders.

Finally, how can any of you be Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists? who stand members of the assemblies in subjection to the prelates, whose Lords you are, if you be either Apostles, Prophets, or Evangelists: but you see they are your Lords: For either you are false Apostles, & false Prophets, or els by the evidence of the word & Spirit, you must rise vp & stand out against & depose the prelates, whose authority you say is Antichristian: besides that you must prove vnto vs by good & sufficient warrant that the Lord raiseth vp Apostles, prophets, &

Evangelists, to overthrow Antichrist, & to restore the true ministerie: & that you who with al your might support the Throne of the beast are those Apostles, prophets, & Evangelists, whome the L. raiseth vp for that purpose: which yet you never have done or attempted to do, & whither you can do or not I leave to the consideration of al those that search after the truth.

Hetherto I have proved by sufficient arguments negatively, that Christs Ministeriall powre is not given by Christ primarily & by succession, either to the pope, Bbs. or presbytery: whose claime dependeth vppon one & the same title, viz: Successive ordination from the Apostles, through the Church of Rome to the hands of every preist or presbyter in England: & therfor the Ministeriall powre of Christ must needes be given primarily to the body of every visible Church, though they be but two or three in number: For this is a sufficient Enumeration of parts that Christs ministeriall powre is given primarily either to the Pope, Bbs. Presbytery or body of the Church: except that men wil say it is given to the King of every Kingdom, which is an absurdity intollerable as is already declared, & which I never heard pleaded for, & which the Kings of England doe renounce: But Christs ministeriall powre is not giuen by successive ordination, either to the Pope, Bbs. or Presbytery primarily or originally: therfor Christs ministeriall powre is giuē to the body of the Church, viz: to two or thre faithful people joyned together into an Ecclesiastical politique body by the true covenant, or new testament of Christ Iesus. But bicause happily some persons may be vnsatisfied, seing the former arguments are only grownded vppon reason, & not frō particular evidence of Scripture: Therfor I hold it necessary furthermore to confirme this truth of the L. by vndeniable growndes of Scripture, & that affirmatively as followeth.

The first Argument from Mat. 16. 13–20.

From this place of Scripture I frame an argument after this manner.

Christs Disciples are Christs Church, Mat. 16. 13. 18.  
Christs ministeriall powre is given to Christs Disciples.

Ergo: Christs ministerial powre is given to Christs Church,

The Minor of this argument which only is doubtful I confirme thus.

That which was spoken & given to Peter, that was spoken & given to al the Disciples of Christ, Mat. 16. 13. 14. 19.

Christs ministerial powre was vttered, & delivered to Peter, who spake for & in the name of the rest, Mat. 16. 13. 15. 16. 18. 19.

Ergo: Christs ministerial powre was by speech & indeed committed to all Christs Disciples.

The Major of this argument only is controversial which I manifest thus:

Vnto them did Christ speake & commit his ministerial powre that made the confession, viz: that Christ was that Christ, the Sonne of the living God.

But Peter & al the Disciples by Peters mouth made that confession, viz: that Christ was that Christ, the Sonne of the living God.

Ergo: Vnto all the Disciples did Christ speake, & give that his Ministeriall powre.

The Minor being cleered the whole Argument is evident: VVherfor consider, 1. That Christ in the vs. 13. asketh his Disciples a question, 2. In the vs, 15. he saith whome do ye say that I am: by which it appeareth that Christ asketh this question of all his Disciples generally: and so it followeth by proportion necessarily that seing all were demaunded that question therfor all made that answer & confession: the argument is framed after this manner.

They answered & made the confession vnto whome Christ propounded the question, or made the demaund.

But Christ propounded the question or demaund to all his Disciples, and not only to peter, or only to the twelve Apostles, as may be proved in the course of the text, vs. 13-24.

Ergo: All the Disciples answered & made the confession, ther mentioned by the Evangelist.



## The Second Argument from Mat. 18. 15–20. &amp; 16. 19.

From these places I reason after this manner.

That which is given to two or thre of Christs Disciples, is given to the body of the Church, if they be many in number.

Christs Ministeriall powre is given to two or three Disciples of Christ.

Ergo: Christs ministerial powre much more is givē to the body of the church being many in number.

The Major is without controversie for iff Christs powre be given to two or three, then much more to twenty, thirtie, an hundreth, they being al of them Christs Disciples.

The minor is proved after this manner:

The keies of the Kingdom of heaven, or the powre of binding & losing, is given to two or three Disciples of Christ.

Christs ministerial powre is the keies of the Kingdom of heaven, or the powre of binding & losing.

Ergo: Christs ministeriall powre is given to two or three Disciples off Christ.

The minor being evident, the major may thus be confirmed.

Vnto them doth Christ give the keies of the kingdom of heaven, or powre of binding & losing to whome & of whome he speaketh:

But Christ speaketh to Disciples, & of brethren.

Ergo: the keies of the Kingdom of heaven, or powre of binding & losing, is givē by Christ to the Disciples or brethren.

The minor, viz: that Christ speaketh to Disciples & of brethren, is manifest by divers particular, vs. 1. 15. 21. The Disciples move a question vnto Christ, concerning the Kingdom of heaven: & Christ teacheth vnto them, vs. 15. that the litle ones, that is the brethrē & the Disciples must not be offēded: or if they go astray & be lost, they should be sought againe, & vs. 15–17. teacheth the dutyes of admonition in the degrees therof for the winning of our brethren, & preserving of them from going astray: therfor vs. 18. he speaketh of brethren & Disciples, attributing to them the powre of binding & losing, & vs. 19.

promising the hearing of their prayers, & vs. 20. promising to them his presence, if they be but three or two, & vs. 21. 22. teaching them remission of offences private, vnto seaventy tyme seaven tymes: VWherevppon I ground this infallible argument.

Iff the whole scope & intent of this place, Mat. 18. 15-20. compared with Mat. 16. 13-20. doth ayme at the Disciples of Christ, or the brethren, Mat. 23. 8. teaching that binding and losing, the keies of the Kingdom of heaven, Christs presence, & acceptance of their prayers, &c. aperteyneth to them: then Christs ministerial powre is given to the Disciples or brethren, if but three or two, & so much more if they be a multitude.

But the whole scope of these places is directed to the Disciples or brethren: Teaching that offences must be avoyded among them: Lost or wandring sheep must be sought out: brethren impenitent must be bound: & penitent losed: That they have the powre of binding & losing on earth: That Christ promiseth to them his presence & acceptance, that they must til 70. tymes 7. tymes remit offences private &c.

Ergo: Christs ministerial powre is given to the Disciples or brethren, if they be but three or two, & so much more if they be a multitude.

The third Argument from Mat. 28. 16-20.

From this place of Scripture I reason after this manner.

To whome preaching & baptizing is committed, to them the powre of binding & losing is given.

Powre to preach & baptize is given to the Disciples of Christ, or to the brethrē, or to the body of the Church.

Ergo: powre to bind & lose, that is Christs ministerial powre is given to the disciples, or brethren, or the body of the Church.

The Major of this argument is true by proportion or parity: For by one & the same powre, doth the Church, preach, pray, baptize, administer the L. Supper, excommunicate, absolve, &c. viz: by the ministerial powre of

Christ: & therfor if the body of the church being more or fewer have powre to preach & baptize, they have powre to bind & lose: The rather considering that preaching the Gospel is a mayne part of binding & losing of men to & from their sinnes, & a principal part of the powre of the keyes in shutting & opening heaven gates to the impenitent or penitent sinners.

The Minor of this argument may be confirmed by this reason.

To whome Christ promiseth his presence to the worldes end: To them he giveth powre to preach & baptize.

But to his Discipl[e]s Christ promiseth his presence to the worldes end, even to two or three gathered together into his name: Mat. 18. 20. & 28. 20. yea to any Seperated people. 2. Cor. 6. 16-18.

Ergo: To his Disciples, to two or thre gathered together into his name, doth he give powre to preach & baptize.

The fourth argument from Marc. 13. 33-37.

From this place of Scripture I frame an Argument thus:

Christ's Servants have Christ's authority:

Christ's visible Church, or two or three faithful people are Christ's Servants.

Ergo: Christ's visible Church hath Christ's authority.

Heer by the way may be noted that in this place Marc. 13. 34. Christ giveth authority to his Servants: But Mat. 28. 18. Christ receaveth authority or powre from his Father, evē al the powre in heaven & earth, wherby wee may collect that which was before affirmed that Christ's powre is double, 1. that powre Monarchicall which is inherent in his owne person, & is incommunicable to any creature, 2. That powre Ministeriall which he delegateth to his Servants, to his Disciples, to two or three faithfull people wheresoever.

But concerning the argument if it be objected that Christ's Servants are the Apostles, & their Successors: I deny it: For ther is a distinction made between the Servants & the Porter: Now the authority is given generally to the Servants of the howse, & watching is

pecially enjoined to the Porter: & if it be any thing that the Apostles & their Successors have, it is watching by way of office, for so the porter is to wa[t]ch: & yet that duty also is particularly applyed & enjoined to every one vs. 37.

The fifth Argument, from Ioh. 20. 18-24.  
& Luk. 24. 35-53.

From these places of Scripture compared together I collect this argument.

If Christs Ministerial powre of binding & losing be given to Marie Magdalene, & Cleopas, joyntly with the rest of the Disciples of Christ: Then it is given to the body of the Church.

But powre of binding & losing, remitting & retayning sinnes is givē to Marie Magdalene, & Cleopas, joyntly with the rest of Christs Disciples.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre of binding & losing, or remitting & retayning sinnes is given to the body of the Church.

The Minor of this argument may easily be proved by comparing the two former places of Scripture together: For in Luke Cleopas & the other Disciple brought tidings off Christs Resurrection to the eleven, & others that were with them: Luke. 24. 33. 34. 36. VVhence it is evident that Cleopas, the other Disciple, the eleven, & others were together: This day was the first day of the weeke, vs. 23. 33. 36. Even that very day wherein Christ arose: Now vppon this day Christ spake those wordes, & gave the powre of remitting & retayning sinnes vnto al the Disciples, not only to the eleven, but to Cleopas, Marie Magdalene, & others assembled together that night when Christ appeared to them al together jointly in the howse, Ioh. 20. 23.

The sixth Argument. from Act. 2. 39. & 3. 25. compared with Rom. 4. 11. 12. & Gal. 3. 7. 9. 14. 15

From these places of Scripture compared together I frame this argument.

Vnto whom the promises, the covenant, the blessing

is given, vnto them the ministerial powre of Christ, viz: the powre of binding & losing is given.

But the promises, the covenant, the blessing is given to the posterity of Abraham, according to the faith, that is to al the faithful, who are indeed the true children of Abraham. Ioh. 8. 39.

Ergo: Christs ministeriall powre, viz: The powre of binding & losing is given to the faithful: That is to two or three faithfull people which are a true body vnto Christ,

The consequent of this argument only is doubtful: For clearing whereof wee must know that the keies of the Kingdom of heaven is a promise which Christ maketh to his Church, Mat. 16. 19. wherin the cheef part of the comfort of the Church consisteth: it is also one principal part of the covenant or new Testament which Christ hath established by his blood & purchased for his Church, which is sealed vp vnto the Church in administring & pertaking in the seales of the covenant: it is also a special part of the blessing by the same reason: For the blessing is this: That they that blesse the Church & faithful shal be blessed & they that curse the Church shalbe cursed: Genes. 12. 3. also remission of sins is a part of the blessing, Rom. 4. 7. 8. & binding & losing is remitting or retayning sinne, blessing & cursing, as is most euident. So that seing that powre of binding & losing, remitting & retayning sinne, is a part of the promise, covenant, & blessing, therfor the faithfull having the covenant, promise, & blessing given to thē, they have also therwith the powre of binding & losing, that is Christs ministerial powre, & therfor the consequent of this argument is firme & the vndoubted truth of God.

The seaventh Argument from Esa. 9. 6. Ioh. 3. 16.

Ioh. 13. 13. Act. 2. 36. & 3. 22. 23. Luk. 2. 11.

From these places of Scripture compared together I reason thus.

Vnto whom Christ is given to be King, Preist, & Prophet, directly & immediately: vnto them is

Christs ministeriall powre given, viz: powre of binding & losing.

But Christ is given as King, Preist, & Prophet, directly & immediately to two or three faithful people wheresoever living together in the world.

Therfor Christs ministerial powre of binding & losing is also given vnto two or thre faithful ones wheresoever joyned together in the world.

The consequent of this argument only is doubtfull which may thus most manifestly be confirmed & expounded: when Christ is given, then with Christ al things els are given, Rom. 8. 32. Christ I say with al his apurtenances: when Christ the King is given to the faithful, then Christs Kingdom is given vnto them, then have they Christs powre to administer that Kingdom according to his direction: when Christ the Preist is given to the faithful, then Christs Sacrifice is given vnto them, & powre to administer al the efficacy of his Preisthood vnto the Saynts according to his direction: when Christ the Prophett is given to the faythful, then Christs Prophesy, or the Holy doctryne of Salvation is givē to the Church, with powre for the dispensing therof according to his owne ordinance: by reason wherof the Saynts are said to have an anoynting or Chrisma from him that is Holy, 1. Ioh. 2. 20. & therfor are called Christians, Act. 11. 26. being anoynted to be Kings & Preists vnto God, Revel. 1. 6. & Prophets, Act. 2. 17. 18. Seing then that by Christ the King, Preist, & Prophet who is given to the Saints, the Saynts are made, Kings, Preists, & Prophets, therfor as Kings they have a ministerial powre given them of binding & losing, & so forth of the rest.

The eight Argument from Mat. 18. 15–20. compared with 1. Cor. 5. 4. 5. Mat. 6. 12. Luk. 17. 3.

From these places of Scripture I collect this argument. If one brother hath powre to retayne the sinnes of a brother impenitent privately, & to remit the sinnes of a brother penitent privately: then a communion of faithful men have powre to retaine the sinnes of an impenitent member publiquely,

& to remit the sinnes of one that is penitent publicly.

But one brother hath powre, given him by Christ to retayne the sinnes of a brother privately impenitent, and to remit the sinnes of a brother privately penitent.

Ergo: a communion of faithfull people have powre to retayne the sinnes of a member publicly impenitent, & to remit the sinnes of a brother publicly penitent.

To the same sense the argument may be framed after this manner.

If witnesses admonishing a brother have powre given them by Christ to retaine the sinnes of a brother impenitent before wnesse & to remit the sinnes of a brother penitent before wnesse then a communiō of faithful men have powre to retain the sinnes of a brother publicly impenitent, or to remit the sinnes of a brother publicly declaring his repentance

But witnesses admonishing a brother, have powre from Christ to retayne the sinnes of a brother impenitent before wnesse, & to remit the sinnes of a brother penitent before wnesse.

Ergo: a communion of faithful men have powre to retayne the sinnes of a brother publicly impenitent, or to remit the sinnes of a brother publicly declaring his repentance.

The premisses of both those arguments are evident out of Mathew & Luke: & the conclusion is the Apostles direction to the Corinthians.

The ninth Argument from Eph. 5. 30. 32. & 1. 22. 23.  
Revel. 21. 2. & 22. 17.

From these Scriptures compared together I draw this argument.

The wife hath powre immediately from her husband, & the body hath powre immediately from the head. The visible Church or a communion of faithful people, are Christs spowse, the wife of the lamb, & Christ mystical body.

Ergo the visible Church or a communion of faithful ones have Christs ministeriall powre immediatly from him.

Againe: As the body hath life, sense, motion & powre from the head, the hands & feet have powre from the body: So the Church hath powre from Christ the head, the members of the Church as the Elders & Deacons have powre from the Church.

But it is true in nature, that the body hath life, sence, motion & powre frō the head: & al the members have powre from the body.

Ergo: the Church hath powre from Christ the head: the members of the Church, viz: the Elders & Deacons have powre from the Church.

By al which arguments put together it appeareth most evidently that Christs ministeriall powre of binding & losing is given to the body of every true visible Church, and that all the Officers of the Church have their powre and authority to administer derived vnto them from Christ through the body of the Church where they administer.

And thus have I proved evidently as I take it both that Christs ministerial powre commeth not by successive ordination by the hands of the ministry: & that it is immediatly given to the body of the Church.

And heer for your further informacion Mr. Bern. I wish you to take notice that succession is a typical ordinance of the Old Testament, & therfor abolished by Christs comming: For the Apostle wisheth vs to take heed of Iewish Fables & Genealogies. 1. Tim. 1 4. Tit. 1. 14. bicause these genealogies were of necessity for the carnal ordinances of the old Testament, but the Spiritual genealogie & succession is for the new testament: In the old Testament they had carnal parents a carnal seed, carnal children, carnal circumcision, carnal commaundemēts, a carnal temple, a carnal cittie, a carnal preisthood, a carnal Kingdom: in the new Testament we have spiritual parents, a spiritual seed which is the word, spiritual children, viz: the faithful, circumcision made without hands, spiritual commaundements, a spiritual



temple, an heavenly cittie, spiritual Preists & Kings, & a spiritual kingdom & preisthood: Therfor succession in the old Testament was carnal by genealogie: if you therfor wil set vp a carnal succession in the new Testament by ordination for the ministry, you must do it also, 1. For the Church, & so fetch it from Rome, 2. For the baptisme, & so fetch it from Rome, 3. For the L. Supper, & so fetch it from Rome, 4. For the Faith, & so fetch it from Rome, 5. For excommunication, & so fetch it from Rome: & so forth of the rest, & this is to tie all Churches to the vnity & succession of the chayre of Rome, as in the old Testament al were tyed to the vnity & succession of the temple at Ierusalem: Herin therfor you see how you vanish away in your jmaginations by setting vp succession, approving your self before you be aware a Iew, a Papist, an Antichristian: this shal suffice for the matter of ordination or succession, wherby it appeareth to be a Iewish Popish, & Antichristian devise.

In the next place let vs heer your nine reasons Mr, Bernard which you bring to confute this our faith, and most evident truth of God: wher first in generall note that wee doe not deny, but that the powre of the Church is for order sake committed into some particular persons hands, who in the Churches name, & for the Churches good, & in the Churches presence are to handle al Church matters, & therfor whereas your 9. reasons are brought against popularity as you cal it, you are to remēber that Christs church in several respects is a Monarchie, an Aristocracy, a Democratie. In respect of Christ the King it is a Monarchy, of the Eldership an Aristocratie, of the brethren joyntly a Democratie or Popular government: For Christ the King he ruleth by his owne lawes & Officers: The body of the Church, the spowse of Christ ruleth as the wife vnder the husband, according to the wil & appointment of her husband: The Elders rule as the stewards of Christ the King, & of the church which is the wife or spowse of the King: Now as it is vnreasonable to appoint the steward or Servant of the King either over the King himself, or over the Queen who is the Kings wife: So is it Antichristian to place the Elders as Rulers over the whole body of the Church,

although every particular person and cause is subject to be ordered by that authority which the Church joyntly receaved from Christ, and delegateth to them: wee say therefore that the body of the Church hath all powre immediatly from Christ: and the Elders have al their powre from the body of the Church, which powre of the Eldership is not exercized, nor can not be vsed over or against the whole body of the Church, for that is an Antichristian vsurpation: but only it is exercized over and against particular persons and disorders arising in the Church, the Eldership herein dealing for the body in the publike workes thereof: breefly therefore to answer in generall to all your nine reasons, vsed against popularity, wee dispute not whither the Elders must rule or not, but wee dispute who have the negative voice in their hands, or who have the determining powre in them: or who give the definitive sentence in al matters: VVee say that the definitive sentence the determining powre, the negative voice is in the body of the church, not in the Elders: yet we say the Elders are to lead & governe al persons & causes of the Church, but to lead & governe contrary to the definition & voice of the body that we deny, & that we say is Antichristian.

Your first reason Mr. Bernard is that popularity is contrary to Gods order vnder the law and before the law, vnder the law the powre of Governing was in the Levites: befor the law it was in the first borne, & this governing powre was not receaved from the people vnder the law, but from the Lord by Moses: but the people only approved the Lords appointment.

I answer: The first borne and so by consequent the Levites did type two things, 1. That Priviledg and prerogative which Christ Iesus hath, who is the first borne having the preeminence in all things, Colos. 1. 18. 1, Cor. 15. 20. Revel. 1. 5. For Christ is the first & most noble in the Church, even the head, & Fountayne of al heavenly grace & excellency: 2. The first borne and so by consequent the Levites did shadow out the church. Exod. 4. 22. 23. who is the first borne of al the men of the earth most deere and pretious to the Lord: So that this reason of yours may thus be retorted vppon your selff.

If the first borne before the law, & the Levites for the first borne vnder the law, had the preheminnence: then Christ, & the visible Church which were shadowed out by the first borne, & by the Levites, have the pre[he]minence & powre in the new Testament.

But the first borne before the law, & the Levites for the first borne vnder the law had the powre & preheminnence: by your owne confession.

Ergo: Christ & the visible church from Christ, shadowed out by the first borne & the Levites, have the powre & preheminnence in the new Testament.

Remember for this particular that the first borne, the first Fruites, the Preists, Levites, Kings & Princes of Iudah did al type forth vnto vs in the new testamēt the visible church & the Saints next vnder Christ who is the head to the body of the Church as these scriptures do manifestly declare, 1. Pet. 2. 5: 9. Revel. 1. 5, 6. Col. 1. 18. 1. Cor. 15. 20.

The second of your nine reasons against popularity is that it is without warrant in the Apostles tyme: The Apostles alwayes begune, continued and composed church matters, the body of the congregation were only made acquaynted with matters, a liberty granted them to chose officers, but they did never make any themselves: nor attēpted any thing of themselves.

This argument Mr. Bern. is partly vntrue, partly against your self: Vntrue it is thus far forth that you say the body of the congregation never attempted any thing without Elders: For I demaund of you: what did the 120. persons in the first of the aēts, did they not chuse an Apostle into office & ordeyne him? but they had no Elders as yet: for the holy Ghost was not come downe vpon them, & so ther were no Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors & Teachers. Eph. 4. 8. 11? did not the Churches of Lystra, Iconium, & Antiochia think you worship God, admonish & excommunicate, during the tyme of the Apostles absence from them, when as yet they had no Elders, Aēt. 14 21-23? did not the Churches in Creta think you worship God, & governe in the absence of the Apostles & Titus when as yet Elders were not

appointed, Tit, 1. 5. you cannot deny that the Churches were established before they had officers: if you do the Apostle saith that they that are to be chosen Elders, must not be newly planted into the faith, 1. Tim. 3. 6. & so by consequent from the tyme of establishing Churches til Election of officers, ther must needes be a space of tyme for tryal of mens gifts & conversation & constancy in the faith, during which tyme the Apostles being absent from the Churches, I make no doubt, but they did worship God, & performe the other parts of their Spiritual communion: if they did so, then I say, look how many Churches were established by the Apostles: So many examples ther are of the congregation attempting every thing almost, without Elders: & so the Second reason of yours conteyneth so many vntruths as ther were Churches planted by the Apostles in the Acts, who did not the first day of their planting institute their Elderships, but some certayne competent space of tyme afterward, wherein ther might be sufficient tryal & knowledg of mens gifts & qualifications fit for office: & this may suffice for your vntruths.

Now further your reason is against your self in this particular wherein you yeeld the cause, that the body of the congregation had a liberty to chose their officers: whence I reason thus against you.

They that have liberty to chose their owne officers, & to worship God publiquely before they have officers: they have al the rest of Christs powre ministerial befor they have officers.

But the body of every congregation hath powre to worship God publiquely (as you see) & have liberty to chose their owne officers (as you confesse) & yet want Elders.

Ergo: the body of every congregation hath al the rest of Christs ministerial powre before they have officers.

I say the body of the Church hath powre: which powre commeth after into act & execution when her officers are chosen, viz: The powre of baptizing & administering the Lords Supper: & yet it may also be questioned whither the Church may not as well administer the Seales

of the covenant before they have Officers, as Pray, Prophecy, Elect Officers and the rest, seing that to put the Seales to the covenant is not a greater work then publishing the covenant, or Election of officers, or ex-communication.

The third of your 9. reasons against popularity is that it is against Christs commission granted to the Apostles & their Successors, as Timothie, Titus, & the cheef ministers of the Gospel: & that therfor the place 1. Cor. 5. 4. must be expounded of the Elders as you say the Apostle sheweth, 1. Cor. 2. 6.

Wel Mr. Bern. this is old rusty rotten popish stuffe even as auncient as the Church of Antichrist some of it, viz: that of succession: which hath already received answer, & the contrary been proved at large in this Section whither I referre you.

But heer are certaine vntruths avouched by you which must be answered, viz: one is: that Christs commission was granted only to the Apostles, & their Successors: I have proved already in the forme[r] reasons that the commission was given to the body of the Church expounding those foure places which you quote, viz: Mat. 28. 19. & 16. 19. Iohn. 20. 21-23. Marc. 13. 34. which also is further cleered, for that the twelve were not yet Apostles, but only nominated to the office, for they were indued with powre frō on high vppon the day of Pentecost, Luk. 24. 49. compared with Act. 2. 4. Eph, 4. 8. 11. as also for that Cleopas, Mary Magdalene, & others besides the eleven were present when the commission was given vnto the Disciples, finally bicause the Apostles were the Church representative, yea every one of them: having in them powre to performe al the offices of al officers, & members of the Church: & the Church only is the true Successor of the Apostles, & no one man or Minister whatsoever, seing no one person hath powre to performe al offices of all officers and members, which notwithstanding the whole Church joyntly hath.

A second vntruth is this, that you say the Apostles committed that commission given them by Christ not to the body of the Church, but to Timothie, Titus, & ther successors as appeareth 1. Tim. 6. 13. 14. as you say:

wherto I answer that the Apostles leave the powre which they received from Christ joyntly with the rest of the Disciples, in the hands of the Church not of Timothie & Titus only, & that chardg which Paul giveth to Timothie respecteth the whole Epistle and all the contents thereof which aperteyne to all sorts of persons in the Church as well as to Timothie, as may be seen in the whole second Chapter: & how prove you that Timothy an Evangelist Succeeded Paull an Apostle? Or that the Elders of Ephesus succeeded Timothie an Evangelist?

A third vntruth is this, that you say the place 1. Cor. 5. 4. 13. must be vnderstood of Elders as you say may appeare, 1. Cor. 2. 6. wherto I answer that this is a prety trick, but it wil not serve your turne, to turne away the truth & evidence to this place: For first the Epistle is written to the whole body of the Church, al the circumstances of the Chap. 5. teach that the whole body was leavened, & that their rejoycing was not good, & that they ought not to be mingled with the brethren that were fornicators, & that they ought not to eate the L. Supper with such persons: that they have powre to judg them that are within, & that they must cast out from among them that incestuous person: & whereas you would needes by one phrase (viz: the rebuke of many, 2. Cor. 2. 6.) expound this general as spoken of many Elders not many brethren, I say herein you coyne a false exposition For doth it follow that bicause the rebuke was delivered by many either brethren or Elders who are to leade in al publique actions, therfor the Apostle enjoyneth the Elders only to excommunicate? or bicause some only pronounce the rebuke, & the sentence of excommunication, therfor they only have powre to decree it? I desire you would make these consequents hang or depend necessarily vppon ther antecedents or els you doe but wrest the Scriptures to your destruction: besides that place, 2. Cor. 2. 6. doth not teach who either decreed or pronounced his excommunication, but only who rebuked him for his sinne which were many (Elders if you will:) For I take it the place is manifest that he was not excommunicate, bicause he repented vppon the reproof: which the Apostle saith, is sufficient. And sometyme

in the Scripture many, signifieth all: & all signifieth many: as these places declare, Matt. 3. 5. Roman. 5. 18. 19. Therefore this quirck off yours is but a meer Sophisticall cavill to put of the truth.

The fourth of your 9. reasons against popularity is that the place of Ephes. 4. 11. 12. is against it, for ther the Apostle declareth (say you) that gifts for the ministerie are given to the Ministers for the Church, not to the Church for the Ministers: and that therefore the powre of Christ is not given to the body of the Church, but only to the Elders: & this you shew by a similie from the parts of the body which do not receive their qualities, facultyes, or gifts from the body, but from God.

To this reason I answer: that you declare your self to be either blind or willfully to shut your eyes against the truth & evidence of this place: For it is as cleer as the shining of the Sunne in the Firmament of heaven against your exposition & objection: For I pray you in good sooth doth this argument follow, viz: Christ giveth gifts vnto mē not by the mediation of the body of the Church: therfor Christ giveth his ministerial powre to the officers, & not to the body? yet this is the force of your argument, which may for more evidence be framed thus.

If Christ give gifts to the officers of the Church, not by the Church, but immediately by & from himself: Then Christ giveth powre of binding & losing to the officers of the Church, not by the meanes of the church, but by such meanes as God hath appointed: (that is as I gesse by Succession.)

But you say the Antecedent is true by the place of the Eph, 4.

And I say the consequent or conclusion followeth not vpon the antecedent: but it is meerly asyllogiston.

But I wil declare the inconsequence more fully: The Lord he giveth gifts to men either ordinarily or extraordinarily: Extraordinarily he gave gifts to men in the primitive Churches: Ordinarily he giveth gifts to men by study, & paynes, & by nature, so he gave the gifts of Tongs and Prophecy extraordinarily to the primittive

Churches, he giveth the same gifts now ordinarily by meanes of Study and the help of naturall witt: How will it follow that bicause the Lord gave gifts, therefore he gave his Ministeriall powre extraordinarily from heaven? VVhy? you confesse that powre of binding and losing was given before Christs ascension, but now you would prove by this place Ephes. 4. that the powre of binding & losing is given after Christs assension, and that these gifts and this powre are given together: is not this to contradict your self? hereby you see the weakenes of your reason: For you must distinguish betwixt the powre of binding and losing which the Disciples had committed vnto them before Christs ascension: and betwixt the gifts of the day of Pentecost.

But what are those gifts mentioned in that place of Ephes. 4. 8. 11. 12. and vnto whome are those gifts given? I will declare it vnto you, and so your mouth shalbe stopt.

These gifts which are said to be given to men are those foure sorts of Officers which the Apostle mentioneth vs. 11. Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors & Teachers, for the two last are one office. These officers with their gifts are said to be given to men: who are these men vnto whome these officers with their gifts are givē? are they not the Church? is not the office of an Elder, Pastor, or Teacher the L. gift to the Church? This place you see therefore is most pregnant against your opinion: as may appeare thus,

That which is given by Christ to the Church is in the powre & possession of the Church.

The officers & offices of the Church are given to the Church.

Ergo: the officers & offices of the Church are in the powre & possession of the Church.

Wherfor I say vnto you that the gifts of preaching, administration of the Sacraments & Governing, are given vnto some mē, but the office & officers indued with these gifts are given vnto the Church, who have powre to appoint them to their office, & who do receave both their office & powre to administer in their office from the Church, vnto whome the office & powre of Christ



is given primarily, being the next Lord therof vnder Christ the Monarch.

And for your similie of the parts receaving their properties from God: not from the body, it is perversly applyed: For this is the true vse and application of the similie: as the head communicateth all the powre & facultie which any part hath from it self, to that part by the body: so the head Christ communicateth his powre to the parts and officers of the Church by the body of the Church: which is Christ mysticall: I confesse some parts of the body have some special properties and qualities which they receive not from the head: as the Stomach hath the quality Chilificandi, the liver Sanguificandi, &c. not from the head, but the powre and faculty to vse the property it hath from the head: So some members of the Church have special gifts given them of God, but the powre of vsing those gifts they have from the head Christ by the meanes of the body, which is the pipe that from the Fountaine conveigheth all powre Ecclesiastical to every officer.

The Fifth of your 9. reasons against popularity is that the Scripture doth not lay the Government vpon the people, nor reproveth them for suffering abuse of Holy things: but vpon the governors civil & Ecclesiastical, Ezech. 22. 26. 1. Sam. 2, 17. 1. King. 13. Mat 23. Revel. 2. 1. 8. 12. 18. & 3. 17. 14.

I answer breefly from the Type to the truth concerning matters of the Old Testament: Seing now the Saynts are all of them made Kings and Preists vnto God Revelat. 1. 6. Or as the Apostle Peter saith: Basileion hierateuma, 1. Pet. 2. 9. a Kingly Preisthood: Therefore now in the New Testament the Saynts succede in the place of the Kings and Preists of the Old Testament in Ecclesiasticall causes: and as they were burdened with Government and reproof for profanation of holy things: so are the Saynts the members of the visible Church, now burdened with Government Ecclesiasticall, and reproof for violating the Holy things committed to their custody & fidelity: & therfor I reason from your owne confession against you thus,

If Kings & Preists in the Old Testament were

chardged with Government, and blamed for violation of holy things: Then in the New Testament the Saints (who are Kings & Preists) are chardged with government, & blamed for violation of Holy things,

But Kings & Preists in the old Testament were chardged with government, & blamed for violation of Holy things.

Therfor the Saints in the new Testament are chardged with government ecclesiastical, & blamed for violation of Holy things.

And thus you see Mr. Ber. how your owne weapon entreth into your owne bowels: & concerning the places of the Revelation that the Aungels of the seaven Churches were chardged with government, & blamed for abuse of the Holy things & not the body of the Church, I say herein you vtter foule vntruths: For Chap. 1. vs. 4-7. the Apostle w[r]iteth to the 7. Churches of Asia, & wisheth grace & peace to the Churches & all the members of the Churches: & Chap. 2. 11. & at the end of every Epistle, the Apostle maketh application of every Epistle to al that have eares, & to the particular Churches: wherfor I wonder at your shamelesse ignorance that should thus falsely belye the Scriptures, & abuse the reader: To turne the point of this reason of yours also vppon your self, I say thus.

If Iohn chardgeth the whole Churches with gouernment & abuse of holy things (though the message be sent to the aungel to be published to the whole church) then the whole churches are charged therwith, viz: with government & violatiō of holy things.

But Iohn chardgeth the whole Churches with the government & abuse of Holy things: (though the message be sent to the Aungel of every Church, to be published to the whole Church.)

Therfor the whole Churches are chardged with the government & violation of the holy things.

Thus much briefly concerning your fifth reason: & heer you make a digression to prove vnto vs that Matt. 18. 17, Tell the Church must be expounded: Tel the

Governors: For confirmation whereof you bring vs seaven reasons which I will handle in order.

Your first reason to prove that: Tel the Church is Tel the Governors, is this: for that otherwise Christ could not be vnderstood, for if he had brought in a strange course not heard of before, nor then practised, no man could vnderstand his meaning: Seing therfor before then & after the practise was to tel to the Elders or governors: therfor tel to the Church is tel to the Governors or Elders.

Alas for you Mr. Bern. this is borrowed stuffe, & yet stark naught: For it is but froth & chaffe: & what is the chaffe to the wheat? Do not you think that the whole Gospell is a mystery which was kept secreat from the beginning of the world? & is not the visible Church of the new Testament with all the ordinances thereof, the cheef & principal part of the Gospel? & therfor, seing this ordinance of telling the Church is a part of the Gospel, it was formerly hidden & mystical, & now it was revealed plainly by Christ: & although happily the Disciples vnderstood not Christs meaning at that present, yet afterward the Holy Ghost brought that & many other necessary things which they eyther vnderstood not Christs meaning at that present, yet afterward the Holy Ghost brought that & many other necessary things which they either vnderstood not or forgot, to their knowledg & memory as the Scripture witnesseth: But further I say even that particular was obscurely signified by the Typical King and Preists in the Old Testament vnto whome the Government was committed, as I have already more then once declared vnto you: & further the government was then given to al Christs Disciples by commission as I have already proved sufficiently to your conscience & the conscience of all that love the truth in sincerity.

That of the excommunication of the blind man Ioh. 9. 22. was a devise of the Iewes, for ther is no warrant for it in al the law: & if it were the L. ordinance, it typeth vnto vs thus much that the visible Church succeeding in the place of the typical Kings & preists have in their hands the powre of excommunication.

And although Cloe made complaint to the Governor yet it is nothing to the purpose: For Cloe complayneth of an whole Church to an Apostle: not of a particular person to the Elders of a particular Church: and doe you think that this is a good argument? That seing a particular person complayneth to or informeth the Apostle of the state of the Church (who had an infallible gift of instructing and directing of Churches) therefore a particular person in the third place or degree of admonition must tell the Elders, & that therfor those Elders are the Church? The argument is altogether inconsequent.

Your second reason that tel the Church is tel the Governors is Christs chandg of the person: From the third to the second: The force of your argument is this.

If Christ having spoken in the third person saying:

Tel the Church: afterward turneth his speech to the second person saying: whatsoever ye bind &c. then tel the Church is tel the Elders.

But Christ chandgeth his speech from the third to the second person.

Therfor tell the Church is tel the Elders.

Mr. Ber. you were not wel advised in making this argument: For it overthroweth your exposition most manifestly, as thus.

If Christ calleth his Disciples the Church, then tel the Church is tel the Disciples or the body of the Church.

But Christ calleth al his Disciples the Church: For this commission of binding and losing is given to all the Disciples jointly as is already declared more fully in the former arguments.

Therfor tel the Church is tel the body of the Church, al Christs Disciples, & not only the Governors.

Therfor this reason confirmeth the truth we hold, & not the error which you seek to defend by wresting the Scripture.

Your third reason that tel the Church is tell the Governors is, for that Christ speaketh of two or three: That is to say (after your exposition) of two or three Elders or governors & not of the whole body.

I answer that your argument is without al force of

consequence: For to argue thus is to argue without reason or force of argument, viz.

Iff Christ speaketh of two or three, then he speaketh of two or three Elders or Governors.

But Christ speaketh of two or three.

Ergo: Christ speaketh of two or three Elders or Governors.

Further by this argument one Apostle could do nothing, but ther must needes be two or thre: & so one Elder can do nothing, but ther must needes be two or thre: & so your Prelates Monarchy in their dioceses falleth to the ground. but your arguments grow ridiculous.

Now the reason why Christ speaketh of two or thre is for consolatiō to the Church & Disciples of Christ, teaching that if but two or thre of them at any tyme walk together in the faith & truth of Christ, those two or thre have title to Christ & al his ordinances & have promise of audience & acceptance: as also to instruct the Saynts, to stand for the truth against multitudes, though they be the smallest number which is three or two, for Christ he wil not leave them destitute of his presence and asistance.

Your Fourth reason that Tel the Church is Tel the Elders is this: that the person is changed from the second to the third, vs. 19. if two of you shal agree, &c. whatsoever they shal ask &c: the force of the argument is al one with the second, & so hath receaved answer there, but it seemeth you delight in number & multitude: yet for further evidēce I will show you the reason: the frame whereof is thus to be conceived.

Iff ther be a Grammaticall change of the person, viz: you: they: then ther is a Reall changd off the person physicall, viz: The Governors: The Church.

But ther is a grammatical changd of the person, you: they.

Ergo: Ther is a Real changd of the person physicall, viz: The Governors: the Church.

I deny your Major, & stil I avouch that the changd of the person is by way of exposition, teaching: that they: & you: are one: namely, whither they be two of Christs

Disciples then living (viz: you) or any other two or thre to the end of the world, (viz: they,) Christ hath promised his powre, presence, & acceptance to them: For so he saith wheresoever two or thre, vs. 20. & Mat. 28. 20. Lo I am with you alwayes: So that these two general circumstances of place & tyme are for the consolatiō & instruction of the Church if they be but two or three in al ages: For not the multitude, but the truth is respected of Christ: & al tymes & places are indifferent for the Church of the new Testament which was otherwise in the old Testament: For the Lord then promised his presence especially in the Temple, vppon their Sabbaths, & to the special people: but now the partition wal is broken downe, & now al tymes, places, & persons are indifferēt for the church & the Lord.

Your fifth reason that Tel the Church is Tel the Governours is this: that otherwise absurdities cannot be avoyded that arise out of the text: the absurdities you suppose would follow are, 1. confusion. 2, carelesnes, wherevppon follow pride & contention, 3. weomen & childrē speaking in the Church, 4. that the whole Church cā speak. 5. Christs should crosse himself, who giveth the powre to two or three.

Herevnto I answer: the supposed absurdities either do not follow, or if they do folow are no absurdities: For the truth is not absurd.

First, it doth not follow that ther must needes be confusion, carelesnes, pride, or contention, if a brother be promoted to the body of the Church for his offence after once & twice admonition: but rather the brethren vnderstanding that al are interested in the busines wilbe careful to dischardg their dutyes, whereas by your fancy the care & chardg being cast vppon the Elders & from the brethren, they may wholly neglect the matter, & the Church grow corrupt through the Elders partiality negligence, or other sinister respect: & for confusion: it is not intended as you grossely imagine that al should speake, but that al should consent: For as in prayer one speaketh & al the Church consent: So in publique admonition & excommunication one speaketh at once & the rest consent: & if any man have any thing to say

he may speake, & the first hold his peace, as in Prophecy so in admonition by proportion, 1. Cor. 14. 30. & yet the Lords order not be violated. & if pride & therevppon contentions do arise it is through the corruption of men, not through the ordinance of God, & may ther not much more pride grow in the Elders think you when they are absolute Lords (as it were) over the people? & wil not that breed much more contention? And to contend for the truth is good and warrantable, yea & contentions must be in the true church, but woe be to those by whome they come.

¶ Secondly, you say the whole Church cannot speake joyntly, nor severally, one by one except weomen & children speak: I deny it: the whole Church may speake joyntly as in prayer & prophesying, 1. Cor. 11. 4. So also in admonition & excommunication, by some persons deputed therto either Elders if ther be any, or other if ther be no Elders: & for the speaking of weomen in the Church I say it needeth not: for they, & so al the brethren may speake by silence: or if any dissent they may speak either woman or youth, & yet the rule of the Apostle not violated, who forbiddeth weomen to lead the action of worship in prayer or prophesy, or praising God, or any action of Government in the presence of men: but he doth not forbid a woman to speake when she is called therto, in matter of Government: neither doth the Apostle intend to forbid weomen to pray or prophesy in the presence of weomen only, as somtyme the occasion may be ministred if the church consist only of weomen: that this is so you shal perceave by comparing these places, 1. Cor. 14. 34. 1. Tim. 2. 12, & considering the reasons of the Apostles prohibition: but let vs see the force of your argument.

If tel it to the Church be tel it to the body of the Church: then every member of the Church must speake in rebuking the partie.

But every member must not speak in rebuking the partie that is promoted to the Church for sinne.

Therfor tel it to the Church is not tel it to the body of the Church, & so it must needes be tel it to the Elders.

I deny your consequent, for al may heare, take notice, give consent, & speake if they se just cause orderly, & yet it followeth not that al are bound to speake vocally one by one: For silence is a sufficient testification of consent: Further I say your minor is weake: For every one is bound to speake that seeth just cause or els he shall ther by strangle his conscience, and quench the Spiritt, and suffer sinne which he cannot do without sinne.

Lastly, Christ crosseth not himself, in giving powre to two or thre: For he may give powre to two or three if ther be no more, & yet to twenty, an hundreth, a thousand, if ther be so many: but you Mr. Bern. raise vp false expositions, & wrack the text to support heresies, therby making the Scriptures a leaden rule to frame to your crooked conceipts, & a nose of waxe to be wrung which way your perverse apprehensions incline.

Your sixth reason that tel the Church is tel the Governours is this: that els the Corinthians offended who were al commaunded to deale with the incestuous Corinth, & yet some only did so: & Paul should sinne who vppon the advertisement of Cloes howse, did not wayt for the churches consent, but himself alone determined the matter, & wils them to exente his sentēce in the open congregation.

I answer: al the Corinths did deale with the incestuous person though many spake the rest giving consent to their speeches: & therfor ther can no more sinne lye vppon thē for not rebuking by voice, then ther lyeth sinne vppon the whole Church, for not lifting vp their voice to speake in prayer & prophesy, being al commaunded so to do: besides all might speake: for many somtyme signifieth al, as I have already shewed: but this is but idle stuffe which you object. Furthermore Paul was an Apostle having powre & infalibility to plant & direct & reforme Churches, & wil you frō hence fetch a rule for the perpetual government of the Church? it followeth not Paul did thus: so, one Prelate may do thus: nay by your owne exposition ther must nedes be two or thre Prelates: but what did Paul? did he performe the whole decree of excommunication? I deny it vtterly:



but the Apostles meaning is that he for his part gave his voice, & advise, & commaundemēt (as having received grace to be faithful) that the incestuous person should be excommunicate: & note it wel Mr. Ber. Paul doth bid the Elders (as you say) excommunicate him: cā these things agre? I beleeve your wit was wandering when you wrote these things: for you avouched out of the 2. Cor. 2. 6. that many Elders did excōmunicate the incestuous person: & now you say that Paul at the information of Cloes Family, like a Lord Bb. decrees the sentence of excommunication in his court, & cōmaundeth them to pronounce it: you gave this powre of late to the Elders, & now you take it frō the Elders, & give it to Paul, & make the Elders only his deputyes: but I wil shew you the reason of this your oversight & contradiction: you had by you in your study when you penned your book, the writings of the Reformists, & the writings of the Prelates: & being in wrath & choler enraged against vs of the Seperatiō, you thought to make Herod & Pilate frends against Christ, & have gathered both the Prelates & Reformists objections against vs & put thē downe in your book without judgment, & so through the weaknes of your vnderstanding not discerning the reasons of the Reformists & Prelates to contradict, bicause they fitted you against vs, you not regarding the truth but the victory, have fallen into this grosse contradiction which your learning can never salve: only your repentance & confession can cure it.

Your last reason that tel the Church is tel the Elders is this: for that al reformed churches judg so: wel: yet you said even now that tel the Church is tel the Apostle Paul, & the Lord Bb. by consequent his successors: are you in your right mynd Mr. Ber. that stumble thus? but you see what it is to resist the truth.

But what if al the reformed Churches say so: is it so? if the Scripture say contrary it is not so: & the Churches must be reformed yet further according to the Scriptures.

Finaly, you prove that figuratively the part may cary the name of the whole: who denyeth it? & that therfor

the Elders are called the Church: I deny that. For it foloweth not: yet I yeeld you thus much (which you shal gaine nothing by) that two or three Elders may be termed a church being severaly by thēselves, but jointly with the body they are not so: so a Christian family, or rather the Christians in a family may be truly termed a church severaly: yet jointly with the body they are not so: For know you Mr. Ber. that the parts of the Church are similes & Homogoncæ: as every part of water is water, so every part of a Church, if they be a cōmunion, is a Church being severed necessarily from the whole: you say also that a company without officers no where is called a Church (Christian families only excepted) in al the new Testament except Act. 14, 23. by anticipation: First you must prove vnto me Mr. Ber. that this place Act. 14. 23. is by anticipation: For doth it follow bicause heaven & earth are so called by anticipation Gen. 1. 1. therfor a company wanting officers are called a Church by anticipation? besides you speake falsely, saying that in al the new testament a company without officers is not caled a church: what say you to Act. 19. 41. any company of people is called a Church in that place: and whereas you confesse that a Christian family is called a Church by the warrant of the new Testament, you yeeld the cause: For if two or thre faithful persons of a family are a Church, then two or thre faithful persons of divers families are a Church: or els shew you a sound reason to the contrary: hence I reason thus.

They which the Scripture cal a Church, are a Church.  
The Scripture calleth two or thre beleevers in a family a Church.

Therfor: two or thre beleevers in a family are a Church.

Againe: If two or thre beleevers of one family are a Church: then two or thre beleevers of divers families are a Church by proportion.

But two or thre beleevers of one family are a Church, by your confession & testimony of the Scripture.  
Therfor: two or thre beleevers of divers families are a Church.

But know, Mr. Ber. that we strive not about the word, but about the matter: be they Ecclesia, Synagoge, Disciples, brethren, Saints, we regard not the word: we say that two or thre Disciples, Saints, brethren, are Sinagoge, Ecclesia, a congregation with whome Christ is present, who have Christs powre, vnto whome every member of the body must be promoted for sinne, this you neither have disproved, nor ever shalbe able: & heer endeth your digression: & now you come vnto your sixth reason.

Your 6. reason against popularity is a repetition of things already answered in the fifth reason, that Tell the Church is Tel the Governours: Therfor I referre the reader thither.

Your 7. reason against popularity is that it is against the cōmaundement of Christ: For Heb. 13. 17. 1. Pet. 5. 2. the sheep must obey the shepheard, & the flock must depend vppon the Pastor: & he is not to obey them or depend vppon them.

I answer: To the place Heb. 13. 17. I say the Apostle doth not intend to teach that the whole body of the Church must yeeld to the voice of the Elders in every thing that they list: nor that the Eldership hath in their hands the powre of Christ to rule contrary to their liking: For the Lord submitteth both Pastors & Flock vnto his owne lawes & wil: but the intent of the Apostle is to show that al the particular members in al their affaires must submitt themselves to the instruction direction & guidance of the Elders: For although Christ hath placed the Elders as stewards over the Servants, yet he hath not appointed them as Lords over his spowse & wife: your argument therfor is a fallacian a conjunctiōe & divisione, thus.

Al the particular members must obey the Elders in their lawful instructions, & their wholsome admonitions severally.

Ergo, the whole body must jointly obey the voice of the Elders.

Againe, the whole Flock consisteth of two parts, Officers, and the Saints: The Saints must obey the Officers, that is one part of the Church must be directed

by another, as the foote by the eye: yet the whole body jointly is above any one member or members apart.

Further al the Saints shal yeeld obedience to the Elders in things cōmaunded by God, & the Elders shal al of them obey the voice of the church in things cōmaunded by God, but the question is how far the sheep must obey the Elders who are shepheards, & how far the Elders which are the L. Servants must obey the wife & spowse of Christ which is the Church: For know you Mr. Ber. these things may well stand together, that the whole Church may obey the Elders in some things: & the Elders must obey the body of the Church in other things.

The other place 1. Pet. 5. 2. to en humin: may aswel be translated with al your best ability, as, that dependeth vppon you: but I say further that the Flock must depend vppon the shepheards, as they are sheep, & as they al jointly are the wife of the lamb the best members must submit to her voice being the voice of her husband & Lord.

Your eight reason against popularity is this, that it is against common sence that the parents should submit to the Children, the workman to the work, the Seedsman to the corne.

I answer, neither is it reason that the whole body should yeeld to the hand, or the Servant to the Mr. Or the wife to the mayd. But you know the Church is a body & the Elders hands & other parts the church is the Mrs. & the Elders are Servants: but comparisons are not to be vrged further then their intention: lest we break them in peeces & spoyle the proportion: & somtyme in some cases the parêts may lawfully submit to children, the workemen to the work, & the husbandmē to the corne: For you know that relations changd arguments.

Your ninth & last reason against popularity is, that it is against the dignity & office of true Ministers who represent Christs person, having their powre from him & which none but such as represent Christ can give or take away: But the body of the Church doth not represent Christs person, nor ever did depose or make Ministers:

and because the body of the Church are not Ministers, therfor they cannot make Ministers: & such like rotten stuffe.

I answer: That the Ministers do represent Christs person I deny not: but avouch that the Church doth much more represent Christs person, who is the Spowse & wife of Christ: & that the Ministers have their powre from Christ I deny not, but al their powre commeth from Christ through the body of the Church as I have sufficiently proved already: That the Church hath made Ministers I have shewed, Act. 1. they chose an Apostle when as yet they were not Apostles, they Elected Deacons, Act 6, Now Election is the very essence of a true Minister: The Church admonisheth an Elder, Col. 4. 17. & deposeth false Apostles, Reve. 2. 2. preacheth, prayeth, & worshippeth wanting Elders, Act. 13. 22. 23 & whereas you say that Ministers only make Ministers, I answer it is the ground of Succession which I have formerly overthrowne: & I say that the body of the Church hath in it al ministerial powre immediately from Christ, & your slender stuffe hath prevailed nothing against this truth of the Lords: the vniversity may make a Doctor, a Bachelor, a Maister, & yet it [is] not any such thing, but a compound body having a charter from the King for that purpose: a corporation may make a Major & Sherifes, & yet the corporation is not a Major or a Sheriffe: So the Church may make Ministers, & yet the Church it self is not properly an Elder, or Deacon, or VVidow, but a body politique having powre to produce such workes by ver[t]ue of the charter which Christ hath given vnto it.

And thus Mr. Ber. I have done with you for this point: but Mr. Ains. steppeth vp with a new kind of Antichristianisme never heard of before: & he teacheth vs if we wil beleve him, that Christs ruling powre is in the Eldership, & that the Pope & Prelates are not Antichrists for taking into their hands the powre of the multitude, but the powre of Christ.

Heer in the first place we must remember that the powre of Christ which we speak of is a ministerial delegated powre given to man: & that the question is who is the

first subiect of this ministerial powre, who receive it immediately from Christ: I say the body of the Church is the first subject of it, & I say that whatsoever the Eldership hath, it hath from Christ through the body of the Church, & by the Churches disposition, & this if you deny Mr. Ains. (which I think you do not) I say you are therein departed from the faith: The body of the Church having al her powre from Christ retaineth & keepeth it intire to it self, & doth not so delegate it to any officers, as that she leese it & is deprived of it: neither doth she delegate any powre to her officers, but that which she formerly received from Christ her head, husband & Lord: For Christ giveth not a double ministerial powre, one immediately to the body of the Church which she hath & keepeth: another mediately to the Eldership by the Churches disposition which the church hath not at al, but is only a conduit pipe to conveigh it to the Eldership: if you hold such a matter, declare it vnto vs out of the word of God & we wil receive it when we see it: in the meane tyme we hold that whatsoever the Elders have, they have it from the Church by delegation: & that the Church hath it in ther owne hands, & received it from Christ by vertue of the covenant God maketh with it in Christ, giving Christ for King, Preist & Prophet to the Church, & therfor the Church hath from Christ the head al powre, & al the members & officers of the Church have al their powre from the body, which they hold & vse in the body & not Seperated from the body: The Elders as it were the hands are conjoynd to the Church as to the body: The body of the Church is conjoynd to Christ the head: The body hath no powre devided from the head: the hands have no powre divided from the body. So a company of men have no powre Seperated from Christ: an Eldership hath no powre Seperated from the Church: but as all powre floweth from the head to the body, & then to the hāds through the body, which is first in the body before it come to the hands: So al powre Ecclesiastical or ministeriall is derived from Christ to the Church, & then through the Church to the Elders, which is first in the Church before it come to the Elders: And as when the hands are cut of the body stil retaineth

the powre intire though it wāt hands & the powre of the hands is stil in the body: So when the Eldership is deposed the Church stil retaineth the powre of the Eldership, though it want an Eldership: & as the hands can do nothing contrary vnto the liking of the whole body, but the actions of the hands are by consent of the body: So the Eldership can do nothing contrary to the liking of the Church: but the actions of the Elders must be by consent of the Church: & as those hands are worthy to be cut of that rebel against the body & wrong it, or endaunger it: So are those Elders worthy to be cut of from the Church that rebel against the Church, wrong it, or endaunger it. This is the faith which I hold Mr. Ains. & if you hold any other faith, it is not the faith of Christ: but let vs see what your book wil aford vs.

First, you say: Christs ruling powre, which the papists say is in the pope, we say not is in the body of the congregation the multitude, but in Christ himself: & that the Pope is Antichrist, not for taking into his hands the powre of the multitude, but of Christ, to rule & governe the Church as head of the same, confutat. of Mr. Bern. pag. 175.

You know Mr. Ains. that the Pope doth not assume that powre which Christ as King hath in his owne hands reserved to himself: but the pope claymeth to be a ministeriall head vnder Christ, having a Ministerial powre given vnto him by succession from Peter: & although it cannot be denyed, but that he doth many actions which are proper works of Christs powre Monarchical proper to himself, yet that is but the misinterpretation of his ministerial headship, not vnderstāding how far that ministerial headship, which he challengeth, extendeth, & it is not his proper clayme to Christs office: therefore properly the Pope is not Antichrist for challengding Christs Kingly powre proper to himself: but for assuming Christs Ministerial powre delegated to his Church: although I do not deny but the Pope enlargeth the delegated powre further then Christ hath prescribed in his word: So that the Pope is Antichrist in two respects, 1. For clayming that powre which Christ hath given to the body of the Church, 2. For extending that ministerial

powre beyond the compasse which Christ hath limited in the word.

Secondly, you say: Christs ruling powre, which the Protestants say is in the Bbs. the Prelates, we do not say is in the multitude, but in Christ himself, & that the Bbs. are very Antichrists for assuming Spiritual jurisdiction aperteyning to Christ alone, confut. of Mr. Bern. pag. 175.

Heer also you cannot be ignorant Mr. Ains. that the Prelates do not challendg that Monarchical powre which is properly inherent in Christs person, but renounce it vtterly as confidently as you do: but they only challendg that Ministerial powre which Christ (as they say) hath delegated to the Apostles & their Successors the L. Bbs. neither can you with any good conscience say that they clayme Christs Kingly powre, but only they are Antichrists as the Pope is for two causes. 1. For clayming that powre Ministeriall which Christ hath given to the body of the Church. 2. For enlarging that ministerial powre beyond that compasse which Christ in his word hath determined.

Thirdly, you say: Neither that ruling powre of Christ, which the Puritanes say is in the presbytery, do we say is in the multitude: For we acknowledg Christ to have ordeyned a presbytery or Eldership & that in every Church, for to teach & rule them by his owne word & lawes: vnto whome al the multitude, the members, the Saints, ought to obey & submit themselves, as the Scriptures teach, confut. of Mr. Bern. pag. 176.

VVee say Christs ruling powre is originally & fundamentally in the body of the Church the multitude: & we acknowledg further that the Elders receive by delegation powre from the body of the Church, which powre ministerial in the hands of the Elders is not so large as that which is in the body, but it is rather a leading powre then a ruling powre: neither are the Elders in al the new testament (to my knowledg) called Rulers archontes, but overseers, leaders, Elders, prohistamanoi, wherby the holy Ghost would teach that their powre is not to rule, but to leade & direct: I do therefore vtterly disclaime this your error Mr. Ains. as one part of Antichristianisme



in your Church: but you had need expound it wel for the satisfaction of the brethren of the Seperation, least you herein destroy your constitution before you be aware.

What we hold concerning the Presbytery I have delivered partly in that which before I have written in answer to Mr. Bern. partly in that which I lately published concerning the differences of the Churches of the Seperation in the second part, & the first Section, Chap. 5. & 6. wherfor if you hold that Lordly, vsurped, Antichristian powre of your Eldership to be that ruling powre which the word of God warranteth, it shalbe your part to justifie it, & to rebuke al that gainstand it, for herein wee vtterly disclayme your judgment & practise: we maintaine that the powre of the Eldership is a leading, directing, & overseeing powre, ministry, or service, both in the Kingdom & Preisthood of the Church, & that the negative voice, the last, definitive, determining sentence is in the body of the Church, wherto the Eldership is bound to yeeld: & that the Church may do any lawful act without the Elders: but the Elders can do nothing without the approbation of the body, or contrary to the body.

#### The eighth Section.

In the next place followeth your second position which is this in your copie.

In holding that one sinne of one man publicly & obstinately stood in & not reformed by a true constituted Church doth so pollute it that none may communicate with it in the holy things of God til the partie offending be by the Church put out after lawful conviction: you say is error: I say it is the most comfortable & holy truth wee hold in our walking one with another in communion of Gods ordinances.

This truth ariseth from the former ground, that al the members of the Church have powre to the censures of admonition & excommunication, to bind & lose: For (observe I pray you) that every brother is bound to admonish his brother for a fault he observeth in him: if he reforme not he must take one or two witnesses

& admonish him: if he reforme not yet, he must bring the matter before the Church, suppose the Church consist of 12. persons as at Ephesus, Aēt. 19. 7. The matter being before the Church the eleven deale with the twelvth, discover his sin, & convince it to his conscience, he refuseth to heer them but despiseth the admonitions: I say if they retaine him stil in communion they consent to his sinne: For as the civill Magistrate in pardoning willfull murther consenteth to it, bicause the murtherer should die: Even so the Church suffering the vnrepentant persone among them, consent to his sinne, and are polluted with it, and consent to all the profanation and violation of the Holy things committed by that vnrepentant person: For God hath commaunded the church to watch over their brethren, & if they do not they hate their brother in suffering sinne to rest vppon him: God hath commaunded that no vncleane person should medle with the Holy things, if they doe they profane & polute the Holy things offering violence to the Lords ordinances.

But it may be you wil say that by this meanes we assume to our selves a kind of perfection & puritie in that we wil have no sinners among vs: I answer that you must distinguish betwixt our persons & our communion: we confesse our persons severally every one of vs to be subject to sinne, & that we doe sinne dayly: & bicause of our sinning nature the Lord hath appointed the ordinances of the visible Church as helps & meanes to subdue this sinning nature of ours, especially these ordinances of admonition & excommunication which are to be vsed & administred vppon al & by al as occasion is offered: Now this is the perfection & puritie of our communion that we suffer no vnrepented sinne, no vnrepentant sinner among vs, but either we cast out the sinne by repentance or the sinner vnrepentant by excommunication: that our cōmunion may be pure & holy, & the church without spot or wrinkle: & that we may be a new lump dayly vnleavened, the leaven being purged out of vs continually: oh Mr. Ber. if you knew but the comfort & powre of the L. ordinances of admonition & excommunication: as we do (blessed be our good God) in some measure, & that growth & reformation which is

in some of vs thereby, you would be so wonderfully ravished with the powre of Gods ordinances, that you would acknowledg the Church to be terrible as an armie with banners, & yet amiable & lovely comely & beautiful: in so much as Christ himself saith that the love of the church is faire that she woundeth his hart with one of her eyes, in regard of the beautiful & holy communion which is dayly maintayned in her by vertue of the censures: but your confused assemblies & al the members of them not only omit, but reject, yea oppose al these holy ordinances which Christ hath given to his Church, & therby you proclaime to all the world that you are of Belial, that is without the yoke of Christs ordinances, & you cast away from you these cordes & bandes wherwith wee are bound one to another, & knit faster & faster vnto Christ our head: & therfor you living thus without the yoke, out of the Lords Holy order, having broken these bandes & cast the cordes frō you, mingling your selves vnto, & joyning with al manner of profane persons that violate al Gods ordinances, how can we have any fellowship, communion, agreement, concord or part with you? Answer to this now Maister Bernard, and seduce your hearers no longer with vanities.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the eighth Section.

Mr. Ber. in his book intituled the Sep. Schisme pa. 103. hath these wordes, viz: that our seaventh error should be to hold: That the sinne of one man publicly & obstinately stood in, being not reformed, nor the offender cast out, doth so pollute the whole congregation, that none may communicate with the same in any of the Holy things of God, (though it be a Church rightly constituted) til the party be excommunicated.

In this eighth Section the position is thus vttered by you, & by mee justified, viz: That one sinne of one man publicly and obstinately stood in and not reformed by a true constituted Church doth so pollute it, that none may communicate with it in the Holy things of God til the partie offending be by the Church put out after lawfull conviction.

Afterward expounding this truth I say, that if the Church hold this obstinate, impenitent, convicted person in communion they consent to his sinne, as the civil magistrate suffering wilful murther consenteth vnto it.

Mr. Ains. confutat. of Mr. Bern. pag. 178. 179. doth first renounce this truth, & denyeth it to be either their judgment or practise referring vs to the confession of their faith, Art. 26. wher their judgmēt is, that none is to Seperate for offences, but by due order to seek redresse: & yet afterward affirmeth, that if the Church will not rebuke nor cast out a man obstinate and impenitent in wickednes, but plead for him against such as call vppon them for judgment then are all such abettors of the wicked sinner themselves, and that in a high degree: & now not that one mans sinne, but the sinne of them al polluteth them.

Wel Mr. Ains. you & I wil not differ about this point, for wither it be his sinne consented vnto by them, or their sin which is a consent & approbation to his sinne, or both, I regard not: The truth is the truth, that that one sinne polluteth them al by contagion, as the leaven leaveneth the whole lump: & although Mr. Bern. hath not so plainly & directly propounded it as he might, yet let it not be denied for it is the truth he doth chardg vs withal, giving a true exposition: & I tell you true Mr. Ains. you deny the truth, if you deny the position: but indeed your denyall, & your affirmation contradict.

Heer Mr. Bern. for your sake I wil performe two things: First I wil confirme this truth which we defend against you that joyne with open knowne sinners in the communion of your false Church: Secondly, I wil repel your cavils against this truth of God, wherin wee walk.

For the first point I wish you to remember what hath been proved vnto you in the former Section, viz, That Christs ministerial powre is given to the body of the Church: which if it be true as it is proved to be the vndoubted truth of God, then this second position followeth necessarily therevppon & therefore is to be embraced for the truth of God in like manner: For every consequent necessarily deduced from the Scripture is as wel & as truly the word of truth as that which is

in plaine termes expressed & noted downe in number of wordes. For even as the branches of the tree doe as truly proceed from the root as the great graines or body of the tree, & are al of one kind & nature both root, body, graynes, & braunches: So a necessary consequent growing by true discourse out of the Scripture is aswel & as truly the word of truth as the position, or doctryne, or sentence is whence it was raised, wherfor I frame an argument from the former ground after this manner.

If they that have Christs ministerial powre to reforme obstinate convicted sinners, or to excommunicate thē: do neither reforme them nor cast them out frō among them, but suffer them stil in communion consenting therby to their sinn: then the persons so suffering & consenting to sinne are polluted by contagion of the sin, & impenitent wicked sinner.

But it may fal out that a Church true in the constitution having Christs ministerial powre yet afterward declining may neither reforme an obstinate convicted sinner, nor cast him out of their communion, but may suffer him stil in communion therby consenting to his sinne.

Ergo: a Church truly constituted, having Christs Ministeriall powre of reformation or excommunication, suffering and consenting to sinne & sinners convinced is polluted by infection of that sinne, and of that impenitent obstinate convicted sinner.

And so by necessary consequent I conclude after this manner.

If a Church truly constituted be all of them polluted by consent as is already declared, then they do violate and profane all the Holy things of God wherin they pertake: For to the vncleane nothing is cleane, as the Apostle testifieth. Tit. 1. 15. & the Prophet, Esa. 1. 12.

But a Church truly constituted may grow to polution by consenting to obstinate sinne & sinners as is already declared.

Therfor a Church truly constituted may grow to

the violation & manifest profanation of al the Holy things of God.

From this evident truth I proceed & reason after this manner.

To that Church, company, or communion of men we may not joyne in Spirituall communion that violateth or profaneth the holy things of God.

But a Church truly constituted may grow to the violation & manifest profanation of al the Holy things of God.

Ergo, to a Church truly constituted growne to polute & violate the holy things of God, we are not to joyne in communion.

Thus you se Mr. Ber. the evidence of this truth manifested vnto your conscience, if the Lord vouchsafe you mercy to see the truth.

Like arguments may be drawne from many places of Scripture: as from Mat. 13. 33. compared with 1. Cor. 5. 6. an argument may be framed thus.

As the whole lump & the feast of the passeover was leavened with a litle leavē: so one open knowne sinne polluteth the visible Church, & the holy things therof: for you must vnderstand that the Apostle doth not cal vnknowne sinne leaven: but by leaven he vnderstandeth sinne openly knowne, convinced, & vnrepented: els ther could be no communion for men on earth.

But the Apostle & our Saviour saith out of the law that a litle leaven leaveneth the whole lump & feast of the passeover.

Therfor, one sinne convinced & vnrepented polluteth the visible church, & the holy things therof: & therevnto may no man joyne.

Againe, from persons ceremonially poluted, & so defiling the Sanctuary of the Lord, as appeareth Nomb. 19. 13. 20. Hag. 2. 14, I reason thus.

As persons ceremonially poluted vnclensed entering into the Sanctuary of the Lord, or meddling with the holy flesh or pottage, did polute the Sanctuary, & the holy flesh, pottage & the rest: So the visible Church of the new Testament

morally poluted & impenitent in sin medling with the holy things of God polute & defile the same. But the L. avoucheth by the mouth of his holy Prophets, that persons ceremonialy vncleane vncensed, entering vnto the Sanctuary, or medling with holy flesh or pottage, polute & defile them.

Therfor the visible Church of the new testament morally poluted & impenitent in sin dealing with the holy things do profane them: & therfor no man with good conscience can joyne with that profanation.

Finally: as in the old testament the King & Magistrates suffering sin vnpunished were poluted therwith by consent: So in the new testament the visible church (who are Kings Spiritually, & have committed vnto them the judgments of the L. the ministerial powre of Christ) suffering sinne vnreformed among them, are polluted thereby.

But in the Old Testament the Kings and Magistrates (by your owne confession Mr. Bernard pag. 94.) were poluted with sinne vnreformed in the common wealth.

Therfor in the New Testament the visible Church (who are Kings Spiritually, having committed vnto them the judgments of the L. the ministerial powre of Christ) suffering sinne vnreformed among them are poluted therby: & so no communiō to be had with them, least partaking with them in sinne by consent, we receave of their plagues.

Now you se evidently proved by testimonies of Scriptures, & by direct consequents from the same, that it is vnlawful for any man to joyne to a Church that was truly constituted, now growne to profane & violate the holy things of God by consenting to sin & wicked, obstinate, convinced, impenitent sinners: & that therfor much more is it vnlawful to joyne to your false churches which never were truly constituted since the defectiō of Antichrist, but remaine in the gulfe of Antichristianisme vnto this day: the first point therfor being manifest, the

second foloweth to be enterprised which is to answer the objections & cavils which you make against this comfortable truth of the L. I cal it a comfortable truth bicause herin consisteth the true comfort of churches & Christians publicuely & privately: that they neither live in nor consent to any known sin in themselves or other For otherwise seing sinnes & corruptions break out dayly in the best Churches & Christians, herin is our comfor[t] that we give no allowance to them no not so much as by our presence in that communion wher open known sinne is suffered, as it is most plentifully and abundantly in your false Churches and in other Churches that are of a true constitution.

In your objections against this truth the first thing that I reprove is that you do falsely interpret consent to sin: for a man may consent to sin, though he in judgment, affection, co[u]ntenāce & action do declare his dislike of it: as for exāple: Ely did al this to his sonnes that poluted the L. Sacrifices, & cōmitted adultery with the weomen that came to sacrifice, 1. Sā. 2. 22. 23. for he should have proceded to the vtmost that the word of God had required at his hāds, viz: to have put his sōnes to death, which bicause he did not he was poluted with their sinnes by consēt, & therfor the fearful judgmēt of God befel him which whosoever heard both their eares tingled, 1. Sa. 3. 11. so except a mā do by al mēanes save himself from the froward generation, by Seperating himself as the Apostle practised & counselleth, Act. 2. 4. & 19. 9. & 2. cor. 6. 17. he cannot be fre fro[m] the contagion of their sin & the profanation of al the Holy things of God: For these places doe evidently declare that Paul & the Apostles not only commaund to seperate from the Gentils, but frō the Iewes who were the true Church of God now growing obstinate in sinne, & so practised themselves commaunding the Disciples & training them vp by his example so to do: & so teaching vs to follow his example herein.

In the next place you proceed to declare by divers reasons (such as they are) that to joyne to the holy things when obstinate impenitent sinners partake in them is no sinne: your first reason is: For that in the old Testament



ther was no Sacrifice appointed for this: Ergo it is no sinne: I deny the antecedent: & I declare the contrary by the examples of the tribe of Benjamin consenting to the sinne of adultery committed vppon the Levites concubine, Iudg. 19. & 20. of the tribes of Israel, fearing lest wrath should fal vppon them for suffering their brethren to make another altar, & to forsake the true worship of God as they suspected, Iosh. 22. & of Achans sin which brought wrath vppon the whole congregation. VVherefore in the law the Lord did appoint a Sacrifice for the whole congregation aswell as for any particular person. Levitt, 4. 13.

A Second reason of yours is: For that in the Old Testament the Godly are never reprov'd for being present at the ministrations of holy things though wicked men were present: but the Prophets reprove the Preists only for not Seperating the cleane from the vncleane, wherto I answer that their communion was typical, & therfor persons typically cleane though wicked in their lives might come to Sacrifice, & yet not pollute others as I have already sufficiently declared in the former Section: besides whereas the Prophets reprove the Preists, & the Saints in the new Testament succeed the carnal Preists as Spiritual Preists, therby it followeth that the Saints in the new Testament are polluted by not distinguishing & seperating the cleane from the vncleane: see these places of Scripture, Ezech. 22. 26. compared with Revel. 1. 6. & 11. 1. Iude vs. 23. 2. Cor. 6. 17.

But stil some may object, that in the old Testament they did pray, & preach, & praise God, & yet notwithstanding the faithful herein were not defiled if the wicked did joyne with them in communion thereof: & therfor now vnder the new Testament, though mē do joyne in communion with open known sinne, & suffer known sinne yet may be saynts, & vnpolluted in communion: & this is the very pith & marrow of your second objection Mr. Bern. wherto I make answer many waies.

First: I deny him to be a Saynt or that he ought to be esteemed a Saynt of vs, that is impenitent in any knowne sinne: Knowne I say to him: For I may know it to be a sinne, & yet bicause he knoweth it not so to be,

he cannot be accounted impenitent though he live in it: sith ignorance is a sinne whereof a man repenteth generally, & so in his generall repentance of sinnes done of ignorance that particular sinne is included.

Secondly, I am to judg of another according to that which I know & according to the rule of the word therin: wherfor if i know any of my brethren to live in any sinne knowne to me: I must admonish him & prove it to him to be sinne, & require his repentance: if he repent not to take withnesses & thē to admonish him before withnesses, & so to convince it againe to his conscience, if he repent not, then to tel it to the Church, wher also he is to be admonished & convinced openly: if then he repent not, to mee he is a Heathen & Publicane, & no Saynt: what he is in the L. account, & to himself in secreat I know not, nor regard, for it aperteyneth not to me.

Lastly, for the consequence of the argument, viz: That seing in the Old Testament the faithful were not defiled joyning in prayer, preaching & praising God with open known sinners, therefore wee in the New Testament so doing are not defiled, I deny vtterly: yea and I deny the Antecedent in some sence also: It shall not be vnprofitable therefore fully to discussce both the Antecedent, and the consequence of this Objection.

The Antecedent is thus to be expounded & conceaved of, namely.

That the L. required one thing outwardly in the communion of the Church, another thing inwardly in the hart for acceptation before God.

If any circumcized Israelite or proselyte clensed according to the purification of the Sanctuarie did joyne in prayer, preaching & praising God, no man could justly refuse his outward communion in these actions seing he was outwardly cleane according to the dispensation of those tymes: For vs in the new Testament ther are required other visible actions for our outward clensing, which were not then required of the carnall Israelites for their outward clensing: if they did declare their inward repentance by Sacrifices for their sinnes general & Speciall, by clensing themselves with those rites & ceremonies which were appointed by the Lord

for those infant tymes of the Church, they were to be judged holy by al men, & so communion might be had with them without sinne: but if they were not censed according to the purification of the Sanctuary, they were not visibly cleane, & therfor communion could not be had with them without sinne, & so Hezechiahs prayer importeth, 2. Chron. 30 18-20. & the Prophets declare plainly, Nōb. 19. 31. 20. Hag. 2. 14. yet heer also cautions must be remembred, viz: That this ceremoniall vn-cleaneenes must be made known vnto others, for otherwise how could it polute others if it were vnknowne to them: Furthermore it cannot be denyed, but that the Sonnes of Belial very vild wicked men did deale with the holy things in the old Testament, but yet I say it cannot be proved but they were visiblie cleane according to the dispensation of those tymes: the Lord did not then require men to proceede with their brethren in the thre degrees of admonition, & so to bring them to the acknowledgment of their sinne & repentance: That is the Lords dispensation for the new Testament: But the L. order for those tymes was 1. reproof for sinne, Levit. 19. 17. 2. The partie reprovved was to offer a Sacrifice which if he did he was censed from hys sinne visiblie, Levit. 4. 23. 3. If he wilfully refused to harken he was to be promoted to the Magistrate, & put to death for his presumption, Levit. 15. 30. 31. Deut. 17. 12. This was the L. æconomie for those tymes when this order was violated, then al communion was defiled, whiles it was observed all was wel in the visible communion: Let any man declare the contrary if he be able: breefly therfor to make a ful answer to the objection: if the faithful did keep communion with persons visiblie vn-cleane, (according to the vn-cleaneenes of the old Testament,) knowne vnto them, I say they were polluted with their vn-cleaneenes by consenting therto, & to the violation of the Lords order appointed for those tymes: if men were the children of Belial, & yet were censed according to the dispensation of the Old Testament, their visible censing did intitle them to the ordinances of the old Testament before men, though before God their consciences were impure: wherfor both the Antecedent & consequent of the argument are

weake and vnsound: & so this truth of God remayneth firme, that impenitency in sinne defileth the communion of the visible Church, as in the old Testament, so in the New Testament.

Your third reason is for that the Prophets did not Seperate who did know the meaning of the L. for this thing, nor taught not the people so to do: I answer as in the new Testament so in the old ther ought not to be Separation til the vtmost meanes be sought for redresse of things: The vtmost meanes for reforming abuses in the Old Testament was the Magistrates authority, in whose hands the powre of reforming was: Hence it is that the Prophets alwayes reprove the Kings for the wickednes of the Land: but the Lord did never teach (bicause he thought it not meet, ther being but one true Church) that when the King neglected his duty the people should forsake the Holy things of God & Seperate, but stil they ought to depend vppon the Lord for redresse of things: but now in the New Testament the Lords administration in this particular is otherwise, 1. Visible Churches may be infinite, & so ther is a possibility of enjoying the Lords ordinances though a man forsake the communion of one Church, 2. the fulnes of tyme being come, & the nonage of the Church being past, the Lord hath now revealed his whole wil & pleasure, & hath set vs at liberty, whereas in the old Testament they were in bondage vnder worldly ordinances, 3. The Saints now in the new Testament are answerable to the Kings in the old Testament having powre Ecclesiastical in their hands (but not civil) to reforme the abuses that arise in the visible Church, 4 Therfor we are in the new T[est]ament to vse al meanes appointed by the Lord for reformation before wee Seperate, al the meanes I say whatsoever: If then ther be no reformation what then? I answer Separation is then lawful: why? The reasons are these 1. The visible Church ceaseth to be a true Church being obstinate in sinne, & from a false Church Separation is lawful, 2. the Lord hath commaunded to come out from among persons obstinate in sinne, & so the Apostles practised. 2. Cor. 6. 17. Act. 19. 9. & 2. 40. 3. bicause the Lord hath said

that if we pertake with them in their sinnes, we shall receive of their plagues, 4. because if but two or three faithful ones being Separated joyne together, they are a true Church vnto Christ where the Lords presence & acceptance is: But in the Old Testament they were necessarily tyed, to the Kingdome, Preisthood, & Temple for the worship & obedience of God, but now in the New Testament al things are free, & the bondage is gone: Mr. Bern. I would have you note this wel & lay it vp in your hart for your instruction & reformation, for in this particular I know you al that feare God in the land are scandalized from the truth, not vnderstanding the difference between the New Testament & the ordinances thereof, & the Old Testament with the ordinances thereof: Summarily therefor to deliver the truth: The Church, Ministry, VVorship, & Government of the Old Testament were so constituted by the Lord as that no Separation could be made from them seing they were al by Succession & the people therfor were necessarily bound over vnto them, otherwise they could not find the Lord & his truth which was only at Ierusalem: in the New Testament, the Church, Ministry, VVorship & Government are so constituted by the Lord, as that in them ther is no Succession nor alligation of tyme, place, person, &c. But when the Church is become false by impenitency, the faithful may Separate & cary the truth with them if but two or three.

Mr. Bern. the L. open your eyes, & the eyes of al his people in England to see this blessed truth of the Lord: & then the cause of Separation wilbe evident vnto your consciences: in the meane tyme you cannot be ignorant.

A fourth reason whereby you would prove that to joyne to the Holy things in the communion of obstinate impenitent persons is no sinne, is, for that the Scripture teacheth the contrary (as you say) two wayes, 1. by acquitting the Godly from the transgression of others, 2. by declaring it to be a sinne to leave the Holy things of God, for the wickednesse of others: & this you say cutteth deeply.

I answer you Mr. Ber. that we do not feele this cut

at al, for the iron is blunt, & you had need put to more strength, & your reason hath in it no cutting quality at all: For I doe acknowledg that the Godly, if they consent not to, nor approve not the sinne of others, are by the Lords sentence acquit from the transgression. but I would learne of you, if the Holy Ghost in the Scripture doth not account the principal & the accessary in the same condition though not in the same degree of sinne: what say you to the sinne of Achan? the sinne of the men of Gibeah concerning the Levites concubine? The feare of the Israelites in respect of the Altar built in the border of the Land of Canaan by Iorden? These places are evident, that consent to sinne polluteth the person consenting: & the places by you quoted do not prove any thing contrary to this assertion of ours: but rather they prove this vndoubted truth of the Lords: the place Ezech. 33. 9. proveth that as the watchman that dischargeth his duty is acquit, so if he discharg not his duty he shalbe accessary to the sinne, & partaker of the punishment as may be seen, vs. 6. the place Ezech. 18. 14. 17. 20. doth declare two things, that if the child follow not the sinne of the parents he shalbe guiltlesse: if he partake in ther sinnes he shalbe partaker of the punishment. the place Ezech. 14. 18. 20. sheweth that Noah, Daniel, & Iob shal deliver their owne soules by their righteousnes: but al those that are polluted with other mens sinnes shal partake of their plagues, Revel. 18. 4. So that you see these places of the old testament quoted by you do not only not help you, but vtterly overthrow your concept.

The places of the new Testament alledged by you also make as litle for you. Tit. 1. 15. teacheth that al thing are pure to the pure, yet the intent of the place is not to shew that sinne is pure to any man: & although I may lawfully vse the Holy things of God being my self cleane: yet being partaker of another mans sinne by consent, I polute al the holy things to my self, & have no title to vse them, & so the Apostle saith presently to the impure is nothing pure: the place Revel. 3. 4. teacheth that so many of the Church at Sardi as defiled not their garments by consenting to the polution of the rest of that Church, but that stood out against their

corruptions to the vtmost, shalbe innocent: & the other place, Revel. 2. 22–24. sheweth the same thing: but for these two places I say: you must prove Mr. Ber. that your assemblies are true churches as these were: againe, you must prove also that these persons neglected their duty of admonishing & standing forth against the Church: & that the Church was convinced by them & yet did joyne with them in communion of Holy things: For otherwise we say we are not to Seperate till wee have done our vtmost endeavour: neither are we poluted til then: your last place is Gal. 5. 10. wher the Apostle teacheth that he that troubleth the Galatians shal beare his condemnation whosoever he be: & yet the Apostle telleth them vs 9. that a litle leaven leaveneth the whole lump: that is to say: if you consent to this false doctrine of joyning circumcision to Christ the person that perswadeth you shal beare his burthen whosoever he be, yet you also shalbe punished receaving the false doctrine, but I hope otherwise of you: this is the meaning of the Apostle.

Secondly, you say the Scripture teacheth it to be a sinne for to leave the holy things of God, for the wickednes of other, & for this purpose you alledg, 1. Sam. 2. 24. 27. wher (you say) the wordes are plaine, & cannot be avoyded by another exposition of the word gnabar. Well: although the word doth as properly signifie to passe vpon or to passe by as to trespasse, & that it is so expounded by Pagnin: yet I will not plead it at this tyme sith it needeth not: Therfor take the place according to your construction that the Sonnes of Ely by their sinnes caused the people to sinne by abhorring the L. offering through occasion of ther wickednes: I answer thus: in the old Testament no man was to forsake the Sacrifices for other mēs sinnes if they were ceremonialy cleane: & therfor that the people did abhorre these ordinances of God vpon the wickednes of Elyes Sonnes was ther transgression: the L. taught no such thing in the old Testament & in the typical communion therof: but now in the new Testament we having the truth that was then signified by the old Testament & the ordinances therof, it followeth necessarily thus: that as in the old Testament & the communion therof which were typical, persons typically

cleane might not have communion typical, with persons typically vncleane, without polution ceremonial: So in the new Testament & the cōmunion therof which is the truth, persons moraly cleane may not have Spiritual communiō with persons moraly vncleane without polution moral which is sinne: & so you are answered according to your exposition of the place: yet I deny it to be necessary to expound the place so as you doe.

Your fifth reason proving it lawful for the Saints to hold communion in the holy things though persons obstinate in sinne be present is: For that in the word we have liberty given to come to partake in the holy things if wee look to our selves to reforme our owne wayes, mat. 5. 23. 24. 1. Cor. 11. 28. & the Corinthians did partake in the holy things with them that were once & twice admonished, 2. Cor. 12. 21. [er]go: so may we do.

I answer. The place of Christ Mat. 5. 23. 24. teacheth that a mā must first reconcile himself to his brother before he offer his gift: truth: but it must be for al the sinnes he committeth against his brother: now to hate his brother by suffering sinne to rest vpon him & not to admonish & bring him to repentance, is a greivous sinne of one man against his brother, & so it is a very greivous hatred for a man to suffer the whole Church vnreformed from sinne, & therfor by this place of Christ you gaine nothing, but rather leese the cause which is hereby confirmed, viz: that til a man doe his duty to the vtmost to his brethren, he cannot offer his gift: now his vtmost duty is, either to bring him to repentance, or to leave him impenitent, & al them that justifie his sinne in their impenitēcy & so in the violation of the holy things: For they being al poluted with his sinne have deprived themselves of title & powre to the holy things, & so vsing them doe violate them, & al that partake with them therein partake with sinne, & shall receave of their judgments.

The place 1. Cor. 11. 28. is also against you: For the Apostle willeth the Corinthians to examine themselves how they have performed their duty to God, & their brethren, in the first & second table: & finding themselves to be cleere then to eate & drinck: otherwise finding our selves to faile in that commaundement, Mat. 14. 15-17.



wee are poluted by contagion & cannot eate & drinck without hurt & judgment, bicause we have not judged our selves aright.

But your last place Mr. Ber. is something to the purpose: viz. 2. Cor. 12. 21. & 13. 1. 2. compared together, for I will help to vrge your argument, & then give you an answer.

Your argument may thus be framed.

If the Corinthians might without sinne have communion with the Church, of the Corinthians after they were once & twice admonished, & did not repent: then may we have communion, with persons obstinate & impenitent, in the holy things without sinne in vs.

But the Corinthians had communion with the Church of Corinth poluted with sin after once & twice admonition, without sinne.

Ergo: we may have communion, with persons obstinate in sinne, in the holy things without sinne in vs.

This is the force of your reason: wherto I answer, that you must prove your minor: For it is weake: & the places of Scripture do not confirme it: For you must know that the latter Epistle to the Corinthians was the second admonition as may be seen, 2. Cor. 13. 2. & before the despising of the second admonition they could not be judged obstinate & impenitent in sinne: now for the full & sufficient confirmation of your minor you should prove vnto vs two things: First, that the Corinthians did despise Pauls second admonition in this his second Epistle: Secondly that if they did despise this his second admonition, the faithful among the Corinthians did keep communion without sinne with that poluted & obstinately impenitent company: now bicause I know this is to hard a task for you, I will therefore conclude that this argument of yours is insufficient to prove your purpose.

Your last & least reasō wherby you endeavour to prove it lawful to vse the holy things though obstinate impenitent sinners be present in communion, is, that Gods commaundement must be obeyed absolutely, & another mans sinne cannot dissolve the bond of allegiance betwixt

God & man, which our position seemeth (as you pretend) to dissolve: seing we say that a man must not keep communion in the holy things if wicked men be present in communion with vs:

To this argument I answer thus: viz: that God indeed commaundeth vs to pray, heare the word, & communicate in the Sacraments, but he also prescribeth both the persons wherwith, & the manner how we must performe these actions: prayer, hearing the word & partaking in the Sacraments are actions of communion, & ther is in the performance of them a manner of doing (modus agendi) to be observed: wee must therfor respect two things in performing these actions of Religion: First that our communion be such as it ought to be, for I may not keep communion with Iewes, Turks, Pagans, Papists, but with Christians, viz: true Christians such as the new Testament describeth ought to be members of the visible Church which is the mystical body of Christ: Secondly, that the actions of our communion be performed after that holy manner & order as the new Testament of Christ teacheth: as that prayer be conceaved not read out of a service book, that prophecy come out of the hart, & not be read out of a book as Homilies be: that baptisme be administred simply as Christ teacheth without Godfathers, the crosse, questions to infants: & that the L. Supper be vsed sitting not kneeling. finally, that al the parts of worship be censed according to the primitive institution, & not vsed with those polutions which the man of sinne hath cast vpon them: breefly, we must worship God with the meanes he hath apointed as the 2. cōmaudemēt teacheth, & after the māner he hath taught as the third commaundement informeth, otherwise ther is idolatry committed in violating the second commaundement worshipping God by other meanes then he hath ordeined: & profanation of the name of God in violating the third commaundement when his ordinances are not so vsed as he hath prescribed: So that to speak directly to your objection, the bond of alleageance betwixt God & vs is preserved & kept inviolable by our position: for we teach that men must pray, heare the word, & receive the Sacraments, but in a true visible communion

of Sain[t]s as the Lord hath appointed, not with al manner of persons; as theeves, murderers, witches, conjurers, Papists, Atheists, Dronkards, perjured, persons, &c. as in your Church: nor after your manner which is devised by man as Ieroboam devised in Israel: but as the Lord hath in the new Testament taught vnto vs.

And heer Mr. Bern. you take vpon you to reduce the places of Scripture which wee alledg for Seperation from your assemblies, to certaine topical or categorical heads, & so give them answer according to your fashion: as thus: the places that forwarne Gods people to Seperate vnder the law are thus to be taken:

1. From idols of false Gods: as Israel from heathenish Gods.
2. From Idols of the true God: as Iudah from Israels calves.
3. From persons ceremonially polluted.

The places vrging Seperation vnder the Gospel are thus to be taken

1. From Iewes not receaving Christ, but rayling against him.
2. From Gentils without Christ.
3. From Antichrist vnder the shew of Christ persecuting Christians.
4. From familiar companying with excommunicates or wicked men.

But (say you) what are al these places to vs who are not vnder any of these heads of reference? I answer you Mr. Ber. that your Church is respectiue vnder al these topical places which you mention excepting the first, For 1. you make Idols of the true God, in setting vp your own inventions, & making Christ a King, Preist, & Prophet, as you imagine 2. you ought much more to Seperate from persons morally vncleane, if the Iewes ought to Seperate from persons ceremonially vncleane, 3. if the Apostles commaund Seperation from the Iewes members of that true Church of the old Testament, refusing Christ & rayling against him: Then much more ought we to Seperate from you the members of false Churches, refusing & persecuting Christ in his members & new Testament vnto death: as they have felt, 4. if

Antichristians & Gentils be in degree equall (as they are in the Holy Ghosts account as I have formerly proved) thē from you who are Antichristiāns & visible members of false Churches ought Seperation to be made, 5. although you are not excommunicate from the true Church whereof you never were, yet you entertaine excommunicates from true Churches, & you are cages of every vncleane & hateful bird: & if I must avoyd private familiar communion with excommunicate & wicked persons then much more must I shun Spirituall holy communion with them: except any man wilbe so ridiculous as to say that the Holy & Spiritual communion afordeth more liberty to sinne & sinners then private civil communion in meate & drinck: &c. & so by your owne confession al the places of Scripture alledged against you by vs, may by just & due proportion be applyed vppon you, being as you stand in your constitution & worship, false Churches, & false worshippers, & persecuters of Christ his truth & faithful witnesses.

To end al: you say that it cannot be proved that it is sinn to heare the word preached & to receave the Sacraments of one that hath converted him, & is called of the church, wel Mr. Bern. I vnderstand your drift, & I wil give you an answer: I say in your assemblies men do not convert to the true visible faith of Christ taught in his word, viz: in the new Testament: nor you ever converted man therto, but pervert men from it, as this book of yours & al your railings against our testimony do plainly evince: what you do invisibly the Lord knoweth, & every mans owne conscience can speak that feeleth: but what say you of the Popish preachers do you think they convert none invisiblie? & what doe you gaine by this fancy? neither they nor you convert to the faith or new Testament of Christ, but they pervert mē from you, & you pervert men from the Seperation: & both hinder & draw from the truth: what you do invisiblie I seek not nor ought not to respect for visible walking: yet know that we hold that ther are 7000. that are of the Lords Election in your false Churches: So are ther in Rome itself. Revel. 18. 4. whence did al the worthy witnesses of Christ arise, as the waldenses, Hus,

Prage, Luther, the Martyrs in Q. Maries dayes in Englād, & at other tymes in other places? did they not come out of the bottomlesse pit of Antichristianisme being converted there? yet I hope you wil not say that they might stil joyne to that ministry: & yet the ministers then had the calling of that church, such as it was: if therfor the argumēt be not good for them no more is it for you: for you wilbe proved to be Antichristiā Ministers as truly in quality, though not asmuch in quantity as they are: & this shal suffice for answer to this point.

#### The ninth Section.

Your next point wherto I will speak is the sixth in number: which you hold error, but I hold as a truth if it be wel conceived: it is this.

6. That the word truly preached & Sacraments rightly administred are no infallible tokens of a true Church.

I am sure you doe or may remember that *proprium cum specie convertitur* as the Logicians speak: For example: Every man is reasonable, & every reasonable creature is a mā. Now al I say is: that the word truly preached, & the Sacraments duely administred are no properties of a true church: For although this be true, that whersoever the word is truly preached *ex officio*, & the Sacraments rightly administred, ther is a true Church, yet I denie the other, viz: That whersoever ther is a true Church, the word is truly preached, & the Sacraments are rightly administred: For these two are not convertible: but this I hold that a true Church, & powre to preach the word truly, and administer the Sacraments duely, are convertible: and therefore that the powre of our Lord Iesus Christ given to the Church is an essential propertie of a true Church, and therefore convertible with a true Church: Now sometyme it falleth out that a true Church hath not the word ministerially preached, nor the Sacraments administred, namely, when it wanteth Officers, as it sometyme falleth out: This point also is plaine enough if you have not lost your Logick: & therefore I leave it requiring your answer.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the ninth Section.

I cannot find in all Mr. Bern. book intituled the Sep. Schisme, any thing in opposition to this Section of my lettre vnto him, whereby I collect that he yeeldeth it as a truth: & it is not material to the point of Separation any thing at al: only the truth must be defended for the Author of truths sake that the Lord & his truth may in all things be honored: the summe of al this Section is thus much: that as not the act of reasoning is the true propertie of a man, but the faculty to reason: Non ratiocinari sed rationale: So not the actual preaching & administring of the Sacraments, but the powre of Christ to have & vse al the holy things of God is the true property convertible, & infallible token of a true Church: For as every man although he be reasonable, yet doth not actually vse reaso at al tymes, as namely, being an infat, being asleep, being in a Lethargie or sincope So the true Church though it have alwayes powre to al the holy things, yet actually it doth not vse the powre: But I list not to speak much concerning this particular which is more Scholasticall then profitable, the rather seing Mr. Bernard contendeth not about it.

The tenth Section,

The next position is according to your order the twelvth, viz:

That every of our assemblies are false churches, al our ministers false ministers, our worship a false worship: you cal this error, I cannot beleeeve you: wherfor I declare them vnto you particularly in order after this manner.

But bicause your wordes seem to import that you doe not defend all your assemblies to be true Churches, all your Ministers true Ministers, & the worship of every assemblie to be a true worship, for that I gesse by your covenant you exclude dumb Ministers, & the assemblies over which they are, & the worship offered vp by them: Therefore I wil onely plead against your parish Church at worksap, and your owne Ministerie, and the worship

offered vp by you for your people in the parish Church at worksap.

First, for your assemblie I vse this reason to prove it no true Church: wher the people are not Holy, Elect, & faithful, having not entered covenant to walk in all Gods wayes, standing in confusion with every abhominable liver, subject to al the Antichristian orders & officers set over them, deprived of the powre of Christ for ther mutuall help & edification, ther is no true Church.

But the parish affemblic of worksap is such: go, it is no true Church.

The Major is manifest by these Scriptures compared together, Math. 15. 9. Apocal. 14. 9—11. Ephes. 1. 1. 4. 2. Corinth. 6. 14—18. Math. 28. 20. & 5. 19. Apocal. 18. 4. Math. 5. 24.

The Minor you dare not deny I assure my self: For you have at least five or six hundreth communicants, & you account not past 30. or 40. of them faithful: & al of you submit to Antichrist his lawes & courts dayly: especially your self who cap & knee runne & ride after Antichrists officers & courts feeing him with your money: yea you plead for them & write your peny pamphlets for them, and yet once you wrote against them, and lost your vicaridg in your testimonie against them, but bicause you could not buy and sell except you receaved the mark of the beast, now you are content to yeeld to all, yea & to plead for all, that you may traffique with your marchandize.

Secondly, for your self I hold you to be no true minister of Christ: For your Church being false, how can your ministerie be true: For if the Fountaine be bitter the streame cā not be sweet: your Church is false, your ministerie which ariseth out of your Church as a streame from a Fountaine is false also.

Thirdly, your worship which commeth from a false Church, & a false ministerie cannot be true: but is false in that double respect, but particularly I except these things against your worship.

1. That it is qualified with your false ministerie.
2. That it is offered vp in a false Church.
3. That it is offered vp to God in the behalf of al

your people which are many of thē (I presume) lewd persons, al of them subjects of Antichrists Kingdome: this I except against your conceaved prayers.

Against your service book I except thus besides the former.

1. It is devised & invented by the man of sinne.

2. That it is imposed vpon you & your people of necessity.

3. That it is stinted & limited & the Spirit therby quenched.

4. That it is read vpon a book.

5. That it is corrupt in all the particular errors objected by the Puritans.

All these 8 particulars are contrary to these Scriptures compared together, Roman 8. 26. Math. 15. 9. Apocal. 5. 8. & 8. 3. 1. Thessal. 5. 19. Apocal. 9. 20. & 16. 13. 14. Act. 16. 18. & 19. 13—16. Math. 24. 23—26. 1. Corinth. 12. 7. and 2. 4. and 14. 15. 26. Ierem. 23. 16. Deut. 13. 3. Col. 3. 16. Iam. 5. 13. Ioh. 4. 24.

Mr. Ber. I would not have you passe by these things lightly but weigh them wel and let vs have your answer vnto them.

#### Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning to the tenth Section.

This Section consisteth of three maine branches which Mr. Bern. handleth from pag. 109. to the 150. of his book called the Sep. Schis. Heer therfor I must endeavor two things: First, to prove by vndeniable arguments drawne from the Scriptures that 1. the assēblies Ecclesiastical of England are false churches, 2. the Ministers administring the holy things to these Ecclesiastical assemblies are false Ministers, 3. the worship performed by the ministry & people in the communion visible to be a false worship: Secondly, Mr. Bern. objections & cavils must be refuted: wher the reader must be advertised that in performing this latter part I shall not endeavour to handle all things that Mr. Bernard propoundeth, for ther is much truth by him propounded, which I with him consent vnto, only the points of difference shalbe discussed, & the rest omitted.

In the first place therfor to deale as they say positively



Kataskeuasticos: I prove that al the Ecclesiastical assemblies of the Land, as they stand established by law are false Churches: that is to say not framed or constituted according to that presidēt which Christ hath left for the constituting of the Churches of the new Testament: but are framed according to the invention of man, even that man of sinne, Antichrist the Arch-enemy of Christ.

The first Argument from Mat. 3. 6. Iam. 2. 18.

Rom. 1. 7. 1. Cor. 1. 2. Eph. 1. 1. Mat. 28. 19.

From these places of Scripture compared together I collect an argument which may thus be framed.

The true Churches of Christ were established of men that did repent & beleeve, and shew their faith by their workes, that were Saints & faithful visiblie: & of these only.

The assemblies Ecclesiastical of England are not established only of such persons: but of al sorts of persons, even the most profane of the Land being compelled by law to submit therto.

Ergo: the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not the true established churches of Christs institution.

Heer it may be considered that before the Churches of the new Testament were established the gospel was preached, & vppon the publishing of the gospel men were converted to the faith of Christ, being made the Disciples of Christ, & so many of them whither Iewes or Gentils as gladly received the word were baptized, & added to the Church, & continued in the Apostles doctrine, & fellowship, & breaking of bread, & prayer: this was the constitution & walking of the Churches of the Apostolique institution: & therfor the Churches of England being raised by compulsion without procedent teaching, & conversion to the faith, & making of them Disciples of Christ, being newly & hardly drawne from the Egiptian darknes of most palpable Antichristianisme, being many of them brutishly ignorant, professed Papists, vild Atheists, witches, conjurers, theeves. dronkards, blasphemers, al of them submitted to Antichristian Lords

& Lawes, to Popish Sacrificing Preists, (for their ministers were not newly ordeyned) to a stinted devised, corrupted, Popish service book or worship: they in this their constitution & walking cannot be accounted the true established Churches of the Apostolique institution but rather are yet remayning in the gulfe of Antichristianisme.

The second Argument from 2. Cor. 6. 17. Revel. 18. 4. Act. 19. 9. & 2. 40. 47. & 5. 13. 1. Timoth. 6. 5.

From these & such like places of Scripture compared together & truly expounded, may be collected an argument framed after this manner.

True Churches of the Apostolique institution consisted of a people seperated from vnbeleevers, whether Iewes or pagans or other.

The Ecclesiastical assemblies of England consist not of such a Seperated people: but are compounded of a mixt people, which for the most part are as bad as Iewes or Pagans, viz: persons notoriously wicked.

Ergo, the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not the truly constituted Churches of the Apostolique institution.

Heer it wil nothing availle them to alledg as they are accustomed that they are neither Iewes nor Pagans: For I have already proved that persons that submit to Antichrist & his abhominations are in the Lords account equal to Pagans, being called in the book of the Revelation, Egyprians, Sodomites, Babylonians, Gentils: & the Apostle willeth the Disciples to Seperate themselves from brethren walking inordinately from persons excommunicate, from covetous persons, & al other that either teach false doctrine, or deny the powre of Godlines indeed, though in word they professe the same. 2. Tim. 3. 5. Tit. 1. 16. 2. Thes. 3. 6. 1. Cor. 5. 11.

The third Argument from Mat. 28. 19. 20. Act. 19. 4. 5. & 10. 48. Mat. 18. 20.

The true Churches of the Apostolique institution were by baptisme gathered into the covenant or new Testament of Christ.

The Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not by their baptisme conunited into the New Testament of Christ, but only into the constitution, ministry, worship, & government, & into that faith & doctrine which is by law established in the Land.

Ergo: the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England  
 • are not the true Churches of the Apostolique institution.

The ground of this argument is this: that the Apostles baptized men indefinitely into the whole new Testament of Christ, & al the ordinances thereof, which was not stinted or limited at the pleasure of men vnder certaine canons, injunctions, articles, or Ecclesiastical constitutions, but was large, even as large as the whole word of truth then inspired or written by the Apostles & Prophets: whereas the assemblies of England do neither themselves professe the true faith of Christ conteyned in the new Testament, their faith being stinted & limited vnder certaine devised articles & convocatiō howse Synodical decrees or constitutions, wherevnto al the ministers of the lād are bound to Subscribe & which is the faith of the whole nation: neither therfor do they baptise into the new Testament of Christ indefinitely & simply, but respectively & definitely into that faith & doctrine which is taught in their stinted book of articles, wherto they subscribe which they beleeve & teach, & whereof the body of that Church is, wherein & wherto they are by baptisme admitted & received: their faith therfor being devised & stinted, or false: therefore their baptisme false: therfor their covenant false: therfor the forme of their Church false: & therfor the Church it self a false Church: For how can that be a true Church, which hath a false faith, covenant, forme?

The fourth argument from Mat. 18. 18–20. Marc.  
 13. 34. Ioh. 20. 23. Mat. 16. 19.

These places & other like Scriptures afoard an argument which may be framed after this manner.

The true Churches of the Apostolique institution

had Christs powre ministerial in the body of the Church.

The Ecclesiastical assemblies of England have not Christs ministerial powre residing in the body of the Church.

Ergo: the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not the true Churches of the primitive Apostolique institution.

The Major or first part of this Argument hath been largely proved in the seaventh Section and in the Paralleles, Censures, Observations, therto aperteyning: whither the Reader is to be referred: where this particular is handled affirmatively and negatively.

The Minor or second part of the argument is evident in it self: For the powre Ecclesiastical of the assemblies is resident in the hands of certaine Archb. Lordb. Archdeacons, Chancellors, Commissaries, Officials, and other Ecclesiastical Superintendents, which have powre over thousands or hundreths of Parish Ecclesiastical assemblies, and the Ministers in them: & which have powre Ecclesiastical one over another to suspend excommunicate, and absolve them according to their canons, decrees, and decretals: the Prelate in his diocese or jurisdiction having absolute powre to interdict one or more Parish Churches from having any prayers or Service: they have no powre to come into the Parish Church, or Temple to worship, whiles the interdiction with the Bbs. seale cleaveth vpon the Church dore, &c. & divers particulars of like nature which doe evidently declare that the parish assemblies have no powre at all of themselves, but are meerly and wholly subject and in bondage to the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy, and subordination of Clergie-men, having Superintendency, Superiority, & jurisdiction over them as their proper Spirituall LL. to whome they dayly yeeld Spirituall homage and Subjection in their oaths off Canonically obedience, and actions of like Servitude.

The fifth Argument from 1. Timoth. 2. 5. Heb. 9. 15.  
Gal. 3. 15. 16. Iohn. 17. 9.

These places of holy Scripture & other of like nature may afoard an argument which may thus be framed.

The true Church of the primitive institution Apostolical had Christ Iesus for their mediator, that is, for their King, Preist, & Prophet.

The assemblies Ecclesiastical of Englād have not Iesus Christ for their Mediator, that is their King, Preist, & Prophet.

Ergo, the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not the true Churches of the primitive institution Apostolical.

The Minor or second part of the Argument may be confirmed by divers particulars, as 1. Christ is not their King, seing he onely ruleth by his owne Lawes and Officers, and not by Antichristian Lords, and Lawes, such as are their Prelates, and their Officers, Courts, and Canons. 2. Christ is not their preist to ratifie vnto them by his blood that ordinance of Church, Ministry, VVorship, and Government which they retaine among them, which is not Christs Testament, but the Testament of Antichrist the vtter enemy of Christ: neither doth he prostitute the blood of his Testament to establish such a worship as their service book affoordeth: or such a Ministry as their Clergie is from the ArchB. to the ParishP: or such a Government as their Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy: or such a people for his body, as are compounded of the Serpents seed, a viperous brood of wicked men of all sorts. 3. Christ is not their Prophet to teach them by the false Prophetts the instruments of Antichrist, which dayly by their doctrine set vp Antichrists Officers, & Lawes, & oppugne the true New Testament of Christ in the true constitution, Ministerie, VVorship, & Government taught in his word: Seing therfor Christ is not their King, Preist, & Prophet, how is he their Mediator? Seing his mediation consisteth not in the execution & dispensation of these their offices of King, Preist, & Prophet.

The sixth Argument from Eph. 1. 22. 23. 1. Cor. 12-27. 12. Gal. 3. 16. Eph. 5. 23.

From these places of Scripture compared together, & truly expounded, may an argument be drawne framed thus.

The true Church of the Apostolique primitive institution hath Christ for the head, and is a true body vnto the true head Christ, truly vnited by the Spiritt of Christ.

The ecclesiastical assemblies of Englād are not a true body vnto Christ the true head truly vnited by the Spirit of Christ.

Ergo, the ecclesiastical assemblies of England are not the true Churches of the primitive Apostolique institution.

The Minor or second part of the Argument may thus be confirmed in the three parts therof, 1. Christ is not their true head seing they deny all his offices (though they hold the doctryne of his nature and persons soundly) as is plainly proved before in the fifth Argument, 2. the assemblies as they stand in confusion with all the vngodly and vitious persons of the Land, vnder the Antichristian Lords and Lawes Ecclesiasticall, can not be a true body vnto Christ, but is a monstrous body, like vnto the body of Nebuchadnetzars image: Daniel. 2. 32. 3. this monstrous body cannot be vnited to the true head Christ by his Spirit, but the people of the assemblies being for the most part the seed of the Serpent must needes be knit together, and vnto their head Antichrist by the Spirit of Antichrist, the Spirit of Sathan. All this I speak of their visible communion, and of that politique body Ecclesiasticall which is called their Church: For otherwise I doe acknowledg vnfeynedly, and doe vndoubtedly beleve that the Lord hath his thousands among them, even a remnant according to the Election of grace.

Thus have I proved vnto you Mr. Bernard positively, that the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England in their present constitution, and walking, are not the true churches of the primitive Apostolique institutiō, but are in their outward, visible, politique subsistence the churches of Antichrist, framed after the shape of the popish assemblies, though much refined from the venemous drosse of popery: now in the second place it remayneth that I deale anaskeuasticos with you answering those things which you alledg for your Churches to prove them true:

The great & main pillar of your building is this, that

seing your Church hath not a false head, false matter, false forme, false properties, therefore it is not a false, but a true Church.

To these 4. particulars I answer distinctly: First, you have a false head in that you worship God in a fantastical Christ of your owne devising, in that you shape him a Kingdom Preisthood, & Prophecy of your owne invention, making him a mediator & intercessor to al the profane people of the Land, causing him to offer vp other worship & worshippers to his Father then he hath taught in his new Testament purchased by his blood: by this meanes dealing with Christ as somtyme the Iewes did, putting a reed in his hand, a crowne of thornes vppon his head, & kneeling downe vnto him as to a King, & bidding him prophecy, & yet smite him vppon the face, spit at him & presently crucify him: For whereas you frame him a Kingdom, Subjects, Officers, Lawes, & a government after your owne invention, or rather out of the Popes decretals & decrees, hereby you seem to make him a King, but indeed you Crucifye him againe, and tread vnder foote the blood of the Testament, which he hath purchased & established at so high a rate.

Secondly, your church hath a false matter: For seing you do al this indignity to Christ the head of his true Church, do you think that he wil entertaine you for the true matter of his Church, the true subjects of his Kingdom, the true members of his body, the faithful Servants of his howse, his chast & true welbeloved Spowse & wife? either you must repent & reforme your selves of al that vild indignity which you offer vnto Christ or els he wil never receive you for the matter of his Church, the Subjects of his Kingdom, the members of his body, the Servants of his howse, his espoused wife: For Christ wil not take a wife of fornication, & children of fornication, Hos. 1. he wil not have the Servants of Antichrist to be his howsehold Servants, Mat. 6. 24. nor wil he take the members of an harlot, & make them the members of Christ, 1. Cor. 6. 15, & the Subjects of his vtter enemy Antichrist, cannot possibly be the true faithful Subjects of Christs Kingdom Luk. 19. 27.

But in the pa. 111–116. of your book you make a distinction of matter, as: No matter True matter, False matter: they are no matter of a church (say you) which do not professe Christ: as Iewes, Turkes, Pagans: They are true matter that professe Christ to be the Sonne of God, & the Sonne of Mary, & the only Saviour of man. False matter (say you) is contrary to the true: Further this true matter of the Church (you say) is good & bad: good matter (you say as it seemeth to me) is men walking vprightly in this profession of Christ: bad matter are men walking wickedly: & this you illustrate by the matter of mariage, for she may be a true wife though a bad one, & also by the similitude of subjects to a King, who may be true, though bad ones, breaking his lawes: & a true tradesman though vnskilful in his professiō: & for your selves you say you are true matter of Christs church (though not good matter) bicause you professe Christ truly as is said before: wel Mr. Ber. I yeeld the general distinction of matter, but I deny the particular application of it to your selves: & I say you are false mat[t]er: how therfor do you prove vnto vs that you are true matter? by 4. reasons: wherof the first is for that you beleving this forsaid truth you beleeeve the summe of the gospel: I deny it vtterly: the summe of the gospel is this, that Iesus Christ the Sonne of God, & the Sonne of Mary, is the only King, Preist, & Prophet of his Church, governing, Sacrificing, making intercession, & prophecying after that holy manner & according to those rules which he hath prescribed in his Testament: Now to beleeeve truly concerning the person of Christ, & to beleeeve falsely concerning his office as you doe, is not to beleeeve the whole gospel, but only a peece of it: So that this is the doctrine alone by which the Apostles did gather a people to make them a Church & disciples of Christ: & the profession herof admitted men as true matter of a Church: & this only differenceth the true Church from Iewes, Turkes, Pagans, Papists, & al other Antichristians & Heretiques, viz: Iesus Christ, God and man, King, Preist, & Prophet, & mediator of his owne Testament: Therfor your second, third, & fourth reasons fal flat to the ground. the first being vnderminded as you see: but ther is one



thing that I wonder at: that you should hold the Papists to be false matter of a Church for holding justification by workes, thereby denying Christs Preisthood: & hold your selves to be true matter of the Church denying Christs Kingdom in the true frame, ministry, worship, & government of his Church: what is not Christs Kingdom as pretious as his Preisthood? is it not as horrible impiety to deny Christs Kingdom, & the ordinances therof: as to deny his Preisthood & the vertue therof? or is Christs Preisthood more fundamental then his Kingdom? or justification by workes more pernicious then to deny Christ to raigne as King, & to refuse his regiment? wel if the papists be false matter by your owne confession for the one, you must needes also be false matter for the other: For I am confident that Christs Kingdom is as pretious an office as his Preisthood, even as the Kingdom in the old Testament was as excellent as the Preisthood: now Mr. Bern. what is become of the Church seing your matter is false as you may perceave by this description? & what shall your similies of a bad wife, a bad subject, of a bad artificer help you? you see they vanish away as chaffe before the wind: your matter is false & not bad, as appeareth evidently if you wil not be blind.

To proceed, pag. 116–122. of your book you describe vnto vs the true forme of the Church, inwardly, to be the Spirit, Faith, & Love: & outwardly, the word, profession, & the Sacramēt of the L. Supper: & these things (say you) are in your assemblies: Ergo: you conclude your Church hath a true forme.

I answer: have not the Papists the word preached? do not they make profession & live as strictly as you? do not they communicate in the L. Supper? & so by consequent have Love, Faith, & the Spirit? yet you say they are false Churches, wanting the true forme, even so are you although you do al that they doe, & much more, (for so you are much bettered in doctrine & vse of the Sacrament, but in profession & practise I suppose you are inferior to many of them:) bicause rejecting Christ in his offices as hath been said especialy in his Kingdom, it is impossible in that constitution & communion, you

should aright vse the word, make profession, & partake in the Sacrament, or have the true visible Love, Faith, & Spirit of Christ: For a false matter is vn-capable of a true forme: & it is impossible that the body of Antichrist should have the true Spirit of Christ, or the true covenant & new Testament of Christ invested vpon them: invisibly I hope wel & am perswaded of millions among you: but I speake of your visible, politique, body Ecclesiastical in that mixture of persons, & subordination of Ecclesiastical officers, & communiõ Spiritual in the Holy things, which by Law is established & supported in your Ecclesiastical assemblies.

But pag. 121. you bid vs note this: what? viz: that corruptions doe not hinder men from being a true Church before men, no more then the corruptions of the hart do hinder a man from being an elect one invisiblie to the Lord: I suppose bicause you bid vs in the margent of your book note this, that you account it a matter worth noting: and I surely think it a note worth nothing: For although corruptions of matters accidentall make not a false Church, yet corruptions essential of matters essential make a false church namely, if the matter be false or the forme false: yea I avouch that if a truly constituted Church detected of corruptions accidental, convinced, & impenitent therein, do so continue, they become a false Church as hath been proved already before in the 8. Section: for impenitency inward or outward, maketh a false Christian & Church, inwardly or outwardly, according to due proportion.

Furthermore, pag. 122-128. you bring vs three true visible properties of your true Church as you say, 1. continuance in the vse of the word, Sacraments & prayer, 2. the holding forth of the truth against the enemyes thereof, 3. mutual care for the welfare each of other: & al these (you say) you have among you, & so you say you must needs be a true Church.

I answer: Seing your matter and forme is false, your propertyes cannot be true: For they arise necessarily from the vnion of the matter and forme, or from the forme induced vpon the matter: seing therefore the first is already proved, the latter also must needs follow: but let vs examine these things particularly: I denie

therfor in the first place that you have wel propounded the propertyes of the true Church: For the first and principal essential property of a true Church is interest and title to al the Holy things, which is extant in divers particulars as parcels of that general and whole property. therefore a people declaring their faith and repentance by Seperating themselves from all vncleanenes, & by resigning themselves wholly to the Lord to become his people, have God for their Father, & Christ for their King, Preist, and Prophett, and so with Christ have title to all the meanes of Salvation: and this title consisteth in the VVord, Sacraments, Censures, Prayers, Almes, and al other parts of Spirituall visible communion whatsoever: even as when the soule is induced vppon the matter, viz: when the breath of life is breathed into the nostrils of dust of the Earth. Genes. 2. then ther is a man with a reasonable and Religious Soule: So when a company of faithful people are invested with the New Testament of Christ, then ther is in them title to al the holy things of God whatsoever: This is evident by that which I have before manifested in the seaventh Section whither the Reader is to be referred: wherfore Mr. Bern. to apply this vnto your Church, I avouch that seing you are a false matter of a Church: and have a false forme or covenāt induced vppon you, as hath been shewed before, therefore you have no true title to the meanes of Salvation, but in vsurping the VVord, Sacraments, Censures, Prayers, Almes, &c. you therein incurre the reproof of the Prophet, saying: Psalm. 50 16. what hast thou to doe to declare myne ordinances, that thou shouldest take my covenant into thy mouth, seing thou hatest to be reformed, and hast cast my wordes behind thee? And as the Prophet speaketh: Esay. 1. 11–18. your worship is iniquity, I cannot beare it, I am weary of it, I hate it: Therefore you may plead as long as you will the Temple of the Lord: the Temple of the Lord: yet I say, vntill you intertayne Christs true Kingdome, Preisthood & Prophecy, you are but vsurpers of all that visible communion in the Word, Sacraments, Prayers, &c. which is among you: For it doth not follow that bicause you have the Word, Sacraments, Censures, prayers, &c. therefore you are a true

Church: neither are the vsing of these, true propertyes of a true Church: But the title to them is the true propertie of a true Church: For the Papists and all Antichristians and Heretiques vse the Word, Sacraments, Censures, prayers, but they are not therfor a true Church, as I know you will confesse.

But heer you wish vs againe pag. 122. to observe well: Lett vs heer what it is that you wish vs to observe well: Namely, the true VVord preached, and the true Sacraments administred, are the true propertyes of a true Church: And that you have those things as you say: well: VVhat is the true word? and what are the true Sacraments? is not the true word the true doctryne of the word? the true doctryne of the New Testament? but you have rejected the whole doctryne of Christs Kingdome in a manner, and have advanced all that false doctryne of the Antichristian hierarchy, which is taught and commaunded by Law to be taught in your Church: And you in your pulpits proclayme all them Heretiques or Schismatiques, that teach and erect the Church, Ministerie, VVorship, and Government, according to the paterne of Christ his New Testament: And so you have abrogated and disanulled the VVord of God by your traditions and Antichristian devises. Againe: VVhat are true Sacraments? is the breaking of bread, and drincking of wine performed by any persons, after any manner, or washing with water likewise, true Sacraments? I think you will not say it: it is therefore necessary that there bee a concurrence of other matters: viz: That seing Sacraments are in relation and reference, those references or relations must needes be annexed, els they are not true Sacraments: as a baptized person, must baptize into the true Faith of Christ, a person capable of baptisme: A communion of men having title to the Lords Supper must break bread, and drinck wine, to remember Christ, and shew forth his death till he come: Therefore whereas you hold and teach, that the whole bundel of the Antichristian constitution, ministerie, worship, and Government of the assemblies are the Lords ordinances, you teach a false word: and whereas you being a false Church and Ministry, doe baptize with

water, and break bread & wine to remember a false Christ, and a false Testament, and a false Faith, therein you declare plainly that you have not the true Sacraments: and whereas in your (Observe well) you say, Truly and Rightly, respect grace in administring the VVord and Sacraments, and therefore to preach the word Truly, and Rightly to administer the Sacraments, are no convertible signes of a true Church. I answer: That Truly and Rightly to administer, doe also respect the outward manner of doing in the Essentiall relations spoken of before and not onely grace: And so your (Observe well) is not worthy observation.

In your third essentiall propertie, you wil needes have discipline no true convertible signe of a true Church: Sir, I confesse vnto you that the vse of the Censures of admonition & excommunication which I suppose you cal discipline, is not a convertible signe of a true Church: but only powre & title & interest to vse them: this title I deny you to have: For how can you being in your constitution mingled with the world, & vnseperated, & poluted with so many Antichristian fornications as yet are extant in your assemblies, have title to any of the Lords ordinances: doth the Lord (think you) give his covenant & new Testament, purchased by the blood of Christ vnto such persons as trample vnder foot the whole Testament of Christ, & the ordinances therof? hath the thief title to the true mans purse though he have the possession of it? no more have you title to Chr. visibly though you vsurp him & challeng him never so peremptorily: wherefor to end this point of the properties of the true Church I say til you have Seperated your selves from al the wicked people & Antichristian ordinances in your assemblies, til you have vowed & covenanted to embrace & practise al the ordinances of Christs new Testament you can have no title or interest to the holy things of God: vse them as long as you list, you abuse them.

Lastly, to conclude this first part of the Section, viz: that your Churches are false churches: I say to that which you object, pag. 110. that many corruptions may be in a church, yet it a true Church the constitution being true,

viz: So long as they are not impenitent after conviction: & therfor Israel the Lords people so long as they retained their true cōstitution, Ezech. 16. 21. 22. the men of Ephesus beleevvers ignorant of the visible gifts of the Holy Ghost, Aēt 14. 2. The Corinthians Saints though incest dronkennes, fornication false doctryne, contention, & much evil among them, bicause they were not impenitent after twise admonition or conviction: & so forth of the rest. But you wil confesse that the Prelates & their faction are obstinate after conviction: & we avouch that the Puritanes are obstinate after conviction, for they neither have answered nor can answer that we object against them: & therfor although your constitutiō had been true (which was never) yet your Church is become false being obstinate in sinne & persecuting to death, imprissonment, losse of goods, &c. al that testify against her abhominations: that this is a signe of a false Church, read, 2. King. 17. & Ierem. 3. 8. Math. 23. 37. 38. Math. 21. 33-43. Aēt. 19. 9.

The second point to be handled in this Section, is, that al your ministers are false ministers: in handling whereof I wil proceed as in the former point of this Section, viz: First, confirme the truth by arguments drawne from the Scriptures. Secondly, refute your fancyes wherby you would prove your ministry true.

Therefore in the first place to prove your ministers false Ministers, I vse these Arguments.

#### The first Argument.

The true ministerie cannot be raised out of a false Church.

The Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are false Churches.

Therfor the ministers of those assemblies Ecclesiastical are false ministers.

The ground of this argument is propounded & confirmed in the 7. Section, where it hath been proved by divers vndeniable reasons that Christs ministerial powre, wherof one part is the calling of Ministers, is not given by succession to the Pope, Bbs. or presbytery, but to the body of the congregation, if they be but two or three:

So that seing the true Church is in nature & being before the ministry, & the ministerie is but one of the holy things given to the Church: one part of Christs powre delegated to the Church: one branch of that true title & interest which the L. Iesus the Bridegrome & husband of the Church giveth to the Bride, the Spowse of Christ, the true Church: The Ministerie therfor must needs follow the Church, be after the Church, be raised out of the church: & therefore the true Ministry of Christ is only where the true Church of Christ is, & so it cannot be in the assemblies Ecclesiastical of England, being not the true Churches of Christ.

#### The second Argument.

The true ministerie hath a true office, in execution wherof it is exercised: Rom. 12. 7 1. Cor. 12. 5. 28. Eph. 4. 11.

The ministerie of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England have not a true office, in execution wherof it is exercised.

Ergo, The ministerie of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is not the true ministerie.

The foundation of this argument is this: viz: that seing the ministerie of the Church of England ariseth out of the ministerie of the Church of Rome, as a branch out of the root of the tree, therfor it must needs be of the same nature & kind with the ministerie of the Church of Rome: For as a man begetteth a man, one light commeth of another, one Preist begetteth another in the old Testament, so in ordination by succession, one Minister maketh another: & therfor, as the branch is of the same nature with the root, the Sonne with the Father, one candle light with another, one Aaronical Preist with another: So must the minister ordeyned be of the same nature & office with him that ordeyneth him: Seing therfor the ministerie of the Church of Rome is a popish Sacrificing Preisthood, that is a false ministerie, having a false office: it must needs follow that the ministerie of the Church of England proceeding from the ministerie of the Church of Rome, as one light is inflamed of another, is of the same nature & office, & therfor a false ministerie:

neither can it suffice to say, that (as it is most true & I do willingly confesse) the ministerie of England is much Refined & Reformed from the drosse of popery: For Refine Sugar as long as you wil, it is Sugar stil in nature: Refine light as oft as you please, from brimstone light to a tallow light, from tallow to Rosen, from Rosen to wax, from wax to Venice Turpentine, from that to the most pretious subject that can be devised, yet the light is of the same nature with the brimstone light: So Refine the ministry by Succession of ordination as long & as oft as you wil, yet it is stil of the first nature: & til it be Refined to nothing, that is, til it be abolished & extinguished, a true ministerie can never be raised vp againe: For who can bring a cleane thing out of that which is vncleane?

### The third Argument.

The true ministerie hath a true vocation & calling, by election, approbation, & ordination of that faithful people wher he is to administer.

The ministry of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England, hath not the true vocatiō & calling, by election, approbation, & ordination of a faithful people where th[e]y doe administer.

Ergo, the ministry of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is not the true ministry which Christ hath placed in his Church.

The Major or first part of this argument is evident by these Scriptures compared together, Act. 6. 2-6. and 14. 23. 1. Timoth. 3. 10. and 4. 14. also it is evident by that which was observed, proved, and answered, concerning the seaventh Section of this Lettre.

The Minor or second part of the argument is evident in it self: For it is apparant that the ministry of England is called by Successive ordination made by a Prelate & his chaplin, in his owne chappel, with Subscription to the abominations of Antichrist, conteyned in the 3. articles, with the oath of Canonical obedience to the Antichristian prelacy their Spiritual LL. & jurisdiction, courts, & canons: by giving the holy Ghost, apishly & blasphemously abusing the words of Christ, Ioh. 20. 22. 23.



giving therby to the Preist ordeyned, powre to remit & retayne sinnes, which Christ hath given only to the body of the Church, & not to the ministers by Successive ordination, as Sacrificing powre was propagated by Genealogie in the old Testamēt from Preist to Preist: then the preist thus ordeyned is inforced vppon a parish, with the Patrons presentation, & the LordB. his institution, & the Archdeacons induction, & his owne tolling of a bell, & taking hold of the Ring of the Church dore contrary to the liking of al the bad men in the parish if he be a reformist, & contrary to al the Puritanes in the parish, if he be a Formalist & with the liking of al the goodfellowes in the parish if he be a dumbdrinking-swaggering Preist: & if this be the true vocation of Christs true Ministers, taught in his Testament, then are the ministers of England true: if not, then is their Ministry false: & for this point I appeale to every good conscience & vpright hart in England: if any man be made minister any other way, he is not made according to law, & his ministry is voyd by law & a nullity in England: & I dispute only against the ministry established by law & if ther be any other ministry besides, or contrary to law, which you Mr. Bern. will plead for, let it be discribed & confirmed by the rules of Christs Testament, & when we know it, we wil then acknowledg it, if the Lord Iesus in his new Testament wil give approbation vnto it: otherwise this we hold for the present cōcerning the ministry of the assemblies Ecclesiastical of the land.

The next point to be handled is the answering of your objections, reasons, & cavils which you bring against this doctryne which we teach, & for the ratefying of your ministry to be true, & I tel you Mr. Bern. you had need bring good ground, or els you & your Fellow ministers wilbe found False Prophets, Theeves, and Robbers. Math. 7. 15. Iohn. 10. 1.

That which you alledg for your selves is conteyned from the pag. 128–146. of your book. The first point wherof is this that (you say) your ministry is true bicause you convert Soules: I answer two things, 1. that you convert no man to that true visible faith taught in the

new Testament of Christ, wherby mans conversion must be judged: but you do pervert men from it dayly: as evident experiēce teacheth: For your books against the Separation, your preaching & Sermons against the way of the Lord, your conferences & disputations, & perswasions, for men to forsake the truth, & to continue stil with you in the communion of your Antichristian abominations, or having forsaken you to returne back againe into Egypt, these & the like courses of yours most frequent to the best Reformists of the land plainly manifest that you convert none at all to the faith of Christs new Testament, but you pervert al that you possibly can from the same: Now what you do in secreat betwixt the L. & the soules of them that heare you, he only that seeth in secreat knoweth in particular: particularly & certainly we know not nor enquire not: See more of this point in that which is written before & in the lettre to Mr. S. at the end of this book, 2. let it be granted that you do convert mē even to the true visible faith of the new Testament, I say this is no proof sufficient of the truth of your ministry, that is to say, that you are those true Pastors mentioned, Eph. 4. 11. Act. 20. 28. 1. Pet. 5. 1-3. 1. Tim 3. 2. Tit. 1. 6-9 For these officers were givē to the true church: which Church was established befor these officers were, & these officers were occupied about the feding, that is teaching & guiding of those particular Churches wherto they attended: the Churches therfor consisting of Saints already converted to the faith of the new Testament, how doth conversion argue a true ministerie of Pastor, or Elder, or Bb. which converteth not as his proper work, but only feedeth, that is edifieth & buildeth vp men converted, by teaching & guiding them in the wayes of the Lord? See more of this point also in the letter to Mr S. at the latter end of this book: & in that which is written before which I desire may be considered.

But heer you object that the Apostle, that is, one sent proveth his calling by the seale of his ministerie, viz. conversion: see: Rom. 4. 14. 15. 1. Cor. 9. 2. & 2. Cor. 3. 1-3. & 13. 3. 5. & that it cannot be proved that Iesus Chr. doth worke by false meanes, & it is our owne grant.

I answer that if your argument be framed into forme it is this.

He that converteth Soules is an Apostle, as Paul,  
2. Cor. 3. 1-2,

The Ministers of England convert Soules.

Ergo, the ministers of England are Apostles as Paul: or thus.

He that converteth Soules is sent of God. Rom. 10.  
14. 15.

The Ministers of England convert Soules.

Ergo, the ministers of England are sent of God.

If I should yeeld your first argument thē it would follow that you & al the ministers that convert soules in England are Ap. but you intend not to prove your selves Apst. but ordinary Pastors of visible churches: & therefore your argument if it were yeelded proveth not your purpose: & I know you do not challeng to be an Apostle as Paul was.

Againe to answer to your second argumēt, we yeeld you that no mā cā cōvert to the true faith of Chr. new Testamēt which is visible, except he be sent of God: but seing you pervert men frō the new testament of Chr. (as I have proved) how can you herby prove your selves to be sent of God? nay I say you are the instruments of Sathan sent by the L. in his wrath to keep the people in bondage frō the obedience of the faith taught in the new testament: I do not determine what you are invisibly, secretly known to the L. neither doth the Scripture teach vs so to judg of faith: For how can the Scripture teach vs visible to judg an invisible thing which is not appearing in visible Fruites?

Further wher as you say that the 1. Cor. 9. 1. & 2. Cor. 3. 1-3. doth not intend the constitution of the Church of the Corinthians, & other Churches: but their conversion from idolatry to embrace the doctryne of the gospel by faith: I answer that these two things which you distinguish are al one, & they are no other in distinction then Aarons beard, & the beard of Aaron (as you speake): for to convert men to the Faith of the gospel, is to convert men to the true constituted Church of Christ: For they are not converted to the true faith til

they be converted & established into the true Church if it may be found: So that this objection of yours is very insufficient if not altogether ridiculous: & for the force of the Apostles argument in these two places of the Corinthians, I say it is mistaken by you vtterly, & so wrested from the Holy Ghosts purpose, & misapplied by you to prove your intention. For the seale of Pauls Apostleship was the Church of the Corinthians converted to the faith, & established into the true constitution of the new Testament 1. Cor. 9. 2. & so Paul expoundeth himself in the other place 2. Cor. 3. 10. saying, that he was made an able Minister of the new Testament, even as Moses was of the old: For the vnderstanding of which place & the whole matter, you must remember what Moses did to the Church of the Iewes, & what Paul did to the Church of the Corinthians: Moses did constitute the Church of the Iewes, according to the paterne shewed him in the mount & that most faithfully, Heb. 8. 5. Paul being the Apostle of the Gentils sent by Chr. Iesus for that purpose, hath established the Church of the Corinthians, according to that paterne which Christ the Mediator revealed vnto him: which none could doe but an Apostle sent by Christ: So that the force of Pauls Argument to prove himself an Apostle must thus be propounded & conceaved.

He that hath the seale of an Apostelship is an Apostle.

Paul hath the seale of an Apostelship, viz: an infallible direction from Christ Iesus by the Spirit to convert & establish the Church of the Corinthians into the true constitution of the new Testament.

Ergo: Paul is an Apostle of Iesus Christ.

Now Mr. Bern. I would require you to answer directly & plainly whither this be not the true Scope & intent of these two places of Scripture: if yea: then are you a most ignorant & shameles perverter & false interpreter of the Scriptures, wherof I require your repentance before the Lord & the world (for your sinne is publique:) if nay: then discover the contrary if you can & justifie your self: or els I doe professe vnto you, & to all the ministers of England, that you doe abuse the honest harted people

of the Land, misleading them meerly by the pretence of this argument of converting soules: For they feeling in their consciences secretly the Lords work of inward conversion by the ministry of the Land, especially the sincerest & most forward puritans thereby are brought to reverence their ministry: & vnder the vizard of this inward work in their consciences pretending conversion to the visible faith of Christs new Testament, doe hereby resolutely persist vnder that ministry whereby (say they) they were converted, assuring themselves that it cannot be a false ministry that converteth men to the Lord inwardly and secretly: then you the ministers of the Land, deceaving others, & being deceived your selves by the misconstruction of these & the like places of Scripture stand vp stoutly to defend your ministry after this manner: are wee not true ministers of Iesus Christ? have wee not converted Soules? are not you the Seale of our ministerie, the forward professors of the Land? wee appeale vnto your consciences if you in our ministry have not felt the powre of the word to your inward conversion: If this be so: how can you forsake your Fathers that begat you? how can you go to the Separation that never cōverted you? &c. I answer what you doe inwardly in conversion, I dispute not, & the Scripture regardeth not: what you doe outwardly that I plead, & the Scripture discovereth: you convert not a man to the true faith of Christ which is visible in the visible communion of the true Church of the Apostle Pauls constitution such as was the Church of the Corinthians: and therfor you cannot by your inward invisible conversion (which you plead for) prove your ministry: For except you can produce such an effect as Paul did in the Corinthians you cannot prove your selves to be the true ministers that are sent of God. For Paul saith yee Corinthians are our Epistle vnderstood & read of al men: So that Pauls Seale of his ministry was an outward visible, legible faith, viz: The faith of the true Church of the new Testament whereinto the Apostle had established them, which al men did see behold, & read manifestly: wherefore if you the Ministers of England wil prove your selves to be the true ministers of the new

Tes[t]ament, then shew mee such a seale of your ministry as the Apostle heere speaketh of: convert men, & establish them in the true Apostolical Church of the primitive institution, & I for my part wil yeeld vnto you, that as paul was sent extraordinarily, so are you ordinarily by the Lord, & you are the true ministers of Iesus Christ truly sent: Rom. 10. but seing you doe what you can to hinder al your disciples from the true Corinthian Church established by paull according to the paterne of Christs new Testament, not bringing the people that depend vpon you so far as you know & acknowledg, but stil counsel them to stay & wayt for a better tyme, til the civil Magistrate wil give his allowance, vnder these pretences stil keeping them in Spiritual boundage to the abominations of Antichrist retayned in the Land: I say herby you manifestly discover vnto al the world, that seing you know the wil of your Lord & Mr. Christ, & doe it not, you are worthy to be beaten with many stripes: that seing you break the commaundements of Christ & teach men so, you are the least (that is none) in the Kingdome of Heaven: practising flat contrary to the Apostles who thought it better to obey God then man: & yet the Magistrates that forbad them were the Magistrates of the true Church of the Iewes: wherefore breefly to answer both Ministers & professors: To the professors I say: Shew mee your faith by embracing the whole new Testament of Christ: To the ministers I say: Shew mee the Seale of your ministry by converting & establishing a Church after the Apostolique Corinthian frame & constitution: & I wil grant that then you are true ministers, & your disciples truly converted: in the meane tyme I wil judg your visible standing in Christianity as it is visible: & your invisible being in Christianity I wil leave to the Lord, who seeth in secreat, & who knoweth who are his, not doubting but the Lord hath his thousands even in the depth of popery much more among you: & this is that Mr. Bern. which wee hold & grant concerning this point.

Now for your objection which you for vs make & answer pag. 129. 130. That private persons may convert, I say you herein also are deceaved & deale deceitfully:

For you are to distinguish of conversion according to the circumstance of tyme wherein mē were converted to Christ: Iohn converted & baptized many into Christ Iesus before the visible Church of the new Testament was revealed, which came vppon the day of Pentecost, Act. 2. Eph. 4. 11. Thus were al the Disciples of Iohn & of Christ converted, of this conversion & Faith must the places of the Evangelists be vnderstood: as namely that Ioh. 4. 39. & others: so were the Iewes, Proselites, & some of Samaria converted, for as yet Chr. was not preached to the Gentils, which he himself forbad to be done, Mat. 10. thus were mē converted to beleve that the Messias which they knew should come, was come, & that Iesus the Sonne of God, & the Sonne of Mary was hee: who vppon their conversion & baptisme became Christs Disciples to learne & practise whatsoever he should afterward teach them: That this is so read, Act. 18, 23. & 19. 2. 3. Now after the day of Pentecost, conversion was larger as I may so speake in respect of the visible manifestatiō therof & other like considerations: For then men were converted to the matter of the day of Pentecost, & to al that frame & constitution of the church of the new Testament which was purchased by Christs death, & exhibited vnto the Apostles by the promise of the Spirit given vnto them: Thus were men converted after the death, resurrection, & ascension of Christ, & after the comming of the Holy Ghost as may be seen, Act. 2. 38–42. & 8. 16. 17. & 10. 44–48. So that Iohn converted men to the Faith of Christ to be manifested: after the day of Pentecost, the Apostles converted men to the Faith of Christ already given & exhibited: Seing therfor that the new Testament of Christ is now confirmed & established, & revealed manifestly in the Scriptures of the Apostles of our Lord, al that are converted now are converted to the new Testament & the ordinances thereof, or els they are not converted to vs visible: This being thus premised as necessarily to be vnderstood for the true knowledg of true conversion: in the next place we must take notice (for the answering of the objection of private mens converting) that Antichrist hath defaced the Faith of Christ in the whole new Testament,

& so the true ministry: & therfor it must needs be that whosoever doth convert from Antichristianisme, & establisheth a people into the true Faith & new Testamēt of Christ performeth that work either as a minister of Antichrist: or as an Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist of Christ: or as a Private person: For this is a sufficient enumeration of parts: ther being no other sort off persons to convert men from Antichrist to Christ but one of these: For you have heard that Pastors do not convert but feed the flock: I suppose you dare not avouch that the Ministers off Antichrist do convert to the true Faith & new Testament off Christ Iesus: neither dare you say that ther are now in the world the offices of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists: wherfor when men convert they do it as private persons: Therefore choose Mr. Bern. which of these three you wil affirme: & then tel mee whither private persons doe not convert, as Act. 11. 19-21. & this shal suffice for this point, of converting performed by private persons in the rising vp from the Apostacy of Antichrist, & for the discovering of your objection & answer.

Now from the pa. 130-141. you teach vs the doctryne of the vocaion of ministers which I wil not altogether disallow, nor approve wholly: & seing it aperteyneth not to our queston, I leave it wholly vntoucht: & come to that which is pa. 141-146. wher you endeavour againe to prove your ministry true, & that after this manner.

They that are called of Christ, having both gifts & graces: hey that are also outwardly caled of the church beng examined, aproved, elected, ordeyned: they that reach true doctrine, administer the true Sacrament, performe their office faithfully, live conscionably, are assisted by Chr. to convert soules, & are aproved by the people, are the true ministers of Christ.

The ministers of the Church of England have al these particulars.

Ergo, the ministers of the Church of England are the true ministers of Christ.

I answer you Mr Ber. that the Popish ministers have al these forsaid qualibations in common with the ministers



of England, (I plead not of the degree or measure of these things, for I confesse some of them to be much more in the English ministers but I speake of the kind or nature of the qualifications): which I prove by induction thus.

1. The Popish ministers many of them have excellent outward gifts & graces as much learning, vtterance, zeale, & gravity as any ministers of England, though al of them have not so: as al the ministers of England have not so.

2. The Popish min[i]sters are called examined, aproved, elected, ordeyned of the Church, (that is as you expound, the cheef governors, who are as true ministers as you are, seing your ministry is a branch of the roote): So are you.

3. The Popish ministers preach the true doctryne of Christ, & administer his true Sacraments: for youretaine the baptisme that men have in popery as true, ad they breake and eate bread and wine in remembrance of Christs death: & although you preach more truth then they do, & administer baptisme & the L. Super more purely, or rather lesse corruptly, yet they hav: the same truths & Sacraments that you have, even the Scriptures, baptizme, & the L. Supper.

4. The Popish ministers many of them peforme their office Faithfully in many things as Faithfull as you do: & the best of you do not performe al the pars of the true ministry, & the worst of you are as badas the worst popish preist.

5. The popish ministers some of them live conscionably according to their rule, the best of you do no more: & the worst of you are as vild beasts as thegrossest shave-lings in Rome.

6. As the Popish ministers convert none visibly to the true Faith and new Testament of Christ, & yet I doubt not but that thousands are by tem converted & saved (what Mr. Be. wil you condemn al the men that have lived from Gregory the great ↓ the council of Constance, & to this day vnder the dornions of the pope? For shame do not so.) So though the frwardest ministers of England convert many invisibly tdlife & Salvation by Christ, yet you ordinarily say, that th Formalists convert none, & the dumb ministers cannot onvert, bicause they

cannot preach: & none of you al convert a man visibly to the true Faith taught in the new Testament of Christ, but with al your might pervert men from it.

7. Finally, the popish ministers are approved by their people, aswel as the best or worst of you are, according to the dispositions of the people.

Seing therfor that al these things are as evident & pregnant for the popish ministers as for you, therfor either they are true ministers if you be true: or els bicause they are fals (as you say) & yet have al these forsaid qualifications, therfor these qualifications make not a true ministry: So that you see Mr. Ber. that your argument is weak to prove your ministry true, & you must seek out a better definition of a true ministry, & according therto shape your ministry, if you wil have it true.

In the next place you with an objection & answer would prove that although your ministers have a false entrance, viz: ordination of the Bb. yet may be true ministers: & namely by two reasons, 1. For that none were ever ordeyned but by ecclesiastical persons; as Apostles, Evangelists, Bbs. 2. a false entrance cannot make a false ministry, as in marriage.

I answer: First, if it were yeilded you that ther could be no true ministers made without ordination of Apostles, Evangelists, Bbs. yet bicause your L.Bbs. are not those true Apostles, Evangelists, Bbs. of the primitive institution, but rather the Servants of Antichrist, (as your forwardest professors & preachers instantly affirme) therefore ther ordination is Antichristian, and so your ministry is false in the entrance: but Secondly, I deny it to be true which you affirme for ordination by precedent Elders: For I have proved vnto you by many vndeniable reasons that the whole ministeriall powre of Christ is given to the body of the Church, whereby, as in the first constituting of Churches, so in the rising of Churches from Antichristianisme, the body hath powre to al the Holy ordinances of Christ for ther mutual edification to life & Salvation, whereof the true ministry is a principal: & therefor the Church hath powre to enjoy the true ministry: & you confesse the Church wanting officers

hath powre to elect her officers, which is the principal, Act. 6. & 14. & why not to approve & ordeyne which are but the inferior & lesse principal? Further, you may read Act. 1. that before ther were any Apostles actually in office, the Church did cho[ose] Mathias into the rome of Iudas, & that by a commō consent: wherfor this first exception of yours is nothing.

Your Second exception is as weake: that seing a faulty entrance into mariage which is one ordinance of God, doth not disanul it, why should a faulty entrance into the ministry disanul it? I say the violating of accidental circumstances through ignorance shall not disanul any of Gods ordinances: For then their should be no true having of any or[di]nance of God whatsoever: Seing it is impossible wee should perfectly & strictly keep all & every circumstance therto aperteyning: but the wilful breach of essential parts of the ordinance doth corrupt the ordinance & make it false: as for example: The matter or forme being false, the ordinance cannot possible be true: A man marieth a mayde that is 6. yeer old: or a woman marieth an Evnuch: the mariage is false, for the matter is false: A man taketh a woman not as his wife, but as a concubine, as the yonger brethren the gētlemen of Venice doe, this is no true mariage, because it wanteth the true forme of mariage: so: your Churches assume them ministers, suppose they be the true pastors described in the word, as I am perswaded your Puritanes so endeavour, I say because your churches or Ecclesiastical assemblies are false, your ministry is not true: For a true Minister & a false Church cannot mary together: Further, if your Church & ministry were true, yet if you should be presented by a Patron, ordeyned by a Prelate, inducted by an Archdeacon, contrary to the wil of the Church, the mariage is false, because the calling is false: So then you see Mr. Ber. how litle your similies help you wherein notwithstanding you by your disciples are thought Specialy to excel, and to have the prehemence over your fellow Preists.

And heer you bring a flourish out of the 10. of Iohn to prove your ministers true ministers: what Mr. Bern.

in good sooth doe you plead this for all your Ministers of England? Speak plainly & double not with God & man: doe you in your conscience think that al the ministers of England, evē your dumb Preists (whome you have excluded by your covenant) your grosse nonresidents & idle bellyes the Cathedral or Collegiate Preists, your double benificed men, that al these & every one of them doe enter in by the dore? have entrance by the porters opening, know their sheep by name, lead thē by sound doctrine & holy life save many & destroy none? Speak plainly Mr. Ber. to this point, & seek no shifts: & yet these are the only men allowed by Law in your ministry: For be he never so dumb, idle, non resident, wicked, yet if he subscribe weare the geere, & do read the Service book, & wil do homage to his Spiritual Lords & their Courts, if he be *amicus curiæ*, if he be conformable & obedient al is wel: is not this even so? this you know in your conscience Mr. Bern. & therfor pag. 143. Lin. 7. 8. you speake warily: you say: The propertyes of a true Shepheard agree wel with Ministers in England: you dare not say with al the Ministers of England: Therefore by your owne conscience al the Ministers of England are not true Shepherds: your Lords the Prelates wil con you litle thank for this: but let vs exclude your dumb Preists, idle bellyes, and al the rable of the conformists if you wil, which are 9. parts of 10. (and then I think you are excluded your self among them:) I wil plead only against the best minister that standeth by Law in your assemblies: 1. he entereth not in by the dore, seing the dore is only in the Sheepfold, that is in the true Church: & seing you are a False Church (as is proved) your dore cannot be true. 2. The porter (that is as you say Gods Spirit: but I think rather the porter to be the watchman, that is the whole Church, Mat. 13. 33–37.) he openeth not to you, for you convert none to the true visible Faith of the new Testament, or if you did, it doth not prove your true Pastorship, seing Shepherds do not make sheep, but feed them: it should only prove that you are Spiritual Fathers that convert men which private persons doe as you have heard, 3. he doth not know them nor is knowne of his Sheep: For of 300. perhaps he wil not

acknowledg above 30. to be sheep, the rest he thinketh goates, & the goates wil not acknowledg him as Shepheard, but hate & fly from him. 4. he doth not lead them by sound doctryne to perfection, but by False doctryne perverteth them from the truth, which blasphemously he proclaymeth dayly in his pulpit to be Brownisme, Schisme, Heresy, &c. 5. he doth not lead them by Godly life, for if the cheef part of Godlines be the true worship of God, how doth he lead them in Godlines, that leadeth them vp & downe in your False Church, Ministry, VVorship, & Government, blindfold like the men of Sodom that sought Lots dore: Therefore I dare in the true feare of the Lord cal the best of you al a Spiritual thief, & a robber, yea a VVolf that cometh to kil, rob, and destroy: not that you so entend to doe: or that you do so wilfully, (& yet I would have you Mr. Bern. Look wel to your self, for I dare not cleare you from sinninge against your conscience, who have acknowledged the truth:) but for that you do so indeed, & by necessary consequent: For seing you are in a False Church, & Ministry, and vse a False worship, & submit to a False Government, you must needes by defending al this Falsehood & teaching it to others, & perswading them to the obedience therof, perswade them to al these abominations of Antichrist, & so do rob them, kil them, & raven them, like wolves, theeves, & robbers: For men may rob, kil, & destroy ignorantly, as Paul did when he was a Pharisee, as I my self did when I was one of your Preists, & as many do in popery, except you wil say that they al do sinne against their conscience, Act. 3. 17. 1. Tim. 1. 13.

And heer you have a fling at our ministers, & wil needes have them no Lawful ministers: you dare not say false: & this you endeavour to prove bicause that we are not made Ministers by Successive ordination.

First, Mr. Be. I tel you bicause of your importunity in this particular of ordination by Succession that if it must needes be (which we deny vtterly) that we have it, if you have it, for we were made Preists by your prelates: why then do you condemne our ministry say you? why do you condemne the ministry of the Church of Rome say I? For if you may have a true ministry, & yet condemne

the ministers of the Church of Rome, from whence yours came: then may we have a true ministry, & yet condemne your ministry whence ours cometh: this I speake, not for that I plead it, but to stop your mouth: For I vtterly renounce your orders which I had from Wickā prelate of Lincolne, when I was chosen Fellow of Christs College in Cambridg: & I receaved & doe retayne my ministry from that particular Church wherof I am Pastor: which hath the whole powre of Christ ministeriall delegated to her from Christ her Husband, when he contracted with her.

Secondly, you neither can nor do prove Succession in the new Testament: For that which you alledg for the Succession of the old Testament, I say it was typical, & is abolished by Christ. For do you think this is a good argument: one Preist begat another in the old Testament, therfor one minister must ordeine another in the new Testament: why may you not plead after this manner: Therfor one Preist may beget another Preist in the new Testament? & wheras you say that Preists did consecrate preists, which consecration was ther ordination, I deny it vtterly, & I prove the contrary, that during the captivity of Babilon ther were many priests borne & none consecrated, only for their admission in to the preists office it was requisite that they should shew their Genealogie, Nehe. 7. 64, 65. but their ordination was their generation or byrth: though I deny not but when they entered into the performance of their office ther were some rites performed which was no part of their ordination: but I would know of you what is ordination: is it any thing but the declaring of the partie elected & approved to be in office, by prayer for him & a chardg given vnto him? can none do this but a precedent officer? Againe, for the old Testament I say, God created the first Preist, viz: Adam, then til Aaron men begat Preists, for the eldest in the Family were the Preists: Moses who was the yonger brother & no preist ordeined Aaron & his Sonnes: after that Preists begat preists til Christs tyme: then Christ appointed officers in the Church: Apostles made Evangelists, Evangelists & Apostles ordeined Bbs. & Deacons: al this I confesse Mr. Ber.

what is this to Succession in the new Testament? I shew you plainly that the Church Elected Mathias, ther being yet no Apostles, Act. 1. ther being Apostles the Church elected Deacons, Act. 6. & Elders, Act. 14. & seing they performed election which is the contract, why may they not performe all? For ordination is nothing in respect of Election, as you may see in al Societyes & corporations whatsoever: The contract which is the mutual consent of a man & woman for mariage maketh man and wife before God: Election which is the mutual consent of the pastor & his Flock, maketh a man pastor of his Flock: So that in this particular Mr. Bern. you show your willfullnes and blindnes asmuch as in any thing in your book, although I doubt not, but it is the best that can be pleaded for Antichrist: & thus much for the second part of this Section.

The third part of this Section is, that your worship is a false worship wherin, as I have dealt in the two former points, so wil I deale in this, viz, first prove the position: Secondly answer your cavils.

To prove your worship a false worship I vse these Arguments following.

#### First Argument.

The true worship of the L. cannot possiblie be offered vp in a false Church.

The Ecclesiastical assemblies of England are false Churches.

Ergo. The worship offered vnto the L. in those Ecclesiasticall assemblies is a false worship.

The ground of this argument is this, that al the Ecclesiastical actions performed by a false Church are stayned with the false constitution of the church: For God wil not have every communion of men worship him, but he wilbe worshipped by such a company of people as he hath described in his new Testament: & as in the old Testament no man or company of men might worship or be accepted visibly, but such as were circumcized, Gen. 17. 14. Exod. 12. 48. Deut. 23. 1-4. Act. 21. 28. 2. King. 17. 25-28. Ioh. 4. 22. So in the new Testament no man or communion of men visiblie can be accepted

of the L. but such as are described in the new Testament, viz. men Separated from al the abominations of Anti-christ, 2. Cor. 6. 17. & gathered into the name of Christ Iesus, Mat. 18. 20. & being made Disciples have received baptisme whereby they are counited into Christ, Mat. 28. 19. If any communion of men otherwise constituted (viz: men not Separated, not gathered together, not gathered into Christs name, not made Disciples, not baptized truely with the baptisme of the new Testament,) if any such company of men do worship God ther worship is not accepted of God: but as the L. sent Lyons among the Samaritanes for persuming to worship him in the land of Israel, they being an vncircumcized cōpany, 2. King 17. 24. 25. & as the L. punished the vagabond Iewes, exorcists by the violence of an evil Spirit, for naming the L. Iesus being an vnbeleeving & vnbaptized company, Act. 19. 13-17. even so wil the L. be avenged on al them that joyning together to worship God, have not Separated themselves, or calling vppon the name of the Lord, do not depart frō iniquity, 2. Cor. 6. 17. 2. Tim. 2. 19. neither wil it serve to say that the worship is true bicause it is true conceaved prayer, or true preaching, or thanksgiving: For true worship must be defined, not only in the matter, but cheefly in the forme: For otherwise among the Anti-christian papists & Heretiques ther is true conceaved prayer, preaching & thāksgiving. & els in the old Testament ther was true Sacrificing among the Babylonians whē they Sacrificed an oxe to the God of Israel, Dan. 6. 25. 26. whereas it was manifested that no Sacrifice could be accepted that was offered with straunge fire, Levit. 10. 1. 2. & therefor the Sacrifices of the Babylonians must needes be abominable, though the matter was true, bicause the forme which cheefly consisted in the fire was false: So though the matter of the worship of the new Testament be true, viz: conceaved prayer, preaching, praising God, yet bicause it proceedeth not from the true fire which is alwayes living vppon the Altar, Levit 6. 9-13. at Ierusalem, that is, in the true Church and Temple of God, bicause it is not inflamed by the true Spirit of Christ, the true visible annoynting which is only in the true body the true Church, (Ephes. 4. 4. For



there is one body and one Spirit :) Therefore the worship is not true worship visibly: what it may be inuisibly I dispute not: nor doe not censure at all, but leave to the Lord, and to every conscience.

#### The Second Argument.

The worship that is offered vp vnto the L. by a false Ministerie, is a false worship, & cannot visibly be judged true or accepted.

The worship of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is offered vp by a false ministry: as hath been proved already.

Ergo: the worship of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is a false worship, & cannot visibly be judged true or accepted.

The ground of this Argument is the same with the former: wherefore as in the old Testament the worship that was performed in Israel by the Preists of Ieroboams devising which were not of the Linage & genealogie of Aaron was a false worship, & could not be accepted visibly, or be judged as accepted judging by the rules of the word. 1. King. 12. 31-33. and as the incēse which Azariah the King of Iudah would have offered, could not be accepted or so judged, bicause it was not offered by the true Preists the Sonnes of Aaron, 2. Chron. 26. 16-22. and the King was punished with Leprosy for his presumption: So al the worship which is offered vp vnto the Lord by a false ministry, is visibly to be judged abhominable, bicause Christ only offereth vp to his Father the worship of the worshippers which his new Testament hath described & no other, Rev. 8. 3. 4. cōpared with Revel. 5. 8-10. & 11. 1. stil let it be remembered that I dispute not, nor censure not, the invisible things of the Lord.

#### The third Argument.

Iewish, that is literal, stinted, imposed book-worship is false worship.

The worship of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is Iewish, that is literal, stinted imposed, book-worship.

Ergo, the worship of the Ecclesiastical assemblies of England is a false worship.

The ground of this argument is the Analogie and proportion which ther is betwixt the type and the truth, the shadow and the substance, the lettre and the Spirit, the Old Testament with the ordinances therof, & the new Testament with the ordinances thereof: For seing the old Testament was a type of the new, therfor the Church, ministry, worship, & government of the old Testament were types of the Church, ministry, worship, and government of the new Testament, therfor the worship of the old testamēt being lyteral beginning in the lettre (as was carnal circumcision Rom. 2. 29.) did type forth the worship of the new Testament to beginne in the Spirit, Ioh. 4. 23. 24. For the Lettre was a type of the Spirit, Col. 2. 17. Seing therfor that Reading the Law was a typical ordinance of the old Testament, & therfor literal, stinted, manifesting the letter, & book-worship, it followeth that it is now abolished by Christ, & the thing signified by the literal Reading is now to be retayned in the new testament, which is, vttering matter out of the hart, called the manifestation of the Spirit, the demonstration of the Spirit, the ministring of the Spirit, & the like: by which phrases of Speech the Holy Ghost would teach vs, that seing we are set at liberty from the bondage of the law which was a Schoolmr. to leade to Christ, we are not therfor againe to be intangled with the yoke of bondage in any thing, no not in this matter of stinted, literal, book-worship which is flat Iudaisme: but we being placed in the liberty of the Spirit, are to vse our gifts in Gods worship, as the spirit giveth vtterance, as we see the Apostles practised vpon the day of Pentecost, when the promise of the Spirit was fulfilled vpon them, & as we see the Church of Corinth practised, 1. Cor. 14. 15. 16. 26. & 12. 7-11. He that desireth to know further of this particular of book-worship let him read the book lately published intituled: The differences of the Churches of the Seperation: wher this point is largely discussed, which if it be the truth I desire may be embraced, if not I require an answer of them to whom it is specially directed: to conclude this first point, Mr. Bern. seing your VVorship for the most part

is book-worship, I conclude it to bee Iewish, and so false VVorship.

Now I come to answer your cavils which are conteyned pag. 146–151.

First, you referre vs to the treatise in the end of your book, & I referre you for answer partly to Mr. Ains. partly to the book intituled the differences of the Churches of the Separation: For I doe acknowledg that in the Old Testament, Psalmes, Prayers, & Prophecies were read out of a book: & yet further I answer three things: 1. that it will not follow that seing it was so in the old Testament, therfor it must be so in the new: nay contrary: it was so in the old Testament, therefore it must not be so in the new: This is the true manner of reasoning: or thus: In the Old Testament they had Psalmes, Prophecyes, Prayers, read out of a book, which was the Type, the manifestation of the Lettre: Therefore in the new Testament, wee must have Psalmes, Prophecyes, Prayers, brought out of the hart, which is the Spiritual book of the New Testament, wherein the Lord doth write his Lawes, Heb. 8. 10. which is the truth, the manifestation of the Spirit, 2. it will not follow that if it were granted that reading the Prayers, Prophecyes, & Psalmes of Scripture out of the Originall tongs the Hebrue and Greek, were lawfull, that therefore the reading of the Apocrypha translations which are the workes of men is Lawful: For the one is interpretation of a Language or Tong, that is the vttering of matter from the knowledg of the Tongs and the gift of interpreting: the other is reading wordes out of a book, which a child of eight yeeres old may doe. 3. neither will it follow that if it were found lawfull to read the English translation of the Scriptures, therefore it shalbe lawfull to read your English Masse-book, your book of Homilies and Articles, your book of Canons: For then why may you not read also Mr. Perkins vppon the Creed, Henry Smyths Sermons, or any other good Catechisme, Commentary, or Sermon book?

Secondly, you prove your worship true by two reasons, 1. Say you, you worship no False God. 2. you worship the true God with no False worship: For you preach the true word, admi[ni]ster the true Sacraments, pray such

prayers as are agreeable to the Scripture, & the forme of prayer taught by Christ: & if any things els be prescribed, it is not imposed as worship: Or if it were prescribed as a part of worship, it doth not therefore follow that all the worship is False: well: I answer: That Israell in Ieroboams tyme and after, and when Aaron made the Calfe, did not worship a false God, & yet their worship was false: So may your worship be false though you worship the true God that hath revealed himself in the old Testament: but their worship is not true by your owne confession: therfor your consequent is not good that seing you worship the true God, your worship must needes be true: if the meanes wherby you worship be a false meanes devised by the wit of a man & not taught in the word of God, I say your worship is false: & so that place of Mat. 15. 1. importeth that whosoever worshippeth God by any invented meanes, taught by mans precept worshippeth God in vayne: Such is an image as the second commaundement teacheth: now the meanes of your worship are false, as first your false Church which is an Idol. 2. your stinted devised, imposed, literal service book, which is an Idol, 3. your false Christ which is not your King, Preist, & Prophet, which is one of our Idols: For though you truly beleeve concerning his person, yet your Faith is false, & your doctryne false concerning his offices & mediation: & therfor these meanes of your worship being false meanes, they must needes be false worship: therfor, seing your doctryne is much of it false: your communiō false: your worship stinted & bookworship: it followeth that your word is not the true word, your Sacraments the signes of your false Faith & communion are not true: your prayers are not true: & whereas you plead that other things besides the word, Sacrament, & prayer, are not imposed as worship, I answer: what doe they then in your worship? wil you mingle that which is no worship, & worship together? either they are worship, or els let them be cast out of your worship: & further, whereas you alledg that though some parts of your worship be false, yet all shal not be false, I grant it, if your Church were true, & your ministry true: but seing your Church & ministry

be false, therfor though you do preach the true word, & administer the true Sacraments, & pray true prayers, yet they can not be true worship offered vp in a false Church, by a false ministry, for the falsehood of the Church & ministry doth essentially cor[r]upt the worship: if al that is set vppon the table be either poisō, or poysoned meate, I say such is your worship: For death is in your worship, as Coloquintida was in the pot: So that you see the distinction of true & false doth most properly aperteyne to your worship: as it doth also to your ministry & Church, as hath been shewed.

In the next place you declare vnto vs out of Philip Mornæus the order of the worship of the old Testament, & out of the Scripture the parts of the worship of the new Testament, & out of Iustinus Martyr the order of worship in his tymes, which I wil not contradict, & yet I plead, that seing your Church is false, your ministry false, your servicebook a false meanes of worship, therfor though al that you alledg were true, it doth not follow that your worship is true: & wheras you plead that reading, Col. 4. 16. is cōmaunded as a part of worship, I wish you to read the book intituled the differences of the Churches of the Seperation, & you shall have your answer: and thus much for this Section.

#### The eleventh Section.

The next position is your third, which is this, viz.

3. In maintaining that it is not lawful to heare any ministers amongst vs whatsoever they be, nor to joyne in prayer with such as feare God among vs: I for my part hold both vnlawful: bicause your ministers are false ministers: & your people of false Churches: Now how can wee who are the Church and body of Christ, have any Spirituall communion with you, who are the ministers and subjects of Antichrist. 2. corinth. 6. 14-16.

But heer you would needes have vs beleeeve that ther be many that feare God among you, & that they are particularly known vnto vs: for my part I do beleeeve generally that God hath his people in Babylon, & even among you who are Babel that is confusion: & I do also

believe that those who are miscalled by the name of Puritanes, are the most likely to be Gods people: but to say, certainly this or that Puritane hath faith or feareth God, I cannot doe by any warrant out of the word of God that I see. For know you that ther is only one true forme of a visible Church, Eph. 4. ther is one body: in this body ther is one only true faith, for the Apostle saith the faith is one: but none of you al are mēbers of this body which is a communion of faithful men Seperated from al vncleanes, & walking in the obedience of al Gods ordinances: & therefor none of you al are of the true faith which is found only in the true body.

You shal see Mr. Be. how many things I chardg you al with.

1. You are mingled with al the abhominable people of the land cōtrary to these scriptures. 2. Cor. 6. 17. Apoc. 18. 4.

2. You cal God Father jointly with al the people of the Land who are brethrē of you & members of the same Church with you: which is vntrue if you take your selves to be faithful: For they are of their Father the Devil.

3. You make Christ a Mediator to you al in common with al the profane people of the land, which is contrary to Apoc. 8. 2. Ioh. 17. 9.

4. You make al the wicked people of the land members of Christ, & members of your selves, in the seales of the covenant, if you challendg your selves to be Faithful: which is contrary to 1. Cor. 6. 15. & 10. 16. 17.

5. You refuse Christs Testament & his Kingdome, & will not have him to raigne over you in his owne Offices & Lawes: which is contrary to these places. Luk. 19. 27. Apoc. 14. 9-11.

6. You vtterly reject the censures of admonition in the thre degrees therof contrary to Mat. 18. 15-17. Heb. 10. 24. 25.

7. You suffer your selves (if you challendg to be Gods people) to be deprived & robbed of the powre of Christ, to cho[o]se your own officers contrary to Act. 6. 5. & 14. 23. 1. tim. 3. toto. & 5. 21. & 6. 13. 14.

8. You reject the truth, we by our testimony offer vnto you, yea you persecute it by slaunders, by lyes,

by raylings, though many of you have been enlightened by it: how then can we account you faithful certainly: but we must certainly know thē to be Faithful with whome we pray: For whatsoever is not of Faith is sinne: I pray you mi[s]construe me not: For although I dare not say you have Faith of a certainty, yet I hope wel of many of you in particular: but to tel you plainly I hope better of many that never knew this truth then of you & some of your Disciples whome I know by their owne confession to have beē enlightened with it, & yet now oppose against it: look to your selves, your estate is fearful: if our gospel be hid saith the Apostle, it is hid to them that perish, 2. cor. 4. 3. & when certaine were hardened & disobedient speaking evil of the way before the multitude (as you doe) Paul departed from them, & Seperated the Disciples, Act. 19. 9. & so doe wee to you, and therefore our practise is warrantable: Therefore consider these things that I write, for I professe before the Lord that this truth which wee testifie vnto you is as cleer and evident vnto vs as the noone day: and observe it well that those among you that have been enlightened with it, and now quench it, shall grow from evill to worse, and shal have Gods hand out against them, so as every man shal say the Lord is avenged of them, except they returne againe: and so I leave this point.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the eleventh Section.

Mr. Bern. Sep. Schis. pag. 152. Saith that those men have lost the feeling of former grace & all true charity, that say thus, viz: That they cannot say certainly, by any warrant of Gods word, that any of vs hath eyther Faith or feare of God: & he nameth Mr. Smyth in the margent.

Againe, pag. 58. he writeth thus, viz: one of them writeth that certainly he cannot by the word be perswaded that any of vs hath eyther true Faith or feare of God: naming Mr. Smyth in the margent.

I write in this Section thus: that particularly, & certainly, I cannot say by any warrant of Gods word that I see, that this or that person hath Faith, & feare of God among you: yet I say also: That I verely beleeve generally

that God hath his people among you, & that they are in al likely hood the persons that are miscalled Puritanes:

Heer I wish the conscionable reader to consider Mr. Bern. evil dealing whither ignorātly or maliciously I know not: I speake generally & specially: Generally I doe certainly beleeve that the Lord hath his people in England: Specially I say certainly & particularly, I know not who they be: yet in likely hood they are the Puritanes so called: now Mr. Bern. to make the Lords truth odious, & his owne part good, perverteth this speech of myne in 3. particulars, 1. he leaveth out the good that I say, viz: that I certainly beleeve Gods people to be in the Lād, & that in likely hood they are the Puritanes, 2. in his speach he leaveth out this word particularly knowne to mee, 3. he in one of his speeches, viz: pa. 59. transporteth the word, Certainly, to the beginning of the Sentence, as if I were certainly perswaded that none of the Land feared God or had Faith: I beseech the Gentle Reader to marke his fraud & evil dealing, & so to trust him according to his desert, as also to consider what I say, & therefore to read the beginning of this Section where my words are manifest: al that I entend is this: That visibly, certainly, & particularly I cannot say any one to have Faith or feare of God in the Churches of England, which are False Churches: but generally, certainly, & invisibly, I beleeve ther are thousands, viz: a remnant according to the Election of grace: See for this Rom. 11. 3. 4. compared with 1. King 19. 10. Revel. 18. 4. Mr. Bern. I wil not desire the Lord to reward you according to your workes as Paul did: but I desire the Lord to give you eyes to see, & a hart to acknowledg this your sinne, & I desire all men to take notice of Mr. Bern. deceptfull dealing in this one particular, and accordingly to judg of the rest of his dealings.

Further, pag. 152. Mr. Bern. accounteth this one of our errors, to hold that None of the Ministers of England may be heard: and pag. 155. He reckoneth this as another of our errors, to defend it to be vnlawfull to joyne in prayer with any of the assemblies.

Seing the assemblies Ecclesiastical are false Churches, and the members of the assemblies members of false



Churches, how can the members of true Churches have communion with them in that estate and standing. For Christ and Antichrist, the members of Christ, and the members of the strumpet cannot be mingled together, and as it is impossible that oyle & water should mingle, so cannot the body of Christ and Antichrist the members of the one body and of the other be made one: Brasse, Iron, Silver, Gold, cannot possibly be mingled with clay or earth: No more can the members of the true Church, and the members of the false Church: but in al the parts of Spirituall communion, as prayer, prophecy, praying God, the Sacraments, the persons that partake in them are commingled, & make one body. 1. Cor. 5. 9. 11. 2. Thes. 3. 14. 1. Cor. 10. 15. 17 & 2. Cor. 6. 14–18. Therfor whosoever shal mingle with false ministers or members of false Churches therin offer as shameful indignity to Christ, as it is to take the members of Christ, & make them the members of an harlot. 1. Cor. 6. 15.

And heer Mr. Bern. pag. 153–156. indevoureth to prove it, 1. Lawfull to heare their Ministers, 2. to be vnlawfull to heare vs, 3. to be lawfull to pray with them that are Faithful among them: For the first you say, who ever heard, that to heare the word should be a sinne? yes: I have heard it in these places of Scripture, Deut. 13. 3 Math. 7. 15. 1. Timoth. 6. 3–5. & 2. 3. 5–6. againe you say: you have converted by the word, go: you may be heard: I deny that ever you converted men visibly to the Faith of the New Testament, I regard not what you doe invisibly, for I cannot see it nor know it: what say you to them that convert in popery, shal they be heard? or doe you think they convert none invisibly? Visibly I am assured they convert not: the like I say of you. Further you plead that the Scripture commaundeth to heare the word, pronounceth them blessed that heare it, and maketh it a marke of Gods Child so to doe: I grant it, if it be preached in the Lords true ordinance, els men are forbidden to heare it, pronounced accursed that heare it, and are marked for the Servants of Antichrist for so doeing, Revelat. 14. 9–11. Moreover you say, Christ forbiddeth not to heare the Scribes and Pharisees: true, for they were members of the true

Church of the Old Testament, and their communion Typical was not polluted by Typicall vncleannes for ought that is mentioned to my knowledg: but you say Paull rejoiced that Christ was preached, though of contention & with a purpose to encrease his afflictions: Well: Paull rejoiced not that false Ministers in false Churches preached Christ, or that Christians heard them so doe: neyther doth Paull speak of visible sinnes, but of invisible affections, which he by the Spiritt discerned to bee in the Teachers, even as Peter discerned Ananias and Sapphyras dissembling: And what is this to your purpose who are both false Ministers in false Churches, & Antichristian convinced Heretiques, except you can and doe make answer, which when you have done, then, &c.

For the Second, you say wee are not to bee heard, bicause (as Brownists) wee speake our owne fantasies, & visions of our owne harts, and are obstinate. Wel Mr. Bern. I say no more for this point, but this, that every Godly mynded man give sentence whither you or wee have the truth: the tyme wil come when secret things will come to light: & your selves doe approve al that wee professe in substance except the Separation: the Lord judg betwixt you & vs: you say againe, that wee convert none but are our selves converted by you: I say al that come from you to vs are by vs converted to the truth from your errors & false wayes, & you doe not convert one man visibly to the faith: Besides I demaund when you Separated from Rome, who converted you from Rome? Finally, wee condemne no man among you, only wee declare what you are visibly in the account of the Scriptures, by reason of your false Church, & standing: & they that see the truth to be the truth & yeeld not to it woe be vnto them: & take heed you be not of them who have seen it to be the truth, & have confessed it so to be, & yet write your bookes against it: if it be so, woe be vnto you from the Lord: I say from the Lord except you repent you shal grow worse and worse: as for them that sinne through ignorance, their is a Sacrifice for their sinnes: Lett willfull scorner looke to them selves.

For the third, you say, that if wee hold you the children of God wee may pray with you: For so Christ hath taught

vs to say our Father: Well: I deny not but those among you that apertayne to the Lords Election have God for their Father, but I say they are invisible, vnknowne to vs certainly & particularly, therefore wee cannot have visible communion with them: For whatsoever is not of faith is sinne: I may have visible communion with one that is a reprobate in the Lords account, as Peter had with Iudas: & I may not have visible communion with one that is Elect in the Lords invisible Electiō, bicause he is not visibly faithful to me, as namely with thousands of you in the assemblies, bicause I cannot possibly know them certainly, & particularly.

### The twelfth Section.

The next particular of yours is the thirteenth in number, viz

13. That a company truly fearing God if any open wicked joyne with them, are not capable to choose them a minister over them: which is a truth, though you hold it error: I manifest it in this manner.

First, you cannot approve to vs certainly that you truly feare God.

Secondly, you cannot convince that they who suffer wicked men in communiō with them truly doe feare God: bicause they live in confusion with the wicked from whome they ought to be Seperated: & that therfor in that confusion & estate they have no title to choose them a minister.

Thirdly, let it be graunted for disputation sake that some fearing God doe consent with open wicked in cho[o]sing a minister, I say that Minister so chosen by the good & bad is no true Minister: For that mixt people are not the true Church: Seing the holy Ghost testifyeth, 2. Cor. 6. 17. that God wil receive only those that are seperated to be his people: & that seing those supposed faithful have the Spirit of God, & the open wicked have the Spirit of Satan, they cannot possiblie combine together, except you wil say that the holy Spirit and sathan can combine: seing then those contrary persons cannot conjoyne how can they in common choose them a minister,

or if they doe how is he a true Minister? seing they that choose him are not a true Church: I pray you Mr. Ber. in your answer dissolve vs this knot, if you can, that we may receive instruction.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the twelfth Section.

Mr. Ber. Sep. Schisme, pag. 151. Saith that this is one of our errors to hold: That our congregations as they stand, are all & every of them vncapable before God to chuse thē Ministers, though they desire the meanes of Salvation.

In the beginning of this Section, I say, that a company truly fearing God, if any open wicked joyne with them, are not capable to choose them a minister over them: & afterward in the end of the Section I say, such a mixt company are not a true Church, & a minister chosen by them is not a true minister.

Heer I desire that it may be observed that I doe not deny, but men that are mixt may ap[p]oint one to preach the word vnto them: but that which I say, is, that a mixt company of good & bad is not a true Church: & that a man chosen by them to be their Minister, is not a true minister. If men desire instruction I deny not, but they may appoint one to teach them, & that Magistrates in ther dominions may appoint men to preach the word to ther subjects for ther conversion, & that it is a lawful thing, for the people to heare such men, & for men of gifts to preach to such a people, this we see practised, Act. 13. 42. & 17. 19–21. & 28. 30. & otherwise how is it possible that men should be brought to the knowledg of the truth? & Mr. Ber. if you think that we deny the lawfulness of this, you doe vs open wrong: & if his Matie. should dissolve the parish Ecclesiastical assemblies & the false ministry, & should cōmaund men of knowledg & gifts to preach the word to his subjects, I doubt not, but al of vs would herein readily yeeld our selves to heare & learne the truth at any such persons, & our selves to teach the truth to such a people: but to say that such a people are true Churches, or such preachers the true

Pastors of true visible Churches that wee deny: & that you shal never be able to prove: but if after such preaching by such preachers the L. work with the people, so as that they gladly receive the word, repent, & beleve, & desire to walk in the truth, & therevppon do promise to the L. & each to other to walk in his wayes, this promise maketh them a true Church: & then if they chose among them men able to lead & feed them, & appoint such men to such office, the men so chosen & ap[p]ointed are the true Pastors which the Scripture describeth: but what is all this to your assemblies & Ministers? who as yet have not cast of[f] the yoke of Antichristian bondage, whose communion & ministry is not dissolved, but remayneth firme, the same in nature (though much bettered in degre) with the Romane assemblies Ecclesiastical: & whereas you in this particular object to vs, that two or three of vs Seperated from you, & gathered together into the new Testament of Christ, assume powre to make Ministers, a practise (as you say) farre from plaine evidence of Scripture, or any practise of the Church these thousand yeeres: I answer it is no mat[t]er for the practise of the Church these thousand yeeres, for Gregory the great Bb. of Rome who lived a thousād yeeres since, hoysed vp Antichrist into the highest exaltation against God & his Christ in a manner: & his Successors especially Boniface & some other have maintayned & enlarged that Antichristian Kingdom even to our dayes: & yet the mistery of iniquity is exalted in these particulars: wherfor this allegation of yours is nothing to the purpose, if you be a sound protestant: For if prescription of a thousand yeeres bee good in any thing, why not in al things? if not in al things then in nothing. And wheras you alledg that it is also far from plaine evidence of the Scripture, I answer the evidence is plaine to them that wil vnderstand: & I would know what is plaine evidence of Scripture: is not a true natural consequence plaine evidence? is not this plaine evidence, Math. 18. 20. whersoever two or three shalbe gathered together into my name, I wilbe in the midst among them? & this, 2. Corinth. 6. 17. bee yee Seperated, & I will receive you & bee your Father: & this, Gallat. 3. 16. the promises are made to

Abraham and to his seed: So then they that are of Faith are blessed with Faithful Abraham. Gallat. 3. 9. If Christ wilbe present with two or three of his Disciples: If God will receave them that are Seperated, & bee their God: if the promises bee given to them that beleve as Abraham beleved: Then Christ is their Christ, God is their Father, the promises are theirs, and the ministry is theirs by plaine evidence, then they may assume the ministry & vse it as God hath appointed, But for this point read the seaventh Section, & the Paral. Censur. Observat. therto aperteyning.

### The thirteenth Section.

The next point to be handled is your seaventh in number, viz.

That a minister may be made without Elders (ordinarily I meane) for extraordinary courses are not now to be vsed for ought I see: this point you blame as error: Let vs see whether it be error or not.

I hold that a minister may be made without Elders: more plainly I say that when the Church wanteth Elders, the Church hath powre to Elect, approve & ordeyne her owne Elders, also: to elect, approve, & ordeine her owne Deacons both men & woemen: For if you remember what was before spoken to your fifth position, viz: that the church hath the powre of Chr in it self, viz: that it hath Chr. the covenant, & al the promises given to it being yet but few in number, & that the Church hath these things in true title & interest as her owne freehold: then you shal see what wil follow hervvpon: namely that the Church hath powre to receave in members & cast out members, to receave in her Officers & to dischargd thē of office, the church hath powre to the preaching of the word to the administring of the seales of the covenant, to binding & losing, which workes she cannot do herself being many, therfor she appointeth fit persons therto, viz: such officers as Christ hath given to his Church, which are the Elders, stil notwithstanding reserving her powre to herself when occasion shalbe offered: these things are sufficiently proved already in answer to your

fifth imputation: but you have some thing perhaps to say for ordination, that the Church hath not powre of it: then belike al the promises are not given to the Church, for if ordination be not given to the Church, then the ministry is not given to the Church, for it seemeth you make ordination a great part of the ministerie: but know for your learning that ordination doth give nothing at al to the Minister: For election is the verie essence & forme of the minister: for in election powre to administer is given to the officer elect: For when the Church cho[o]seth the minister, doth not the Church in effect say: we give the A.b, powre to administer the word, seales of the covenant, & censures in the behalf of the whole Church? & the minister Elect doth then actually possesse & assume that powre delegated vnto him by the Church: so when the Church cho[o]seth her Deacons doth she not in effect speake thus: we give you, c.d.e.f. powre to collect, & distribute the Churches Treasury, & to minister for the body & mēbers of the Church in other general services, helpful to the body & outward part: this is evident enough if you wil not be blind wilfully: For as in matter of mariage, this is the very forme of mariage: I take the for my wife, & I take the for my husband: So in the matter of office this is the very forme therof: we take the for our Pastor: I take you for my flock: & so forth of the rest: now ordination is nothing but the publishing of the officers election with prayer made for him & admonition given to him to be faithful: The Church doth the former which is al in all even the very forme, the latter is but the lesser & an accident without which the officer may be a true officer: declare the contrarie to this if you can if not yeeld to the truth.

Ob. But you wil say the word mentioneth an Eldership which must ordeine, & Paul commandeth Titus to ordeyne Elders, Tit. 1. 5. 1. Tim. 4. 14.

Ans. 1. The place of Timothie compared with 2. Timoth, 1. 6. yeeldeth this sence, that Timothie by the exercise of prophecy wherein he was trayned, & by the imposition of the Apostles handes whereby the extraordinary gifts of tongs & prophecy were then vsually conferred, had an excellent grace (so the word is in the originall) conferred vpon him.

But let it be granted that Timothie had a ministerie conferred vnto him, surely it must needes be the office of an Evangelist, & what is that to an ordinary Elders office: Paull only & the Apostles could create Evangelists.

Further let it be yeilded you that Timothie was made a Bishop of Ephesus by the Eldership of Ephesus, the Eldership in that action did nothing but that which the Church appointed them to, & for the effecting wherof they had powre & authority from the Church who is the Fountaine of al the powre that any officer hath.

Ans. 2. To the place of Titus I thus answer, that Titus ther is not commaunded to ordeyne ministers, but to constitute Elders: For the word is not to ordeyne, or to lay on hands, but to constitute: if you vnderstand the Greek tongue you wil acknowledg that I say to be true: now to constitute an Elder signifieth Election, approbation, & ordinatiō: not ordination only as the objection importeth: but you know, or els you are a sworne slave to the Prelates, that the Church hath powre to Elect & approve her Elders: yet Titus is heer commaunded to doe it: whence wee must needes conclude that Titus only should teach & direct the Churches in constituting of her Elders according to the Apostolique institution: which what it was Titus being an Evangelist & wel acquainted with the Apostles course, could wel tel: & this must needes be the sence of this place, except you have any thing to say against it, which we pray you let vs heer if ther be any thing: you seeme in this point to distinguish the calling of Elders, as if ther were two manners or formes of calling Elders ordinary & extraordinary: I know no such thing, & therefore I leave that till I see it expounded.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the thirteenth Section.

Al this thirteenth Section hath for the subject matter of it the ordination or making of ministers, & the question of it is this, viz: whither a company of faithful people gathered into the name of Christ by the voluntary covenant of the new Testament, have not powre of themselves



to create their owne Pastors, & Deacons: Although that which hath been spoken concerning the seaventh Section may fully & sufficiently satisfie al this doubt: yet I thought meet to add certaine argumēts of plaine evidence for the further declaration here of that al scruples & shifts may be taken away.

#### The first Argument.

They which have powre to enter into, & to assume the New Testament, have also powre to assume al the ordinances of the new Testament, & so by necessary consequent the ministry.

Two or three faithful people have powre to enter into, & to assume the new Testament of Christ:

Ergo: two or thre faithful people have powre to assume al the ordinances of the new Testament, & therfor the ministry.

The Minor only is doubtful: which may thus be confirmed, Gal. 3. 14–16. wher the Apostle saith plainly that the promises were made to Abraham & his seed, viz: to the Faithful, vs. 16. that the blessing of Abraham came vpon the beleeving gentils: vs. 14. & that these promises & blessing is the covenant or new Testament, vs. 15. wherevpon it followeth that seing the Faithful have the blessing, the promises, the new Testament, therfor they have the powre of enjoying the ministry: For the ministry is one part or ordinance of the new Testament.

#### The second Argument.

They that have Christ & with Christ all things els: they that have al things aperteyning to life & Godlines: they that have the promise of this life & of the life to come have the powre to assume the ministry, for that is a part of Godlines.

But the Faithful, be they but two or thre, have with Christ al things els, Rom. 8. 32. have the promise of life & Godlines, 2. Pet. 1. 3. have the promise of this life, & of the life to come, 1. Timoth. 4. 8.

Ergo: The Faythfull though but two or three have powre to assume the Ministry.

## The third Argument.

They who have powre to examine, & elect their Officers have also powre to pray for them, & to commaund them to minister, which is ordination.

But the Scripture teacheth plainly that the Faithfull have powre to Elect and choose their owne Officers: as Deacons, Act. 6. one to bee an Apostle, Act. 1. 26. Elders, Act. 14. also to approve them: Act. 6. 3. 1. Timoth. 3. 10. and you confesse no lesse your self.

Ergo: the Scripture teacheth plainly, (& you by consequent grant indeed, though you deny in wordes) that the Faithful have powre to pray for ther officers Elect, & to commaund them to administer: & that is ordination.

## The Fourth Argument.

They that have powre to make a Church, have powre to make a minister or ministers: For they that can doe the greater, can do the lesse.

Two or thre Faithful people have powre to make a Church.

Ergo: two or thre Faithful people have powre to make ministers.

The reason of this argument is, for that the Church is the body of Christ, the Spowse of Christ, & the ministry is but one part of the body, one Servant of the Spowse, one of the ornaments of the Church.

The Minor is plaine: For two or three Faithful people have Christ Iesus, have the promises, have the holy things of David, wlfich are Faithful, have the blessing of Abraham, being Abrahams seed & furthermore the Apostle, Heb. 8. 10-12. expounding what the new Testament is teacheth that they that have the Lawes of the Lord put in their mindes, & written in their harts, are the people of God, & have God for their God, & so are the Church of the new Testament: Mr. Bern. this point is cleerer then can be denied, & al the world can never be able to overthrow it: the vnderstanding & feeling whereof I do hartily wish vnto your soule, & to al the vpright harted of the Land.

## The Fifth Argument.

They that are the true matter of the Church of the new Testament, shall be invested with the true forme of the new Testament: they that have true matter & forme, have the true property which ariseth from the vnion of matter & forme, that is Christs ministerial powre to assume al the meanes of their edification to Salvation: & so by consequent the ministry.

Two or thre Faithful people are the true matter of the true Church of the new Testament: & therfor have the true forme or covenant of the new Testament induced vpon them: & so being a Church subsisting of true matter & forme, have the true property arising from the vnion of the matter & forme, viz: the powre of our L. Iesus Christ, to assume & vse al the meanes of their edification to salvation: & so by consequent have powre to assume the ministry.

Ergo: two or thre Faithful people being a true Church, may create, that is Elect, approve, & ordeyne their owne officers.

And this may suffice for the proof of this point.

## The Fourteenth Section.

And so I passe to another point which is you[r] Fourteenth, viz.

14. That baptisme is not administred among vs simply into the Faith of Christ, but into the faith of the Bbs. or the Church of England.

This point you say is also erroneous: let vs consider of it I pray you seriously: I would know into what Faith they are baptized if not into the Faith of the church of England, they are members of the Church of England, & they professe the Faith of the Church of England, are they not then baptized into that Faith of the Church wherof they stand as members, & of which Faith they make profession? are they baptized into one Faith, and do they professe another Faith? or do you think that the Faith of Christ & the Faith of the Church of England are not one? me thinkes Mr. Bern. you lay a fowle imputation vpon your Church: in holding that the Faith of

the Church of England is not the faith of Christ, & that baptisme is not administred into the Faith of the Church of England respectively, but into the faith of Christ simply. I dare say your Lords the Prelates wil cō you litle thank for this geare: but let vs consider of your Faiths. The Prelates & Church of England have one Faith wherto they Subscribe: The Puritanes & their Faction have an other Faith, for they wil not Subscribe to the Prelates Faith: Christ & wee of the Seperation have a third Faith, for we wil Subscribe neither to the Bbs. Faith, nor the Puritanes Faith, but to the Faith of Christ indefinitely comprehended in the Holy Scriptures: Heer now are thre Faiths: thre Churches: & so thre baptisemes. But the true Faith is one, the true Church is one, the true baptisme one: Therfor you & we have not both the true Faith, Church, & baptisme: but we approve vnto you our Faith, church, & baptisme to be true: & therfor your Faith, Church, & baptisme is false: & so certainly it is: For whosoever have stinted their covenant, & limited their repentance, & abridged their Faith, have a false Faith, Covenant, & Repentance: but you in your assemblies have your Covenant, Faith, & repentance at the wil of the Prelates, & you dare not covenant and practise al that you know, but walk in violating of the whole Kingdom of Christ, are mingled among al the refuse of the Land in your Church, worship, & communion of holy things: therfor your Repentance, Faith, & Covenant is false, your church false, your Ministerie false, your worship false, your baptisme false, the Lords Supper false, al false: & heer give me leave to advertise you to look to your selves that know the wil of God & doe not nor dare not practise as you know: I wish you consider your own doctryne that whosoever liveth in any open knowne sinne hath no grace: but you live in open known sinnes: For you know you should reforme many things, which you doe not nor cannot seing you want the Censures: how then can you perswade vs that your repentance is true, & that your faith is true: you plead you have a true ministry, bicause you conuert soules: you convert soules a pace do you not? when you convert them to your false repentance, false Faith, false Church, false

Ministry, false VVorship, false Government: is this the conversion wherby you would prove your ministry? not only to live in your false repentance, covenant, Faith, Church, vnder your false Ministry & Government, but to reject & oppose the truth, & that with such slaunderous & lying courses as we heare of you? you must afford vs better evidences of your Faith, repentance, & of your true ministerie, or els we hold them al false. Consider what I say Mr. Bern. & the Lord give you vnderstanding in al things.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the Fourteenth Section.

Against this Section of my Lettre Mr. Ber. taketh exception in two particulars, pa. 152. of the Sep. Schisme: accounting them both errors. 1. that baptisme is not administred into the Faith of Christ simply, but into the Faith of Bbs. or Church of England: (so say I,) 2. That our Faith and repentance, is a false Fayth, and a false repentance, (so say I of their visible Fayth, not speaking of things secreat:) Mr. Ainsw. confutat. of Mr. Bern. pag. 159. accounteth both those imputations of Mr. Bern. vncharitable collections, and calumniations: Seing Mr. Ainsw. doth renounce them, I wil therefore vndertake the defence of them vnto whom they aperteyne: and heer I wish the Reader to observe whither it lay not vpon mee justly to answer Mr. Bern. whose whole book in the essential parts of it was directed against this lettre of myne, as may evidently be perceaved as in the whole tenor of it, so especially in these two particulars against which he excepteth in this Section.

Now for the first let vs consider the intendment of the baptizer: How the Ministers of the Church of England intend their baptisme: How the law of the Land intendeth baptisme: how the Service-book intendeth & directeth baptisme: how the parents Susceptors or Suretyes do demaund baptisme & consent to baptisme administred: & vpon the conceaving of these particulars the baptisme must be censured: now if al these intend definitely that Faith which is by law established in the Land, & that the partie is baptized into that Faith which they intend,

it wil follow necessarily that baptisme is administred not simply & indefinitely into the Faith of Christ, but particularly & definitely into that Faith which the Bbs. & the Church of England do teach & professe: For which consideration an argument may be framed thus.

Into that faith are the members of the Church of England baptized, which the Law establisheth: which the Prelates & Ministers teach: which the Church of England professeth: which the minister baptising intendeth: & wherto the parents, witnesses or Susceptors consent: & which the Service-book expressly mentioneth.

But the law doth not establish: the Prelates & ministers do not teach: the Church of England doth not professe: the baptizer doth not intend: the parents & Susceptors doe not consent to: & the Servicebook doth not mention the Faith of Christ simply, but the Faith of Bbs. or Church of England.

Ergo, The members of the Church of England are not baptized into the Faith of Christ simply, but into the Fayth of the Bbs. or Church of England, which is the false Fayth of the baptizer, of the Suretyes or parents, and so the Faith of the baptisme.

For the second point let vs consider the faith & repentance of the Church of Englād, I meane of the faith that is visibly professed & expressed in the fruites of repētance amōg them: & therby we shal know the tree.

The faith of that Church is not a true faith which teach & professe a false mediator: & the repentance of that Church is not a true repentance, which practise according to that false doctryne.

But the assemblies Ecclesiastical of England with the teachers & professors of them, teach and professe a false Mediator: For they teach that Christ is a Mediator of all that false Church, Ministry, VVorship and Government, established in the Land: Sacrificing and making intercession for them in the dayly practise of al those abominations: Ruling and Governing them by all the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy, and by the courts & canons Ecclesiasticall, which are the inventions of the man of sinne: Teaching & Prophesying vnto them by those Antichristian, Prelates, Preists, & Deacons, which raigne

in the Land: & so practising according to this false Faith practise a false repentance.

Ergo, the Faith of the Church of England, of the teachers & professors therof, & the repentance of them is not true, but false.

But it wilbe objected against both these assertions that although one thing be intended in baptisme, yet the Lord may admit of & accept another: & though they professe & preach falsely, yet the Lord he can & doth no doubt work mervaylously besides al that we can think or speak: Truth: I yeeld it most willingly: & blessed be the Lord for his infinite & vnspeakeable mercy therein: but we dispute not what God can do of his powre or wil do of his mercy, things vnknowne vnto vs: but we speake of things revealed and manifested vnto vs, according whervnto we must walk & judg of matters according to that which we see: according as the word judgeth: according as the Church & members of the Church of England teach, professe, & practise visibly, which is seen & discerned of vs, we are to passe our censure: but we judg no man before the tyme: we doe not clyme vp into Gods judgment seate: our Faith is visible: our repentance is visible: our charity visible: our Spirit visible: our baptisme visible: our preaching visible: our covenant visible, our Church visible: our judgment visible: things that are revealed aperteyne to vs & our Children, that say we is false in the assemblies Ecclesiastical: Secreat things aperteyne to the Lord: these we leave to the Lord, we med[d]le not with them: this I desire may once for al be remembred & pondered, & so I end this matter.

#### The Fiftenth Section.

The next point is your Fourth wherin you do vs open injury, viz.

4. In holding that Princes have no more to do in ecclesiastical causes then one of you in a particular congregation: these are your wordes.

Mr. Ber. I challeng you in this particular imputation, to be either a malicious or an ignorant slaunderer: For eyther you know not what we teach concerning Princes

Authorities, & so slaunders vs ignorantly: or if you know our judgment in that matter you slaunders vs maliciously: Remember that the Prophet in the Psalmes complayneth that his enemies digd pits for him, laid snares, ginses & nets in his way to catch him vnawares & to bring evil vpon him: are you now become such an enemy vnto vs? doe you think by calling into question the Supremacy of Princes imputing therein treason to vs to catch vs in a snare, & cause vs to fall into the pit? if this be your course, thus to hunt the Soules of men, look vnto your self, therein you manifest little grace to me: but let vs heere the cause you impute to vs. You say we hold that princes have no more to do in ecclesiastical causes then one of vs in a particular congregaciō: I say for myne owne part, & I think I may say it for al the brethren of our Church, that herein you do shamefully believe: I will therfor manifest what we hold & teach concerning Princes Supremacy.

1. First, wee teach & hold according to the Scriptures that Princes & civil Estates are the Lords blessed ordinance, Rom. 13. 2.

2. Secondly, that every Soule ought to be subject vnto the civil Magistrates of what estate & condition soever they be, Rom. 13. 1. Tit. 3. 1. 1. Pet. 2. 13.

3. Thirdly, that we must absolutely submit vnto the civil Magistrate eyther to do his lawful commaundements, or to suffer his vnlawful punishments: by consequence from the former places.

4. Fourthly, that it is vnlawful for any subject to make insurrection or rebellion against the civil Magistrates: by consequence from the former places.

5. Fifthly, that it is the Magistrates office to be the keeper of both the tables of the cōmaundemēt: both to abolish Idolatry & al false wayes, also to forbid & punish al vnrighteousnes as also to commaund & cause al men within these Dominions to walk in the wayes of God, being fitted & prepared therevnto: and that by the examples of David, Iosaphat, Hezechiah, Iosiah, Nehemiah, Roman. 13. 4. 5. Psalm. 101. toto. and 132. 2-5.

6. That a Prince hath powre in a particular visible Church, to punish any wickednes any one committeth:



and to cause that visible Church to assume & practise any truth Gods word teacheth: ex præcedentibus: now this is more authority then any one particular member hath.

7. VVee teach notwithstanding that Princes if they wilbe saved must bee members of a true visible Church, & must walk ther in the obedience of Gods Commaundements & ordinances, submitting to the censures for the reformation & salvation of his soule, as well as to the preaching of the VVord, administration of the Seales of the covenant, prayers, &c. bicause God hath appointed but one way to save the Soules of Princes and Subjects.

8. If civil Magistrates be by censures cast out of the true visible Church, yet they are stil to be accounted Gods ordinance, stil to bee obeyed in the L. stil to be submitted to in regard of their punishment, no rebellion or insurrection to be made against them by any of the Church whatsoever: but prayer to bee made for them instantly and dayly.

Now Mr. Bern. stop your mouth & cease slaundering, & take away the popson from vnder your Tong.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the fiftenth Section.

I desire heer that the reader would observe carefully: that although Mr. Bern. in his Lettre to Mr. Hel. had charged vs with this slaunderous vntruth concerning our disloyalty to Magistrates: yet I having written this Lettre vnto him, he in this his book sayeth not a word to this Section of my lettre: whereas if he had dealt vprightly he should have cleered vs in that particular of disloyalty, wherein he chardged vs falsely: but like a subtil adversary he thought to bring vs into disgrace & hatred by al meanes, & wherein he saw vs approvable therein he craftily forsaketh vs: & leaveth vs to the obloquy of the world, which vsually lay this false imputation of disloyalty vppon vs: wel let Mr. Bern. & al men know, especially al lawful civil Magistrates of what degree soever, that the Churches of the Seperation are in their judgments as sound, & in their harts as loyal & dutiful vnto Princes & civil States, as the best prelate of England, & that the more popelike they are the more

trayterous they wil prove vnto the civil Magist. & that if they bee let alone, they with the Pope at the length wil take vppon them: Petrus dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Radolpho, & cause the Emperor to hold the stirrop.

The sixteenth Section.

Your fiftenth point followeth: which is this, viz.

15. That ministers ought only to live of voluntary contribution & not of stippends, or any set maintenāce: this you impute to vs: we reject it, for we hold it lawful for the Elders of the Church to receive weekely, monthly, or yeerely a pencion of the Church for their labors, al that we teach concerning the mayntenance of the ministerie is this.

1. That it is vnlawful for the Elders of the Church to challengd at the hands of them that are infidels & vnbeleevvers, tithes, & offerings as you do.

2. Wee hold that tithes are either Iewish or popish.

3. That the officers of the visible Church may receive any gift of any Frend that is without, & live of it.

4. That the officers of the Church in the necessity of the Church ought to work for their living, as Paul made tents.

5. That the officers of the Church may challengd mayntenance of the Church, if the Church be able to yeeld it.

6. That also the poore of the Church may require mayntenance vppon the same grounds for we are al members one of another, & have al things common in vse, though not in possession: al these particulars are plaine by these Scriptures, Heb. 7. 12. & 9. 9. Act. 2. 44. 45. 1. Cor. 9. 1-15. Gal. 6. 6. & 4. 9. 10. Col. 2. 16. 17. 20. 21.

This is the substance of that wee hold herein: and therefore Mr. Bern. you do vs open wrong in this point also.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the sixteenth Section.

Mr. Bern. pag. 156. of the Sep. Schisme avoucheth that to deny tithes, & a set mayntenance to Ministers is contrary to the Lords wisdom, who vnder the law

appointeth tithes a set maintenāce, & ther is nothing against it in the gospel: I answer with the Apostle, the old Testament (I doe not meane the writings of the Law, the Prophets, & the Psalmes) and the ordinances thereof are abolished: The bond woeman and her Children are cast out, Gallat. 4. 30. and if ther bee a chandg of the Preisthood ther must needes bee a chandg of the law, Heb. 7. 12. wherefore seing set stipends by tithes were a part of these worldly ordinances of the old Testament, of those impotent & beggerly rudiments, of that yoke of bondage whence Christ hath set vs free: it followeth that set mayntenance by tythes is abolished by Christ: & as the liberty of the gospel is to be carefully preserved in other things, as in that of circumcision, of the passe-over, of the preisthood, of the Sacrifices and the rest, So must it bee carefully preserved even in this particular of set maintenance by tithes, for if any Mosaicall, impotent, beggerly rudiment, or worldly ordinance: if any part of the yoke of bondage may be joynd with Christ, why not all? if not all, why may any? Againe whereas you say there is nothing against set mayntenance by tithes in the New Testament, I demaund two things: 1. [V]Whither Christ hath not abolished the Mosaical ordinances & brought in the New Testament? & whither this be not contrary to set maintenance by tithes? 2. whither wee ought not to have something for set mayntenance by tithes in the New Testament, (if it must be retayned) that wee vpon fayth may submit vnto it? Seing that whatsoever is not of Fayth is sinne: So that this speach of yours, viz: ther is nothing against it in the gospel, is both false, & if it were true, yet is insufficient, seing that it is not a good plea to say ther is nothing against it, except wee can also say, that ther is something for it: & thus much for this point.

#### The seventeenth Section.

Your sixtenth point followeth, viz.

16. That our Churches ought to be rased downe, & not to be employed to the worship of God: we are not absolute & peremptorie in this: only this we think for

the present that al the reliques, shapes, formes, memorials, instruments, & remembrances of Antichristian Idolatry ought now as wel to be defaced, as in the old Testament ought Reliques of paganisme, bicause that the proportion of paganisme & Antichristianisme is equal, therfor the L. calleth Rome & al Antichristian assemblies, Babylon, Egipt, Sodom, Apoc. 18. 2. & 11. 8. & Antichristians are called by the same reason, Gentils, Apo. 11. 2. even Babylonians, Egiptians, Sodomites. & so by consequent proportion the Temples Babylonish Temples, pagan Temples, Egiptian Temples, Sodomitish Temples: & therefore to be defaced vtterly according to the commaundement, Deut. 7. 5. 6. & 12. 2. Iudg. 2. 2. Gen. 35 1-4. 2. King. 10. 27. 28. & 18. 4. 5. Psal. 16. 4. Exod. 23. 13. Esay. 30. 22. the same may be said of your holydayes, your tithes & offerings, your Surplices, Copes, Crosses, Fonts, & al other Superstitious reliques, that God wil not be honored by instruments of Idolatry: nor Idols must not bee so much honored as to retayne a nayle or pinne of them or their implements to honor God with all: Lett vs see Mr. Bernard what you can say, to convince vs of error: You see the reasons that move vs thus to think till wee see better.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the sevententh Section.

Although Mr. Ainsw. hath sufficiently stopt your mouth Mr. Bern. in this particular, yet I think it not amisse to add thus much, for further cleering of the matter: know therefore, that as Iehu turned the Temple of Baal into a jakes after he had defaced it, 2. King. 10. 27. and as Hezechiah brake in peeces the brasen Serpent, the Lords owne ordinance being abused to Idolatry, 2. King. 18, 4. So the Kings of the earth should doe wel to follow the Holy Ghosts prophecy, Revel. 17. 16. even to make the whore of Babylon desolate, and naked, to eate her Flesh, and burne her with fire: and not to suffer her wares, that is her vessels of wood, Ivory, Brasse, Iron, marble, to be bought any more: which I am perswaded shal in due tyme be accomplished: that as the

goodly buildings of the Abbayes, Monasteries, & Nunries, are already destroyed, & made barnes, stables, swine-styes, jakes, so shal it be done with al the Idol Temples when the howre of their visitation shal come: & whereas you object for the justifying of the vse of the Idol Temples, that seing Antichrist sitteth in the Church of God, that therfor when the Idol Temples were built, the Church took possession of them to keep possession for the Lord in his creatures, therby concluding a lawful vse of them now for the Church restored, I answer you: your ground is faulty, & therfor your building tottereth: the place of the Apostle, 2. Thes. 2. 4, wher it is said that Antichrist sitteth in the Temple of God, is falsely by you conceived & interpreted, for it doth not import that (as you would have it), Antichrists Church, & the true Church of Christ are one & the same, & that the same company of men can be, and are, both the true visible Church of Christ, & at that same tyme the Church of Antichrist: this is impossible: for the true Church is not the false Church. But this is the meaning, viz: either that Antichrist shal sitt in the consciences of men which is properly the Temple of God: Or that Antichrist shall arise vp out of that company of men which once were the Temple of God, as Rome was: or that the Church being true in the constitution, Antichrist shal foyst into it by litle and litle his false ministry, VVorship, and Government, as experience teacheth he hath done: For a true Church may have Antichristian ordinances retayned & raised vp in it: this being the true meaning of the Apostle, how can you hence conclude soundly that the true Church tooke possession of the Temples, which the false Church of Antichrist built? Seing the true Church is not the false Church, & seing that the temples were built in the palpable darknes of grosse popery, some of them perhaps dedicated to heathen Idols, some of them to Antichristian Idols, as ther Hee, & shee Saints, al of them to Devils. For if Ieroboams Preists were appointed for Devils, 2. Chron. 11. 15. & if the Antichristian preists are the Spirit of Devils, Revel. 16. 14. & the worship of Antichristians the worship of Devils, Revel. 9. 20. & the Antichristian Churches the habitation of Devils, Revel.

18. 2. then the Temples are dedicated to Devils: not that they intended so to dedicate them, but for that they are so indeed: the Lord accounting that to be done to the Devil, which is not done to him as he hath commaunded: & the Devill substituting himself in Gods place, when men go a whoring after ther owne inventions: Therefor the Apostle saith plainly that the Gentils Sacrifice to Devils, 1. Cor. 10. 20. to conclude this point therfor, & so to leave you to meditate vppon these things: Seing the Gentils Sacrifice to Devils, seing the Antichristians worship Devils, seing Ieroboams preists were appointed for Devils: & yet al these intended to worship God even the true God: then it followeth that though the Antichristians did intend to dedicate their Temples to the true God (which yet is not granted) neverthesse they were dedicated to Devils: & therfor are to be rased downe & converted to the habitation of Iim, & Zijm, Satyres, Shrich owles, & Ravens as the Prophet speaketh Esay. 34. 8-15.

#### The eighteenth Section.

Your first point now commeth in the last place to be considered, viz.

1. In seperating from al the reformed Churches: you say we do il: Let vs consider what we hold: Surely we say the Churches are of two sorts, false Churches such as yours of worksop is, & al others of like fashion: 2. true Churches, & those also of two sorts: pure, wherin no open knowne sinne is suffered: corrupt, wherin some one or more knowne sinne is tolerated: to the true Churches which are pure wee may & wil joyne: to the true Churches which are corrupt we cary our selves thus: First, we labor to discover their faults vnto them, admonishing them to reforme which wee are bound to doe, bicause they are our brethren. Secondly, if they wil not reforme after we have convinced their errors vnto them, we depart from them lest wee should partake with their sinnes: this is our judgment, & practise: if you can reprove it, let vs heer from you wee pray you.

Paralleles, Censures, Observations, aperteyning  
to the eighteenth Section.

Heer I desire the Gentle Reader not to be offended that wee endeavouring to walk in the liberty of the gospel, do not tie our selves to any Church or Churches whatsoever, but only to the rules of Gods word: & therfor howsoever it may seem odious that wee Seperate from al churches, yet the causses being indifferently considered, the matter wil seem reasonable, for we Seperate from al Churches vppon several reasons, 1. From some (such as are the English Churches) we Seperate for the Falseness of them: & that is a just cause in any indifferent mans judgment, 2. from other (such as are the Reformed Churches) wee Seperate not for that they are false, but for that being true they are corrupt: & herein our Separation is not total but for a tyme, til we have performed our dutyes vnto them: whē we have therfor admonished them of their corruptions & they repent, then we joyne in communion with them: if they repent not wee leave them to the Lord: & we must needs keep our selves vnspotted, & take heed that we partake not with other mens sinnes.

The nintenth Section.

And now Mr. Bern. suffer me a litle to deale with you as with one of whome I have thought so wel as I have done: it greeveth my Soule for you to see you so straungely seduced by Sathan, & so violently carryed in your boysterous & robustious disposition against the truth, & the professors therof: it hath greaved me heretofore to see your arrogant, proud & ambitious cariage preferring your self in place before men both more auncient, holy, & learned then your self in the judgment of al that know you & them: it hath greaved mee to hear such calumnies as you have in the bitternes of your wrath vttered against divers of vs which I could relate to your eternal infamy, but I spare you: it hath greaved me to heare your formality that you are become an absolute conformitāt in judgment, & that you would be so in practise if some persons hindered you not: it greeveth me exceedingly to see some Letters of yours wherein you & your Disciples

lying at the advantage take all things in the evil part, pervert & misconstrue mens writings manifesting therein much perversnes of Spirit: it greeveth mee above all that you should support the Kingdome of Antichrist, by your writings against the truth, & by your vntruth vttered of mee & others, You have now two writings of myne in your hands this & the other you know of, wherein our cause is discovered, which I have especially directed to you for your good: I beesech you in the name of the L. look to your self & search into this truth, I wonder you should not see it, it is clearer to mee then noone day, or if you see it as it seemeth you once did by your confession, then I wonder much more that you who seem so holye as you doe, should dare to continue in your evil way. if you have any thing to say in answer to this & the other writing let vs heer from you: take heed of wresting & misconstruing my writings: you shal gaine nothing by it I assure you at my handes: set your conscience vppon the wrack before the Lord, examine your hart what hindereth you from the truth: know this that if any sinister respect hinder you, you therein shal find litle peace to your conscience, & declare lesse thankfulness to God: know it would bee the greatest honour ever befel you to be one of the Lords witnesses, & it wilbe the greatest disgrace that can possiblie light vppon you to be found one of those that fight against the lamb Iesus Christ in resisting his truth, & the witnesses thereof: assure your self Gods truth wil prevaile in despite of al the gainsayers: remember that our cause is the same in a manner with the Puritane cause, onely they dare not practise as wee doe: remember that the Lord hath had those that have spilt ther blood in this testimonie, & ther blood & testimony hath stirred vs vp to this our witsnesse: consider that this truth prevayleth daily, & shal prevayle: it was opposed in the Queenes dayes it hath prevayled & standeth in despite of al the gainsayers: consider that though the Prelates & you with your fellow Preists oppose against it, yet it hath growne to this head as you see? what are you Mr. Bern. to oppose against it: you are a simple man in comparison of them that have de[al]t against it, & have taken the foyle, All the



Oxford Doctors, Mr. Hildershā, Mr. Iacob, Mr. Bredwel, Mr. Giffard, could not with ther writings overthrow this truth, & doe you think that you can batter it with your mediocrity? nay you are to[o] yong to deale against this cause: al your rage & wrath, & choller, & revendge shall never bee able to daunt vs, or to diminish the credit of Gods truth: you had need more then any mā I know in your way to walk in this way with vs: For you have so many vagaries to & froe, so many rebellious courses, so many distempered affections & speeches, that so long as you are not vnder the L. yoke, & vnhampered by the L. ordinances the censures of the Church, you shall find litle rest to your Soule: wee for our part care not for your help, for our gaine wilbe litle by you, if any thing at all, but wee respect your own good: God hath no need of you, you see he can work his work without you: Let these things work vpon you, take heed you bee not deceived by the applause of the multitude, nor by the Prelates fayre wordes, nor by his angels: Remember that if you receave not the love of the truth God may deliver you over justly to beleeve lies to your owne overthrow: think not, much that I write thus vnto you: I doe it out of compassion and love to you, vnto whome I wish so well: David was content to bee smitten by the righteous, and flatterie I think overthroweth you: your Parasites have robbed you of your wisdome: beleeve mee I speak the truth: So requiring your answer to both my writings I bid you farewell.

Heer endeth the letter which was written to Mr. B. divided into 19 Sections, with the Paralleles, Censures, & Observations, aperteyning to every particular Section therof.

Thus have I Mr. Bern. passed through the substantial part of your book, which concerneth the cause it self: which although you have placed in the last place, namely from pag. 78. forward, yet I thought meet to make answer to it in the first place, bicause it is the most material part of your book: and heerin you have vsed a notable peece of Sophistical Rhetorick, first to draw our persons into dislike with your readers, and so to prejudicate & forstal ther myndes against our cause: For so it falleth

out customably that the person being disliked the cause cannot bee entertayned: wherfor after you had collected al your superficial stuffe, al the accidental conjectures which you heape vp in your book from pag. 21. to 78. and had cast them in the Readers way, whereat he might stumble: thē you come from pag. 78. to the end, to the matter, & varnish that also as wel as you can, therby thinking vtterly to pervert your Reader from the truth: well Mr. Bern. I have through the mercy of God answered al the substantial points of your book: not omitting one to my knowledg that is worth answer: but especially I have labored to manifest the mayne cause of our Separation, the first fo[u]ndacion & rock of truth, which is, that Christs ministerial powre is given to two or thre Faithful ones, who are the true seed of Abraham, to whome the promises, the covenant of the New Testament, Christ, & al the holy things are given: For this is the groundwork & Foundation of the L. truth: & this I beseech al the land, al the faithful of the land especialy to look vnto: & if they yeeld this ground they must needes Separate: if they deny this ground, then ther is no footing for them but in Succession, & the Popes chayre: So that heer is the controversy, heer is the state of the Question, whither the holy things with Christ be given originally to the body of the Church to the Faithful: or whither the holy things with Christ bee given to the Ministry originally, & that the Church hath al from the ministry: & that is the point of succession: I beseech you Mr. Bern. & all the honest harted people of the Land to waygh & determine this point in their owne harts, & then your book wilbe found to be but froth: now having answered your mayne matter: I come to answer your probabilities against the Sep. schisme: From the pag. 21-44. you propound 7. Likelihoods that the way of the Separation is not the truth which probabilities may be framed into these formes of reasoning.

The first Likelyhood against the Sep. is thus framed.

Novelty is not the truth: The Separation is Novelty, [er]go: not the truth: For answer to this argument: I ask,

whither Luthers & Calvins opinions were false, bicause they were new: For popery had the prescription of a thousand yeers against Calvin: but Calvin hath not had the prescription of an hundreth yeeres against the Seperation: nay I suppose not above fifty yeeres: & may not the Prelates reason against the Puritane thus: or the papists against the Protestants? wherfor although I wil not scoffe at this argument, yet I pity your simplicity in it: but I alter your argument, and frame another after this manner against you, Antiquity is the truth: The Seperation is true antiquity: [er]go: the truth, the reason of this Argument is for that we approve the Doctryne and practise of seperation from the beginning out of the writings of the Holy Apostles: and on the contrary I reason thus against your Protestancy: Novelty is not the truth: The ministry, worship, & government of the protestant churches of England are Novelty, [er]go: Not the truth: that al these things are novelty, I prove bicause they are not of the primitive Apostolique institution as I have sufficiently proved in the former Treatise: Thus much for your first Likelyhood.

The second Likelyhood against the Sep. is thus framed.

They that in some things agree with auncient Heretiques & Schismatiques, are Heretiques & Schismatiques, & their opinions heresy & Schisme.

The Sep: in some things agre with auncient Heretiques & Schismatiques.

Ergo, they are Heretiq. & Schismatq. & their opinions heresy & Schisme.

I answer by this arg. I can prove you Mr. Bern. to bee an Heretique and Schismatique, except you will renounce the Deity, and Trinity, the fall of Adam, redemption by Christ, &c. For I can prove that Heretiques, yea most vild Heretiques have held these opinions with you: if my argument be not good against you, neither is yours good against vs, besides you should, counting vs to agree with auncient Heretiques & Schismatiques, have proved two things, 1. that they were indeed & in truth Heretiques and Schismatiques, for holding the points that wee hold,

2. you should have set downe the particulars wherin we agree with them: but you have done neither of them: & therefore fayle in your proof: and so let this Likelyhood also passe as a matter not worth taking vp.

The third Likelyhood against the Sep. is framed thus.

That is not the truth, the Teachers & professors wherof somtyme do give straung expositions, & therby do wrest the Scriptures.

The Teachers & professors of the Separation doe straungely expound & wrest the Scriptures somtyme.

Ergo, the Separation is not the truth.

I answer: First do you expound no Scripture straungely to the Papists: do not they instantly defend against you al, that you shamefully wrest those two places of Scripture, Mat. 16. 18. vppon this rock I wil build my church. 1. Cor. 11. 24. this is my body: yea & a hundreth more besides? if therfor the argument be good for you against vs, it is good for the Papists against you: but the argument is naught: For may not a company of men have the truth & somtyme through ignorance misinterpret, & so pervert the Scripture? it may be so vndoubtedly, except you wil say that men professing the truth have in them (as the Pope saith he hath in *Scrinio pectoris*) the infalibility of expounding Scriptures, as the Apostles & Prophets had in writing Scripture: & except you wil say that men have the perfect & ful knowledg of the Scripture: but secondly what are the Scriptures wee do straungely expound & wrest: I require you Mr. Bern, before the Lord to produce the places of Scripture that I do wrest & pervert, & eyther I wil acknowledg my sinne, or els justifie them to be truly expounded: in the meane tyme the reader may se that this is but simple stuffe, & the Papists can take it vp every whit against you.

The 4. Likelyhood against the Sep. is framed thus.

They that are not approved by the Reformed Churches, have not the truth.

The Sep. is not approved by the Reformed Churches.

Ergo, The Separation is not the truth.

I answer: That seeing the Separation have published the confession of their Faith wherein they have by name desired the approbation of the universities of the Reformed Churches, either by writing or silence, & the said Christian universities have not disallowed that their confession though long since published, their silence is therefore in all equity to be accounted their consent: & Mr. Iunius his silence what is it else to be esteemed but consent? but suppose that all the men upon earth should disallow the Separation, if the Reformed Churches of Corinth, Rome, Thessalonica, Galatia, & the seven Churches of Asia, the Mother Church of Jerusalem planted by Christ, John Baptist, & the Apostles, all of them being of one & the same primitive Apostolique constitution, if I say the Separation have the allowance & approbation of these Apostolique Churches it shall be sufficient for them: & therein they shall rest contented by my consent. In the mean season you forget that your Church is utterly disallowed by the reformed Churches in regard of your prelacy, which is one of the chief abominations among you: & in many other particular which I shall not need to relate: but remember for a conclusion for this point: The stone which the builders refused is become the chief corner stone: & I appeal unto your consciences if you do not think the Churches of the Separation better than your own: & then tell me how you can stay in a worse knowing a better.

The 5. Likelihood against Sep, may be framed thus.

Whatsoever Mr. Whittakers, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Bredwel, Mr. Willat, Mr. Allison, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. James, Mr. Rogers, Mr. H. Smyth saith of the Separation is true.

These forsaid learned men say the Sep. is not the truth.

Ergo, The Separation is not the truth.

I make another argument like unto this which shall be your answer.

Whatsoever, Herod, Pontius Pilate, Annas, & Cayphas, the learned Scribes & Pharisees, Tertullus the Orator and all the learned men of the Church of the Jews say is true, that is true.

These persons al of them with one consent say that Christian Religion is Heresy and schisme, as you may see in the History of the Gospel & acts.

Ergo, Christian Religion is Heresy & schisme.

If this argument be faulty then is yours faulty much more: but I wil reason thus for the Separation & against you: whatsoever Christ the Apostles the Holy Scripture & the Primitive Apostolique Churches collected of the Iewes & Gentils do allow or disallow, is to be allowed or disallowed:

The separation is allowed, & the Church, ministry, worship & Governmēt of the English assemblies is disallowed by these forsaid persons.

Ergo, The sep. is to be allowed, & you are to be disallowed.

The minor of this argument is proved in this book which I present to every honest hart of the Land, to be measured by the golden reed.

But mee thinks Mr. Bern. should blush at his Logick.

The 6. Likelyhood against Separation may be framed thus.

They have not the truth that are judged of the Lord.

The separation is judged of the Lord.

Ergo: The Separation hath not the truth, & againe.

They have the truth that are prospered by God in their course.

The English Protestants are prospered in their course.

Ergo, The English Protestants have the truth.

I answer: That this is false doctrine: For the wiseman saith Ecces. 9. 1-3. That prosperity or adversity are no signes of love or hatred, & Ierem. 12. 1, 2. that the wicked are in prosperity: and 1. Pet. 4. 17. judgment beginneth at Gods howse: This your reason therfor is most absurd & false, & is fit to breed Atheisme, & overthrow the whole truth of the Scriptures: but let vs see what judgments are vppon the Separation: you frame them thus.

If Mr. Bolton that Apostated did hang himself: if Mr. Harison & Mr. Browne did differ, & one fel back: if Mr. Barrow & Mr. Greenwood, for calling you serpents, generations of Vipers, were martyred by the persecuting

Prelates: if Mr. Iohnson pronounced excommunication against his brother: & if the Church excommunicated the Father: if Mr. Burnet died of the Plague: if Mr. Smyth was delivered twice from the Pursivant, & was sick almost to death, & doubted of the Separation for 9. monethes space: then the Separation is not the truth.

But al these things befel Mr. Bolton, Mr. Browne, Mr. Harison, Mr. Iohnsons, Mr. Burnet, Mr. Smyth.

Ergo: The separation is not the truth.

I answer: The Churches of England have had thousand thousands of such accidents as these are befalling their Officers and Leaders, and yet as it were folly in vs to alledg them against you as the Papists doe: so it is no wisdom but weaknes of judgment in you to mention them in your book against vs: VVhat is it good reasoning to say?

Judas hanged himself, Christ was Crucified for blasphemy: Demas embraced the world: Nicholas the Deacon proved an Heretique: Paull and Barnabas fel out: Paull chardged Peter and Barnabas with dissembling: Peter denyed Christ: All the Apostles were put to death for heresy. Ergo, the Christian Religion is heresy: if this argument be false then is yours false: yet this is your goodly reason: if this bee a good argument wher is your Faith become [?]

But in this Likelyhood you have a fling at me in particular Mr. Ber. charging me with divers vntruths, which I wil manifest.

1. That I doubted 9 months I acknowledg: but that ever I did acknowledg the separation for truth, & seperated from the English assemblies, & then returned againe vnto them (which you say) I do vtterly deny, & I appeale to the towne of Ganesbrugh, & those ther that knew my footesteps in this matter: & therfor herein I indite you as a publike slaunderer.

2. VVhereas you say I became satisfied at Coventree after conference had with certayne Ministers, and here-vppon kneeled downe and praised God: I answer: I did not conferre with them about the separation as you & they know wel inough in your consciences: but about withdrawing from true Churches, Ministers, and VVorship, corrupted: VVherein I received no satisfaction,

but rather thought I had given instruction to them: and for kneeling downe to praise God I confesse I did, being requested to performe the duty at night after the conference by the Ministers: but that I praised God for resolution of my doubts, I deny to death and you therein are also a slaunderer: I praised God for the quiet & peaceable conference, & such like matters, & desired pardon of the L. for ignorances, & errors, & weaknes of judgment, & any disordered caryage: if the ministers that heard my prayers & praises of God did misconstrue my meaning let them look vnto it.

3. VWhereas you impute an absurdity to mee as yet vnanswered, viz: that I should affirme the spit whereon the passeover was rosted was the Altar: I say: seing the passeover was a sacrifice, Marc. 14. 12. & that every sacrifice hath an altar, either the spit was the altar, or els it had no altar: Now tel me which is the Likeliest of the two? & if this be a reasonable speech that the wooden crosse was the Altar whereon Christ was sacrific[ed], why may not by as good reason, the spit be the altar of the passeover? the sacrifice was not slayne vppon the altar, but it was burnt vppon the altar: so that was not the altar wherevppon the passeover was killed, but wherevppon it was burnt or rosted: Mr. Bern. I doe confidently affirme against you, that the spit was asmuch the altar to the passeover, as the crosse was an altar to Christ: & let me heare what you in your best Logick can say against it.

The 7. Likelyhood against the Sep. is framed thus.

The truth increaseth in short space into a multitude.  
The Seperation doth not increase, but is kept vnder.  
Ergo, the Seperation is not the truth.

I answer you Mr. Bern. that this is but a popish argument: & Christ saith his Flock is but a litle Flock: but how very many yeeres hath the cause of the Seperation had il successe? Forsooth 20. or 30. yeeres alas as Mr. Be. what increase hath the Prelacy gotten in the world this hundreth yeeres? yet they say that is the truth against the Presbytery: what increase hath puritanisme gotten this 20. or 30. yeeres in England? yet they say



that is the truth against the Prelacy: is not the cause of the Reformists almost dead and buried? but know Mr. Bern. that the cause of the Separation being the same in the mayne groundes, and essentiall parts with the Reformed Churches, it hath had infinite increase ever since Luthers tyme: and whereas you object heer that wee leave our country without leave: I answer that you know the Law of the Land doth banish vs all: and if Abraham did lawfully passe from one country to another people, I se no reason that wee may not doe so: & though Israel could not get from Egipt, nor Iudah from Babylon being deteyned by violence in captivity, yet the Lord in working ther deliverance declareth that he will have his people depart wher they may freely professe it without let or disturbance: besides you doe pervert the Prophet Ezechiell his speech: Cap. 3. 6. For was not Ionas sent to Nineveh? were not the Iewes caryed into captivity? were not the Apostles sent to al Nations? did al the Corinthians speak with straunge Tonges? is it vnlawful to send men to convert the Pagans? but the meaning of Ezechiell is that though the Iewes vnderstand his preaching yet they wil not beleeve: & the straungers (viz: them of Tyrus & Sidon as Christ saith) would sooner beleeve him then the Iewes, for a Prophet is not without honor save in his owne country: & so the place is misconstrued by you: Finally whereas you object that the L. leaveth a curse behind vs in the Land, I say that is an argument that it is the truth we professe, which bicause it is not intertaind doth therfor prove the savour of death vnto death, and hardeneth the hart of that people where it hath been offered and is refused: & thus much breefly of your froth.

In the next place you bring vs reasons of more force then bare probabilityes, wherby you confesse that your 7. Likelyhoods are of litle force, which I desire the reader to take notice of, that the alledging of them by Mr. Ber. argueth an ill mynd seing he confesseth them to be of smal force against our cause.

The first reason against sep. may be framed thus.

That way is not the truth which teacheth to renounce

the constitution, ministry, worship, & Government of the English assemblies Ecclesiasticall as false: & so in respect thereof to sepearate from them & al spiritual communion with them: & to entertayne the true constitution, ministry, worship, and Government of the Apostolique institution.

The way of the sepearation teacheth thus much.

Ergo, the way of the sepearation is not the truth.

I answer: if the scriptures approve this which we teach of you & of our selves, then is your arg. worth nothing: now whither the sepearation be the truth or not, I refer me to the scriptures, wherby I desire that which I have written may be examined, & if it bee found sound let it be intertayned, if not, follow the truth whatsoever it be: & whereas you say heer that men in sepearating from you must cast of the word which begat them, I deny it, & you are a slaunderer herin: For we retaine al truth that you have, & we reject only your Anti-christianisme: & for acknowledging your Faith, repentance, baptisme false I say it is necessary, but vnderstand that we speak of your things that are visible, & leave things invisible to the Lord: & for that objection you make from our owne confession that we say our Sepearation is only for corruptions, I say it is truth: but yet know that your corruptions are essential: and essential corruptions corrupt the essence of things, & make them false: viz: when the matter is essentially corrupted, or the forme, &c. as a mule procreated of an horse & an asse: Now such is your Church, Ministry, worship, & Government, as is already proved sufficiently.

The 2. reason against Sep. is framed thus.

That way is not the truth, which teacheth the professors thereof to entertayne and joyne with open wicked, obstinate sinnes & sinners.

The Sepearation Teacheth men so to doe.

Ergo, The Sepearation is not the truth.

I answer: That the truth may be the truth though men that professe it walk never so wickedly in it: neither doth it follow bicause the Churches of the Sepearation walk corruptly, therfor the Sepearation is not the truth:

you know Mr. Bern. that this is but sophistry, & hereby you might prove the Doctryne of Christ not to be the truth, because the Corinthians had contentions, incest, fornication, dronkennes & heresy among them: & what say you to your selves who have as many thousand obstinate sinnes & sinners in the land as ther be men of the Separation among vs? is your way therfor error? For the force of this argument therfor I referre mee to your owne conscience, & to every indifferent mans censure.

VVel: Let vs see what obstinate sinnes & sinners are in the Separation: the sinnes are these as you reckon them vp, 1. vnthankfulnes, 2. spiritual vncharitablenes, 3. abusing the Scriptures, 4. Obstynacy in schisme, 5. Rayling & scoffing, 6. false opinions or Brownisme, & the persons persisting in these sinnes are (you say) obstinate wicked.

Let vs handle these things in order.

1. Vnthankfulnes to God that regenerated vs by the word among you, & vnto the Church of Englād our mother that bare vs, in calling her an harlot: I answer: what truth the Lord hath wrought inwardly in vs we do thankfully a[c]knowledg: & I for my part do professe that in your assemblies I receaved the seedes of true faith invisible, which (if I had dyed not knowing the Separation) should I doubt not through Gods mercy have been effectual to my justification & salvatiō in Christ: but this was so invisibly judging according to the inward feeling of my hart, not according to the outward censure of the word: For though I could truly judg so of my self out of myne owne feeling, yet I deny other men could so judg of me judging truly according to the Scriptures. & this I suppose none of the Separation wil deny: This is the thankfulnes which we can yeeld, & do yeeld to God dayly: but for our visible conversion we learned it not from you: & therfor we deny any thākfulnes to be due vnto you for it: neither do we acknowledge the church of England our mother therin, but we say she is barrē & beareth no children vnto the L. in respect thereof.

2. Sinne you impute to vs is spiritual vncharitablenes ap[p]earing first in censuring 3. sorts of persons among you,

1. The ignorant as blinded by the God of the world, 2. judging them that know the Separation, & do not yeeld vnto it as fearfull persons & worldlings, 3. such as tasting of it & falling back are censured as Apostates by vs: wel Mr. Bern. if the way of the Separation be the truth (as it is proved to be) then I know not why it is vncharitablenes thus to censure you: For it is but the censure of the holy Ghost in the scriptures, & in censuring of you herein wee manifest no more vncharitablenes toward you then the Scriptures teach & take heed you do not blaspheme the scriptures censure through vs.

Secondly, our vncharitablenes appeareth (say you) in our vngodly desire to have the word vtterly extinguished among you & Egiptian darknes to come over you rather thē it should be preached by your false ministry: I āswer you by making a demaund which is this: of two sinnes, viz: of murther or adultery which is to be chosen? I suppose you wil answer, neither of them, & that truly: so say I for this particular: if it be demaunded whither wee would that the word should be vtterly extinguished, or preached by your false ministry, I make answer: wee would neither of them: but wee desire both that your false ministry were dissolved, & that the word might by the Kings commaundement, or allowance, or permission bee preached throughout his dominions by men fitted therto: wherefore in this point I challeng you for an vncharitable slaunderer of vs: and heer you digresse to prove that the word may bee preached without a true constitution of a Church: & that preaching is more necessary then a true constitution: I confesse it vnfeynedly & most hartily: neither came the contrary into the thoughts of the brethren of the Separation I suppose: For certainly the true constitution must bee taught, & men must bee brought to the faith, before the Church can bee constituted: & this is it which wee must labor for, that first the word be preached by men of able gifts, & that men bee taught & converted to the Faith, & then they bee established into the new Testament of Christ: but you have done & doe practise the contrary: First, you have established thē into an Antichristian communion &

constitution jumbling together al the people of the Land, of what Religion or condition soever, & then you set over them a false ministry, & then teach them stil to hold & retayne that Antichristian constitution, ministry worship, & government, placed over them: & wholly to reject any reformation offered: & in this your digression you runne out into another calumny, viz: that some of vs are so in dislike with your Church, as that wee would rather intertayne popery, then returne to you againe: For my self I confesse my thoughts & speeches have been & are to this purpose, that whensoever I returne to keep communion with the English assēblies acknowledging them true Churches, & their Ministry true, then must I also of necessity acknowledg Rome to be a true constituted Church, & their ministry true: For your Church & ministry are of the same nature & kind, though of divers degrees of corruption, yours being much refined from infinite drosse which is stil remayning with them. Now if I should returne to succession, & so acknowledg, the East Churches of the Grecians, and the VWest Churches of Rome, & her Daughters wherof England is one (for Rome is the Mother-Church) to be true Churches, yet I would make my choise ther to joyne wher are fewest corruptions: & so rather returne to you then to Rome: & therefore herein I suppose also you are but a slauderer, in advancing a false report, Psalm. 15. 3. wherefore brefly I say, to desire your reformation, & the truth to be practised among you, is neither hatred of you (as you strongly plead) nor any vncharitable desire to have the truth extinguished, and popery intertayned, as you most vncharitably suggest vnto your Reader.

Thirdly, our vncharitablenes ap[p]eareth (you say) in this that we envy that good things prosper with you: wretched man that you are thus to slauder & calumniate vs falsely: I professe that I wish from my Soule, that every Formalist in the Land were a Reformist, & that every Reformist were of the Seperation, & this is al the hurt that wee wish vnto you: whereas you object that the Seperation scoffe at your Religious exercises and your conversion: I doe detest scoffing, & if I my self have at any tyme scoffed I doe proclayme my repentance for

it vnto you & the whole Land: yet know that scoffing at Baals preists was lawfull in Elias, if you cal scoffing an Eironie: neither doe we scoffe at any thing that is good, but at your irrecoverable stifnes in your corrupted courses: neither is this eironie vsed as a mock to disgrace you, but as a meanes to reforme you as Elias his eironie was: againe you say wee pray not for your Ministers, but wish discontentment, that men may thereby come to the Seperation: I answer wee pray for the Ministers and people, that they may repent and yeeld to the truth: and wee wish that men may bee discontented with their corrupt and evil wayes, which is the high way to repentance: but wee wish no man through discontentment of poverty, or reproach, or disgrace to fall from any truth, as it seemeth you have done from Puritanisme to the Prelates faction & conformity: Further you vrge vncharitablenes in hasty excommunications for smal matters: I answer, (not for others) but for our particular Church of the Seperation, that wee doe not vse excommunication as a matter of hatred, but of love, neyther doe wee excommunicate any man but for sinne convinced, and that after once and twice admonition, and that is not hastily: and whereas you teach vs not to excommunicate for every sinne wee doe practise your advertisement: but if you wil have vs retaine in our communion any sinner willfully impenitent and peevisly obstinate in sinne, wee answer, that wee abhorre your counsel, and wee think such persons fitter for your Antichristian Synagogues, then for the true Church of Christ, which is a communion of Saints only.

Againe, you censure the Seperation of vncharitablenes for excommunicating them that heer the word of your Ministers: I deny it except they continue impenitent in that sinne: and then indeed wee doe: and the reason is, bicause wee hold according to the truth, that you are false Churches, and false Ministers, and that wee ought not to have any Spirituall communion with Idols: and doe you think that impenitency in Idolatry is not worthy excommunication? and for that you say it is no sinne to heare the true word of any man: I ask whither you think it lawfull to heare the Popish preists preach, & to

pray with them: if it bee vnlawful then you are answered: and the Lord forbiddeth to heare false Prophets. Deut. 13. 3. & the Apostle willeth to Seperate from such as teach false Doctryne, 1. Timoth. 6. 3-5. to reject an Heretique after once and twice admonition: Tit. 3. 10. and not to give entertaynment to the false teachers. 2. John. 10.

Heer I omit your gibe of the annoynting which is the Holy Ghost, that the Apostle saith the Faithful have to teach them all truth, whereby the brethren of the Seperation presume (as you say) to teach wanting gifts: & referre you to the Apostles speech. 1. Cor. 14. wher he willeth al the brethren to endeavor to prophecy: & teacheth them that they may prophecy one by one: & wil you to remember that this gibe of yours falleth vppon Paul, the Holy Scriptures, the Spirit of God, & Christ Iesus the mediator of the new Testament which hath established the exercise of Prophecy in the Church for all the brethren that have gifts: & ther is no man that doth beleve but he can speak.

Finally, this want of love which you impute to vs, I wonder how it is bettered amōg you who persecute one another so hatefully as you do: as the Prelates & their factiō do devoure the reformists & ther faction: So as it seemeth you are blind at home, though you can see so dragon-like abroad.

3. Synne you impute to vs is misaledging, & wresting the Scriptures: instances you give none, onely you say that some have accused some of the principals of vs: but doth it follow therefore that the accusation is true? Christ was accused for blasphemy: was hee therefore a blasphemer? But if you meane that the Ministers in the conference of Coventre with my self have accused mee thereof: I answer it was before I knew the Seperation, as you & they can tel: & what is this to the Seperation: but for their chardging me with wresting the Scriptures, I answer that wherein I have wrested the Scripture it is of ignorance, & I doe not presently remember the particulars: Let them bee produced to the world, I desire no favor, if it bee my sinne I wil confesse it, but neither doe I know it, neither do you prove it, only you say it, & whither you must be beleved on your bare word that

are so common a slaunderer in this your book I referre mee to the Censure of every man that is not partiall, and doteth not vppon you.

4. Synne you chardg vs with is wilful persisting in Schisme joyned with contempt & scorne of others: I answer: doe not you wilfully persist in your Schisme from Rome, contemning & scorning of them? you will say, they are in error: & wee say you are in error, & that the difference betwixt you & vs is more, then betwixt you & them: For your constitution, ministry, & Government is one with theirs: but wee are opposite vnto you in all these. If it be no sinne in you thus to deale with Rome: it is no sinne in vs thus to deale with you: but I deny vtterly that wee Schisme from you: For ther can bee no Schisme from a false Church, ministry, worship, & Government, except it be Schisme to depart out of Babylon.

Againe we do neither contemne nor scorne any man, only we single the truth, & leave their corruptions & errors, & refuse to build our Faith vppon men, or Churches, or false expositions of Scripture: & we desire no man to come to vs further then wee have the truth, which whither we have or not, I referre it & must doe to the conscience of every one that loveth the truth, who shal live by his owne Fayth, and dye for his owne sinnes.

5. Synne you cast vppon vs is Rayling, Scoffing, and blaspheming, this you exemplify in two particulars, 1. Mr. Barrowes sharp speeches in the discovery, 2. our approbation of it in him.

I answer: First: that Mr. Barrowes Scripture phrases whatsoever I doe approve, & justify them fitly to be applyed to your false Church, Ministry, worship, & Government: & til you have forsaken al that falsehood they doe deservedly lye vppon you: Secondly, The phrases which Mr. Barrow alledgeth & borroweth els where, I dare not either alow them or reprove them, because I know not what particular motion of the Spirit guided him so to write: but the things signified by those phrases declaring the Idolatry of your Church, Ministry, VVorship, and Government, I approve. Thirdly, that Mr. Barrow eironically vpbraydeth the preaching and



VVorship of the assemblies, following therein Elias his example, I dare not censure that as an vngodly act of his though I doubt not but you doe performe these Religious exercises in the honesty of your ignorance, as I my self somtyme did. Fourthly, that he specially inveigheth against the Reformists, he doth it not for that they are the worst men, but for that by their doings the Lords truth is most hindered, they being like the Pharisees aptest to deceave. Finally, I wil not vnder-take the defence of Mr. Barrowes tartnes, neither dare I absolutely condemne it, seing the Prophet Esay is as sharpe against the true Church as ever was Mr. Barrow against your false Church: & whereas you alledg my writing vpon the Lords prayer before I saw the Seperation, as a confutation or contradiction to Mr. Barrow, I say you may aswel alledg against St. Paul his Pharisaical practises, persecutions, & blasphemies befor he came to the truth, as evidence to confute Christian Religion which afterward he embraced.

6. Synne you lay vpon vs is our oppinions the matter of our Schisme Brownisme as you call it: which I have already cleered to be the vndoubted truth of God, & wherto I require your answer, or els I affirme before the Lord that you are not able: & that being convinced & your mouth stopped, either you must yeeld to the truth, or els woe be vnto you from the Lord.

And so I end my answer leaving your advertisements & counsels of peace vntoucht as matters nothing per-teyning to the cause of the Seperation: they being like Apollos Oracles apt to bee expounded eyther way: or like Delphos sword fit to be vsed for any purpose: for they may fit, eyther Papist, Protestant, Reformist, or the Seperation.

#### An advertisement to the Reader.

It may happily be thought that this treatise (by reason of the tartnes of some speches phrases, & censures, passed vpon Mr. Be. the ministers, & Church of England) may passe the bounds of Christian wisdom & charity: especially considering that we of the Seperation cannot be ignorant, what great offence ther is taken at Mr.

Barrowes bitterness in his discovery, & that we know how greatly the forward preachers & professors of the land desire to be mildly & gently handled, & to have a charitable censure passe of them in respect of their Religious dispositions to the truth: wel: For Mr. Be. let him know for his part that he is fallen into a deep pit of Apostacy from his formerly seeming sincerity, & if men may be judged by that which is visible, I see no reason why the forward preachers & professors of the Land should not esteem of him as they do of Mr. Merbury, sith Mr Be. is now fallen to his gracious Lords aswel as the other: only Mr. Ber. case is somthing better in this respect, that he wanteth some of Achitophels pollicy, & Rabsakeh his rayling, & of Tertullus Rhetorick to oppose the truth: in respect whereof ther is hope that Mr. Be. sinning through infirmity, simplicity, weaknes of judgment, & violence of affection may by some sharpe effectual ingredients, having vomited vp al his choler, & purged out al his evil humors, be reduced eyther to as good, or to a better constitution then wherin he formerly was: & to this purpose is al the sharpe phisick administred vpon him in this pre-script: and so the Author doth intreat Mr. Ber. in his best love to interpret it: & to remember what Nathan said vnto David: thou art that man: & what David answered Nathan: I have sinned: & what comfort Nathan presently annexed: The Lord hath put away thy sinne: This condition we vnfeynedly wish to Mr. Be. our old & kind frend: & for the forward preachers & professors of the Land, they must vnderstand, that our censure must be & is only according to that which is visible in their communion: now in that respect seing the Church, Ministry, VVorship, and Government, of the English Ecclesiastical assemblies is judged & proved false, & Antichristian: how is it possible that wee should speake otherwise of them as they are ministers and members of that Antichristian body then as of false ministers & false Christians? what would they have vs speak as the false Prophets did, Peace, Peace, where ther is no peace? would they have vs proclayme, The Temple of the Lord: The Temple of the Lord: to the Synagogues of Antichrist? this were to deceave them,

& to daube the wal with vntempered mortar: but if the forward preachers & professors of the Land do imagine that we condemne them, as persons voyd of grace, as excluded from salvation by Christ or the like censures: we give them to vnderstand that the Scripture teacheth vs no such thing, but rather forbiddeth such censures, for we are not to iudg before the tyme: & therfor concerning this particular we absolutely leave them to the Lord, not doubting but he hath his thousands among them: desiring them to remember that it is one thing to apply the Scripture, to lay the salve to the sore, to denounce judgment against the sinne: another to pronounce the sentence of absolution & condemnation which Christ Iesus alone (into whose hands the Father hath committed al judgment) shal do, & which for any man to vsurp is to intrude into Christs throne & seate of mercy & justice.

But if ther be any in the assemblies, either forward preacher & professor that seeth this truth of the Seperation, & yeeldeth not in obedience to forsake that Antichristian way, & to walk in the truth, let him know, that seing his hart cōdemneth him, God is greater then his hart: & blessed is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth: & thus humbly & hartily desiring the Lord to shew the light of his truth more & more vppon the Land, & at the length vtterly to disperse al that myst & darknes that overshadoweth & obscureth the truth, I cease writing: wishing all welfare to the vpright hearted Reader.

FINIS.

A Lettre written to Mr. A. S.  
By Iohn Smyth.

Aister S. beinge requested by Mr. H. your kind frend  
M & myne, as also, out of myne owne inclination to  
doe you good, whome I heare to be stronglie caried  
out of the true way, & in respect of the auncient acquaint-  
ance which I had with you in the vniversitie of Cam-  
bridge, I thought good at this tyme in few lines to salute  
you, hoping that you wil interpret this which I doe in  
good part. I desier you would communicate this my  
writinge with Mr. B. our ould Frende, & with whome  
soever els you shal see cause, that you al whome I take  
to be the Lords people yet in Babilon, may come forth  
of her, that ye be not pertaker of her sinnes, & that ye  
receave not of her plagues: you wrote to Mr. H. certaine  
reasons provinge your Church a true Church, & your  
ministerie a true ministerie, this Letter Mr. H. hath lost,  
& so the particulars ther of he cannot perfectlie remem-  
ber: you wrote another Letter after vnto him, wherin  
you triumphed before the victorie: I have advent[u]red in  
this writinge to declare vnto you, both the insufficiencie  
of such your reasons, for your Church & ministerie, as  
Mr. H. remembreth, as also the substance of that truth  
which we professe, & for the which wee suffer bonds,  
losse of goods, banishment, & death, according as the  
Lord alloteth to vs: Mr. S. I pray you be perswaded  
that that which we do, we doe it not rashlie, nor vppon  
discontentment, nor in pride, or vppon any sinister  
respect: no: we cal God to record to our soules that  
the evidence of the truth workinge vppon our consciences  
through the Lords vnspeakeable mercie, even contrarie  
to our rebellious nature, hath mightelye convinced &  
violentlye caried vs to this truth we professe & practise:  
heare our groundes, & then give sentence, waigh al things  
indifferently, cast prejudice into nether ballance, examine  
what I say by the worde, & leane not to any mans opinion,  
& I dare adventure my credit that then the light of this  
truth wil shine in your hart, & then I pray you put it  
not away: so with this preface I beginne to lay downe

the groundes of our cause which is also the Lords everlastinge truth: the groundes are these.

1. The covenant, the promise, Christ, is given to Abraham the Father of the faithful, & to al those that are of the faith of Abraham, & to no other: as is plaine by these Scriptures. Gen. 17. 7. Levit. 26. 9. 12. Luk. 1. 72. 74. Rom. 4. 10. 12. 23. 24. Iohn. 8. 39. 44. Mat. 3. 9. Gal. 3. 7. 9. 16.

2. This covenant is not limited at the pleasure of men, but it is absolute, no Prince nor State can either ad to it, or take ought frō it, or alter the least part of it, but God giveth whole Christ, al the promises, the whole covenant on his behalf to the faithful: & the faithful on the other side promise to be Gods people wholly to deny themselves & to obey God in every one of his precepts, even the least, though it cost them their lives, Gē. 17. 1. Deut. 12. 32. Mat. 22. 32. Rom. 8. 22. 2. Cor. 1. 20. Mat. 10. 37-39.

3. Two or thre faithful men have this covenant, promises, Christ, given vnto them immediatlie from heaven, & not by meanes of any State, Prince, Priest, Prelate whatsoever: but whersoever two or thre faithful people arise in the world, in what countrie or nation soever, at what tyme soever, there & then, the covenant, promises, & Christ is theirs, & with them, 2. Cor. 6. 17. 18. Mat. 18. 20. & 28. 20, Act. 4. 12. Heb. 8. 10. Apoc. 1. 11. & 14. 9. 12. 1. Pet. 1. 1 Act. 2. 39. Apoc. 17. 13. 14.

4. These faithfull people whersoever they arise in the VVorld, must be Seperated from the VVorld, and from all vncleanenes whatsoever: For the faithfull must not draw the yoake with vnbeleevers, righteousnes can have no fellowship with vnrighteousnes, light can have no communion with darknes, Christ can have no concord with Beliall, that is, with a Societie that is without his yoke, the beleever can have no part with the vnbeleever, and the Temple of God can have no agreement with Idols. 2. Corinth. 6. 16. 18. Apoc. 14. 9-11. Deut. 22. 10. & 7. 2. 3. 6. Act. 19. 9. Ephe. 5. 7. 11.

5. A few faithfull people standing in confusion with vnbeleevers, vnseperated from them, being one bodie

with them, in that estate standing are not a true church of Christ, which I prove by divers reasons.

1. The faithful have the Spirit of Christ, the vnbeleevers have the Spirit of satan, how can these two contrarie Spirits, these two contrarie sorts of persons combyne together, 2. Cor. 6. 14. 15. 16.

2. Ther is enmity put betwixt these two sortes of persons, ergo: they cannot combine together, see Gen. 3. 15.

3. The covenant, promises, Christ, is the faithfull only: how can vnbeleevers have any part in them.

6. Seing the faithfull being but few, have the covenant, promises, Christ, therefore they have powre to all the meanes whereby they shall enjoy Christ as the word, seales of the covenant, the ministerie, the powre of binding and losing, for all these are parts of the covenant, they are the promises, they are the meanes of pertaking Christ. Roman. 3. 2. and 4. 11. Act. 6. 5. and 14. 23. Math. 18. 18. 20. 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. 2. Pet. 1. 3. 4. 1. Tim. 4. 8.

7. As they have the powre of all these things, so they are commaunded to vse al these helpes, and are bound to obey the Lord in usinge all these meanes for enjoying Christ, therefore they are bound to vse the word, the seales of the covenant, the ministerie, the censures for their owne mutuall good. Deuter. 5. 31. 32. 33. and 6. 17. and 12. 32. 1. Corint. 14. 37. 1. Tim. 5. 21. & 6. 13. 14. Gal. 3. 15. Iam. 1. 19-22. 1. Cor. 11. 24. 25. Act. 6. 3. Heb. 13. 17. Mat. 18. 15. 17.

8. The faithfull must be Seperated from the wicked and vnbeleevers, 2. Corinth. 6. 17. They must Seperate wicked men from among them by the censures, 1. Corinth, 5. 13. Math. 18. 15. 17. 2. Thessa 3. 6. 14. They must chose, aprove & ordeine their owne Elders & Deacons, Act. 6. 3. & 14. 23. 1. Tim, 3. 10 & 6. 13. 14. As wel as vse the word and seales of the covenant.

9. If the faithfull either doe not Seperate themselves from the wicked, or not Seperate the vnbeleevers from them: if they still mingle with them they forfeite the covenant, they consent to all the sinne of the vnbeleevers, to all their prophanation of the Holy things: seing God

hath given them power to reforme themselves, and to keepe all wicked persons from among their communion by the censures of admonition and excommunication, Apoc. 18. 4 Eph. 5. 3. 11. 1. Cor. 5. 6. Mat. 13. 33. 1. Cor. 12. 17. 22. Levit. 19. 17. Mat. 22. 39. Mat. 18. 15. 17.

10. If Kings and States forbid the faithfull to vse any of these helps and meanes which God hath given and commaunded them to vse, they are to lose their lives rather then to forbear, bicause they are bound to obey God rather then men, Act. 4. 19. Deut. 12. 32.

11. If Princes and States commaund the Church and faithfull to entertaine any other ordinances, then these before rehearsed, they are not to obey, but rather to leese their lives, 1. Tim. 6. 13. 14. Mat. 16. 24. 25. Apoc. 22. 18. 19.

Mr. S. these are the very grounds and principles of our cause, which is the Lords truth, there are divers other particulars which I thincke not fitt to relate vnto you: They may be after discovered vnto you vppon occasion: Now I come to answeere your reasons for your Church and ministerie: First, you say you have a true church, your reason is, for that you have the word truly preached, and the Sacraments duely administred.

I confesse that wheresoever these thinges are found there is a true Church, but I denie the word to bee truly Preached, and the Sacraments duely administred in any parish Church of England, which I manifest vnto you after this manner.

1. First, the people pertakinge in the seales of the covenante in prayer, and in the communion of Holy thinges: are not a people Seperated from all the vnbeleev-ers, open sinners of the Land, but stand still in confusion with them, submitinge to all the false Government of the Prelates, &c. Such a people so standinge have no title to the covenant, to Christ, to the promises, see the first ground: supra.

2. Secondly, this people so mingled with the wicked of the Land, cannot be a true Church, seinge it is impossible for them to be conjoynd & combynd together into one bodie, as the true Church is. For as two disparate seeds, viz: of an horse and an asse, doe not

produce either an Horse or an Asse, but a mule. Genes. 36. 24. So of the two contrarie seeds of the VVoman and of the Serpent, Genes 3. 15. can not proceede a true Church, but some thing of another nature, viz: a false Church: VVherefore in the false Church cannot the word be truly preached, & the Sacraments duely administred.

3. Thirdly, there is one only true forme of a visible Church. Ephes. 4. 4. One bodie, which bodie is called Christ, 1. Corinth. 12. 12. Galat. 3. 16. This one body hath one Spirit, Ephes. 4. 4. This one body guided by this one Spirit, hath one Lord. Ephes. 4. 5. VVhich Lord is Christ the onely Lawgiver: It hath also one faith, which is the faith expressed in the writings of the Apostles. it hath also one Baptisme whereby men are admitted into this faith, submitted vnto this Lord, baptized into this Spirit, incorporated into this bodie: and so have one God and Father: one hope of life everlastinge, to whome the promises and covenant is given: Now in the assemblies of England there are divers Faythes, one of the Puritanes so miscalled, another of the Prelates, a third of the Papistes that come to Church, a fourth of the ignorant persons. So, they cannot be one, & they denye themselves to be of the same body with Papists, Atheists, Prelates, witches conjurers, theves, murtherers, blasphemers, drunckerds, vsurers, &c. Therfor they are not the true body of Christ, the true Church of God, therefore all the holy things are profaned, when they are ther administred, how then can they be said, as you plead to be truly administred in the assemblies of England.

4. Add herevnto that the most forward Preachers & Professors of the Land do not practize according to that which they know the Lord requireth to be practised, viz: in admitting of al to the Holy things, good & bad, in neglecting the censures vtterly: in fetching the Ministers calling from the prelates whome they hold Antichristiã: in submitting to their Ecclesiastical jurisdiction which is vnlawful: therby yealding their consciences to other Lawgivers then Christ: For their cannõs & Christs lawes are contrary: how can we say that they that thus doe, sinning against their consciences, in this manner, are Separated from al sinne, touch no vncleane



thing, & so how can they be said in that constitution the true Church, & so how can the word be said truly preached & the Sacraments duely administred in that estate?

Thus Mr. S. you see your Church is proved not to be true, & your signes of a true church therefore not to be found in your assemblies. Your second point foloweth, viz: that your ministerie is a true ministerie: I pray you how can ther be a true ministerie, where is a false Church? doth not the true ministerie arise out of the true Church? can there be a true ministerie & a false Church? I know not how these things can stand together.

But let vs heare your arguments, to prove your true ministerie.

First, you say ther is a true ministerie bicause men are converted thereby: I answere conversion is no signe of a true ministerie: For Prophets, Preists, Apostles, Evangelists, ordinary Prophets, Pastors, private men, private women have converted, Iohn. 4. 39 Phillip. 1. 14. 15. 1. Cor. 14. 24. 31. Aēt. 9. 1. & 11. 19. 21. Ergo: conversion apertaineth not only to ministers: n[e]ither is it a proper effect or adjunct of a true ministerie.

Secondly, let your argument be framed after a true forme: it wilbe this: whosoever converteth soules is a true Pastor: The ministers of the church of England convert soules [Er]go, they are true Pastors.

I make another argument: whosoever converteth soules is an Apostle, 1. Cor. 9. 2. The ministers of England convert soules, [Er]go: they are Apostles: The like arguments may be made to prove the ministers of England, Priests, extraordinary Prophets, evangelistes, yea Christ himselfe, Mat. 11. 5. Ier[e]m. 23. 22. Malach. 4. 6. Aēt. 8. 12. Now Mr. S. judge whither your Argument be good, to prove a true ministerie, yea or nay.

Thirdly I would know whither you thinke that the Ministers of the Romish Church are true Ministers, yea or nay: but it is manifest, Apoc. 18, 4. that Gods people are in Rome how came they thyther? ther they are converted: how was Luther, Husse, Ierom of Prage the waldenses converted? how were they converted in King Henrie the 8. tyme? answere this if you can I pray you.

Fourthly it is not the worke of the Officers of the Church to convert soules, but to fede & edifie them being converted: a Pastor doth not make shepe, but fedeth, guideth, & tendeth his shepe: the members of the true Church are al Saints, now Saints are converted already: and the Officers of the Church are conversant about the Saints converted, not about the profane vnconverted, you know a shepherd & a flock are convertible: therefore the place Ephe. 4. 12, doth not signifie as it is translated gathering or converting the Saints. But it signifieth the joyning of them as you may see, Gal. 6. 1. & the mending of any thinge, Mat. 4. 21.

Lastly, how can you or any man prove to me out of the word that you convert soules by your ministerie? men that are converted, are converted to the true faith, which is one, which true faith is only in the true Church, which is the body Christ, which is but one, Eph. 4. 4. 5. 6. But your Church is not true, therfor your faith is not true, therfor you convert none to the true faith which Gods word doth declare vnto vs: I confesse that ther are thousands which I am perswaded aperteyne to the Lords election, but which they be in particular I certainly know not: I hope wel of you & manie more that I know.

Now that your faith is not true I prove thus: They which beleve not Christ to be their King, or if they know him to be ther King, do not submit to his Kingdome have not the true faith, Luk. 19. 27. But none of you in your assemblies beleve Christ to be your King, or if ye do yeeld not to his Kingdome, which is his visible Church, & the ordinances therof, seing you mingle with al the profane in the Land, reject his Officers, submit to the Prelates vnlawful authoritie Ecclesiastical, neglect his lawes, statutes & Iudgements, viz: the censures of admonition & excommunication.

Secondly, you say you have a true ministerie, 1. bicause God hath sent you, bicause he hath given you giftes, 2. you are allowed to exercise your gifts by some approved there vnto, & 3. your gifts are approved by your people among whom you administer, this is the some of your reason, where vnto I answere many thinges, first to your first point.

1. That God sendeth none ordinarily, but those whome the true Church sendeth, but yours is not the true Church as is proved: therfor God sendeth you not, seing you are not sent by the true Church, which you have not: againe it doth not follow that bicause you have giftes, that therfor you are sent, for ther be among the Popish Preists men that have excellent gifts, & yet you wil not say they are sent: so among the common & civill lawyers, ther are men that have giftes, yet you cannot say, they are sent: Lastly, if you be sent of God, how is it that contrarie to the L. commaundement you keepe silence when the Prelates silence you? For if God hath sent you, who can forbid you?

2. To your second point I answere thus: viz:  
 1. that the allowance you have, is not sufficient for the true Church must & doth & can only give sufficient allowance or powre to her Officers, which you have not.  
 2. The Prelates which are in vnlawful Ecclesiastical authoritie, can give no sufficient authoritie or allowance to true Ministers, for can good come from evill? 3. if you say you have your authoritie from the civil State, I answere, the civil State can not give Ecclesiastical authoritie, 4. if you chalenge your powre from some Presbyterie of Ministers: I answer they must shew that they have powre to give you authoritie.

3. I say as before, that every particular visible Church, which is a communion of Saints and faithful people, hath al powre Ecclesiastical with in it selfe, which your parishes can not have, bicause they are confused rowtes, mingle mangles of al sortes, cages to hold every vncleane and hateful bird, Apoc. 18. 2. contrarie to Deut. 14. 2. 3. 11. 12. vnequally yoaked contrarie to the Type. Deuter. 22. 10. And contrarie to the truth, 1. Corinth. 6. 14. and therefore it is impossible that you should have a true callinge, from them who have no powre of Christ given them to enjoy the covenant, promises, Christ, or any meanes to partake Christ as is already proved vnto you, & so your third point all so falleth to the ground.

Breefly therefore to discover vnto you the true callinge which is onely one, for there is onely one true way for

Officers to enter into Office, viz: that way which is taught by Christ, for he is the dore into the Shepfold, and whosoever climeth vp any other way (Christ saith) is a thefe and a robber, Iohn. 10. 1. 7. 9, the true calling is this. 1. A company of faithful people, 2. must be Seperate from all wicked men, 3. joyned together into covenant to enjoy all Gods ordinances. 4. assembled with fasting, and prayer, 5. must chose out from among themselves, one or more able persons, 6. must be approved according to the rules: mentioned by the Apostle, 1. Timoth. 3. and afterward, 7. charged & commaunded to administer faithfully that this is so, these places witnes, Roman. 1. 7. 1. Corinth. 1. 2. Ephes. 1. 4. Apocal. 17. 14. and 15. 3. Apocal. 18. 4. 2. Corinth. 6. 17. Ephes. 5. 7. Deuter, 29. 9. 13. Iosua. 24. 25. Act. 3. 25. Heb. 8. 10. Act. 13. 2. 3. and 14. 23. & 6. 5. 1. Tim. 3. 10. Tit. 1. 6. 9. 1. Tim. 6. 3. 14. Act. 20. 28. 1. Pet, 5. 1. 3. 4.

Now Mr. S. shew mee such a Church, and such a Ministerie, in any parish Church in England, and I will acknowledg it a true Church, and that ministerie, a true ministerie: but if you cannot shew it, give vs leave to doe as wee doe accordinge to that which wee have shewed you warrant for out of the word.

And now I pray you examine these things carefully, and thinke it not labour lost to search and weigh seriously the Scriptures by mee quoted in every point. Know that the Lord will not be served with halves, he will have all or none: I confesse you have much good doctrine among you: yea you have the doctrine of Christs Preisthood pure in his Sacrifice and intercession, but you have vtterly cast off his Kingdome, which is the true constitution of the visible Church in the true causes essentiall thereof, viz: 1. the true matter which are only Saints, 2 the true forme which is the covenant to walke in al Gods wayes. 3. The true essential properties which is the powre of our Lord Iesus Christ especially in binding and losing, without which it is impossible for the Church to continue a Holy communion among themselves: al this you want, and therefore you in the assemblies deny Christ the King to reigne over you, you have rejected Christs Testament, for his Testament is that which he

hath purchased with his blood: as you may see, 1. Corinth. 11. 25. Heb. 10. 29. For the Old Testament was abolished by the blood of his crosse, and the new Testament succeeded & is established in stead thereof by his blood: for Christ by his Preisthood obteyned his Kingdome, & now in his Kingdom dispenceth the vertue of his Preisthood to his subjects: Mr. S. I pray you consider carefully these things, I know they are the vndoubted & most cleare & evident truth of Gods word: & that wil I adventure further to prove before any witnesses, vppon the hazard of my life if I may have audience: do not you now as you have once done in your Letter to Mr. H. take it granted that nether he nor his leaders, as you speak, can answere your arguments, you see it is otherwise: I pray you doe not oppose against this truth in your pulpits till you have throughly scanned all thinges, & til you have had further passages with mee about it: I did thinke that I ought to doe many things against this way, but it pleased the Lord at the length to reveale his truth vnto me, for the which I blesse my God for ever: I know if you once interest your selfe in opposition against the cause publicuely, it will be very hard for you afterwards to deny your doinges, & to pul downe that which you have built: Therefore be advised: raise vp your hart to enter into the cause, & be not afrayd of it, deny al, even wife & children, & life also: els you are not capable of this truth.

I pray you commend mee to Mr. B. and to your selfe most kindly: The Lord of his mercy vouchsafe to enlighten you with the evident brightnes of his truth: and the Lord open your hart to entertayne it in love: and the Lord guide your feete into the way of peace: so in all kindnes I take leave of you bidding you most hartely farewell.

F I N I S .

[The Printer adds eight lines of errata, incorporated in this edition.]

A Lettre written to certaine brethren in S.  
By Iohn Smyth.

Mercie and peace be multiplied vnto you.

Rethrē: I am exceedingly rejoyced in my soule  
B hearing of the grace of God bestowed vpon you:  
& although you are but few in nomber, yet considering that the Kingdome of heaven is as a graine of mustard seed smal in the beginning: I do not doubt but you may in tyme grow vp to a multitude, and be as it weere a great tree full of Fruitful branches which I vnfeignedlie desire, brethren, in your behalf at the Lords handes.

I have receaved your lettre long since, & I had sēt you answer ere this if I had had a cōvenient messenger, but now having fit opportunity offered I doe willingly & of duty to you my brethren, to the L. Iesus, & his truth, make answer to your motion: & whereas Mr. K. is a man famous in the Churches of England for learning & sincerity being now growen aged in them both, it might therfor be thought boldnes in mee to deale with him, yet being provoked therevnto by you & by himself, & by my place which I susteyne in the Church of Christ, I durst not refuse, but choose rather to incure the vnder-served suspitiō of arrogācie (if any man dare so deem it) by manifesting the truth, then the deserved reproach of the denyal of the truth, which is committed when the truth is not defended vpon due calling thervnto: F[i]rst therfor I doe professe before al men that the truth wee professe is manifested already sufficiently (to all that wil but open there eyes) in the writings of those worthy witnesses of Iesus Christ, who have gone before vs in the Testimonie of this truth wee hold out to the world: & therfor I shal by this my writing, only doe that which is already done: & therfor this my labor might wel have been spared: Secondly, neverthesse bicause things may be further expla[i]ned & manifested by special gifts: I thought it not amisse to shew myne opinion also: The rather being called thervnto, by your

selves as also by Mr. K. briefly therefore to come to the matter the two points to be proved are these.

First, that such matters as are excepted against in the Church of England, are contrary to the word of God.

Secondly: That they are in such sort opposite thereunto as thereby it is become no Church meet for any good Christian to Remaine in and to communicate with.

These two points shalbe manifestly proved by these Scriptures following.

1. First, your Church is not of the Apostolique constitution, but framed according to the invention of man, which is proved thus. Deut. 14. 2. compared with 1. Pet. 2. 9. Roman. 1. 7.

1. The Churches of the Apostolique constitution consisted of Saints only.

The Churches of England consist not of Saints only.

Therfor the Churches of England are not of the Apostolique constitution, & therfor are framed according to the invention of man.

The major is proved by the former Scriptures, for Moses calleth the Iewes an Holy people ceremonially typing that the people of the new Testament should be truly holy as Peter doth expound it, and Paull exemplifie it to the Romanes and in all his Epistles.

The minor is manifest: for all sorts of persons, Atheists, Papists, adulterers, theeves, &c & who not? are compelled to be & are members of the English Churches. Ergo.

2. Againe from that Church which is not of the Apostolique constitution, but of mans invention, al the faithful must make Seperation, 2, Chron. 13. 5-13. & 30. 5-12. compared with Revel. 14. 9. 10. & 18. 4. 5.

The Churches of England are not of the Apostolique constitution, but of mans invention.

Therfor the faithful must make Seperation from the Churches of England.

The major is proved thus: as Ezechiah perswadeth the Israelites to Seperate from the Church of Ieroboams invention to joyne to the true Church of Iudah which was of Moses constitution, so Iohn by vision is commaunded to pronounce a woe to them that give homage

to Antichrists ordinances, and to perswade all the faithfull to Seperate from Babylon, which is by interpretation a confusion: Now all mens inventions are Antichristian, seing that as Christ & Antichrist are opposite, so are Christian & Antichristians, if therfor the constitution of the Churches of England be not of Christs, that is of the Apostolique primitive frame, it is of man, of Antichrist, & so woe be to them that doe not Seperate from it.

2. Secondly, your ministerie is not of the Apostolique primitive institution, but framed according to mans invention which is proved thus, Heb. 5. 4. 5. Levit. 8. compared with Esay. 66. 20. 21. Aēt. 6. 3–6. & Aēt. 14. 23.

1. The true ministerie of the Apostolique institution was by election, approbation, & ordination of that particular holy people wherto they did administer.

The ministry of the assemblies of England is not so, but after the invention of man.

Therfor the ministerie of the assemblies is not the true minister[i]e of the Apostolique institution, but devised by man.

The major is proved by the former scriptures, for as that only was the true preisthood which Moses by the cōmaudemēt of the L. apointed in the old testamēt: & therfor that of Ieroboams was false, 1. King. 12. 31. & 2. Chron. 13. 9. So in the new Testament that is only the true ministerie which is of the Apostolique institution, viz: by election, ordination, approbation, of that faithful & holy people wherto they administer.

The minor is evident: For the ministerie of England, viz: the Prelacie, Preisthood, & Deaconry, like thre vncleane Spirits proceed out of the mouth of the beast, that is are by the Authority of the Romane Empyre established: Revel. 16. 15. out of the mouth of the false Prophet, that is are by Authority of the Pope of Rome established: & out of the mouth of the Dragon, that is are by the Authority of Sathan himself established: For ther is not a minister in England Elected by that faithful people wher he administreth, but is chosen by a profane mixt people, if he be chosen, & law doth not allow such election: he is approved & ordeyned by



Antichrist himself, comming out of the mouth of the false Prophets the Prelates of the Land.

2. Againe, from that ministerie which is not of the Apostolique institution, but of mans invention must all the good Christians make Seperation, Deut. 13. 3. Math. 7. 15. 2. Timoth. 3. 5. Revel. 14. 9. 2. Corinth. 11. 13-15. Revel. 2. 2.

The Ministerie of England is not of the Apostolique institution, but of mans invention.

Therefore all good Christians must make Seperation from the Ministerie of England.

The Major is proved thus: as in the old Testament Moses commaundeth not to harkē to false Prophets, Ezechiah endevoreth to draw the people from Ieroboams Preists, So in the new Testament Christ willeth to take heed of false Prophets, Paull willeth to turne away from such, & a woe is threatned by Iohn to al that receive the beasts mark from his Ministers.

Thirdly, your worship is not of the Apostolique primitive institution, but is invented by man & so is Antichristian: as may be proved thus, Act. 2. 4. 11. 42. & 10. 46. & 19. 6. Rom. 8. 26. 1. Cor. 12. 7. & 14. 15. 26.

1. The true worship of the Apostolique institution proceeded meerly from the Spirit having no outward help of devised formes of prayers, exhortations, psalmes, & Ceremonies.

The worship of the English assemblies proceedeth out of the Servicebook in devised formes of prayers, exhortations, & psalmes, & other Ceremonies.

Therfor the worship of the English assemblies is not the true worship of the Apostolique institution, but is invented by man.

The major is manifest by the places alledged: For vppon the day of Pentecost the Apostles had the holy Ghost given them in the shape of fiery & cloven tongues, & thervppon they spake as the holy Ghost gave them vtterance, manifesting the Spirit to the hearers, & so was it with the Gentils afterward when the holy Ghost came vppon them, & since that tyme all the churches of the Apostolique institutiō worshipped after the same manner, for al Churches worshipped after one manner,

1. Cor. 16. 1. & 14. 36. 37. & 11. 2 16. wher note that if devised formes of prayers, psalmes, exhortations, were Gods ordināces, the Apostles would have delivered them to the Churches, & they should have received vppon the day of Pentecost fiery bookes aswel as fiery tongs.

The minor is evident & needeth no proof. Ergo.

2. Againe: From that worship which is invented by man, & not of the Apostolique institution must al the good Christians Seperate, Col. 2. 20–23. Mat. 15. 9. Levit. 10. 1. 2. compared with Act. 2. 3.

The worship of the English assemblies is invented by man, & not of the Apostolique institution.

Therfor from the worship of the English assemblies ought al good Christians to Seperate.

The major is proved thus: For seing the worship of the assēblies is wil-worship, vaine-worship, devised by man, not kindled with the true living fire which came downe from heaven vppon the primitive Church, but with such a straunge fire as Nadab and Abihu offered withal, therfor it is idolatry & so to be Seperated from.

4. Fourthly, the Government of the assemblies is Antichristian by the confessiō of thēselves, & therin can no good Christian joyne, except it be lawful for a good Christian which is or ought to be a subject of Christs Kingdom which is his visible Church, to submit to the vtter enemie of Chr. & to his authority, which what is it els but to bee a traytor against the L. Iesus? yet for further proof I reason thus from these places, Act. 14. 23. & 20. 28. Phillip. 1. 1. 1. Pet. 5. 1–4.

1. The Government of the primitive Apostolique institution was by a Colledge of pastors, or presbytery.

The Government of the English assemblies is by an Antichristian prelate & his Officers.

Therfor the Government of the English assemblies is not the primitive Apostolique Government.

The major is evident thus: For the Apostles instituted Elders by the election of the Saints to oversee the Church & feed the Flock of one particular visible Church only; as is manifest among the Ephesians, Philippians, Hebrues, & al Churches.

The minor is evident: For the Prelates & ther officers

are not those Christian Bishops of the Apostolique institution, elected by & placed over one particular Church of the Saynts, but are a devised Tyrannical Lordship ruling hundreths of parishes by ther owne devised Canons. Ergo.

2. Againe: From the Government which is devised by man in the Church, & so is Antichristian, & which is not of the Apostolique institution must al good Christians Seperate. Luk. 19. 27. 1. Cor. 7. 23. Revel. 14. 9.

The Government of the English assemblies is not of the Apostolique institution, but is devised by man & Antichristian.

Therfor, from the Government of the English assemblies must al good Christians Seperate.

The major is manifest by the places alledged, for seing Christ Iesus only must reigne in the harts of the faythful by his owne officers & lawes: therfor good Christians must only submit to his officers, & if they submit to any new officers devised by man, Christ saith he wil have thē slayne, they are the Servants of men, & obeying the Antichristian beast have a woe threatned against them.

Thus brethren have I written vnto you according to your request, & Mr. K. his direction proofes of those two points which you expect: & that in 4. mayne transgressions in the English assemblies, viz: in the constitution, ministerie, worship, & Government of them: I pray you brethren keep the copie I send you safe, & let Mr. K. have a transcript of it, & if it please him to answer, I will be ready to explane matters more fully if ther be any ambiguity, & to confirme matters doubtful & that especialy for your establishment in the truth: which now blessed be the Lord is so evident that al the men vpon earth with ther learning can never be able to obscure it: Brethren I beseech you grow in grace & in the knowledg of our Lord Iesus Christ, to whome bee praise in his Church throughout all generations, Amen.

Your Brother in the Fayth  
Iohn Smyth.

THE CHARACTER OF THE BEAST  
OR  
THE FALSE CONSTITVTION OF THE CHVRCH.

Discovered

IN CERTAYNE PASSAGES BETWIXT Mr. R. CLIFTON  
& Iohn Smyth, concerning true Christian baptisme of New Creatures,  
or New borne Babes in Christ: and false Baptisme of Infants  
borne after the Flesh.

Referred to two Propositions.

1. That infants are not to bee Baptized.
2. That Antichristians converted are to bee admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

Revelat. 13. 16. And he made all both small & great, rich & poore, free and bond, to receave a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads.

Revelat. 14. 9. 10. If any man receave the mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God.

Revelat. 21. 5. And he that sate vpon the Throne said: Behold: I make all things new.

Printed. 1609.

TO EVERY ONE THAT LOVETH THE  
Truth in sincerity Salutations.

It may be thought most straung, that a man should oft tymes chandg his Religiō: & it cannot be accounted a commendable quality in any man to make many alterations & chandges in such weighty matters, as are the cases of conscience: but if constancy be commēdable in any thing, it is most cōmendable in the best things which is Religion: & if inconstancy be worthy reproof in matters of inferior estimation, it is much more blameable in matters of Salvatiō: In respect wherof the wisest & most Religious men have been alwayes most constant in ther profession & faith: & inconstant persons cannot escape the deserved imputatiō of folly or weaknes of judgment therein.

This must needs be true, (& we confesse it) if one condition be admitted, that the Religion which a man chandgeth be the truth: For otherwise to chandge a false Religion is commendable, & to retaine a false Religion is damnable. For a man of a Turk to become a Iew, of a Iew to become a Papist, of a Papist to become a Protestant are al commendable chandges though they al of them befall one & the same person in one yeere, nay, if it were in one month: So that not to chandg Religion is evil simply: & therfor that we should fal from the profession of Puritanisme to Brownisme, & from Brownisme to true Christian baptisme, is not simply evil or reprobable in it self, except it be proved that we have fallen from true Religion: If wee therfor being formerly deceaved in the way of Pedobaptistry, now doe embrace the truth in the true Christian Apostolique baptisme: Then let no mā impute this as a fault vnto vs: This therfor is the question: whither the baptisme of infants be lawful, yea or nay: & whither persons baptized being infants must not renounce that false baptisme, & assume the true baptisme of Chr: which is to be administred vppon persons confessing their faith & their sinnes: This being the controversy now betwixt vs, & the Seperation commonly called Brownists: For the glory of God,

the manifesting of the truth to our own nation, & the destruction of the man of sinne, wee have thought good to publish this present treatise, wherin the whole cause is handled: Let the indifferent reader judg of the whole & give sentence without partiality: & I doubt not but he shalbe constraigned to give glory to God in acknowledging the error of baptising infants, to have been a cheef point of Antichristianisme, & the very essence & constitution of the false Church, as is cleerly discovered in this treatise: Now happily some man wil wish that the controversy had been with the Rabbyes of the Separation, & not with Mr. Clifton whom thy calūniate to be a weake man, vnable to deale in so great a controversy: wel, let the Reader take notice, that although it be Mr. Cliftons pen, yet it is not only Mr. Cliftons cause & defence, but his allegations & reasons are the best plea of the greatest Rabbyes themselves: & if they think that they can say better they may now speake, for by publishing answer to their reasons: we do challendg al the Separation in special to the combat. Be it knowne therfor to all the Separation that we account them in respect of their constitution to bee as very an harlot as either her Mother England, or her grandmother Rome is, out of whose loynes she came: & although once in our ignorance we have acknowledged her a true Chu. yet now being better informed we revoke that our erroneous judgment & protest against her, aswel for her false constitution, as for her false ministry, worship, & government: The true constitution of the Chu. is of a new creature baptized into the Father, the Sonne, & the holy Ghost: The false constitution is of infants baptized: we professe therfor that al those Churches that baptise infants are of the same false constitution: & al those Chu. that baptize the new creature, those that are made Disciples by teaching, men confessing their faith & their sinnes, are of one true constitution: & therfor the Chu. of the Separation being of the same constitution with England & Rome, is a most vnnatural daughter to her mother England, & her grandmother Rome, who being of the self same genealogie & generation, (that of the prophet being true of her, as is the Mother so is the daughter) she dare notwithstanding

most impudently wipe her own mouth, & cal her mother & grandmother adulteresses. Heerin therfor we do acknowledg our error, that we retayning the baptisme of England which gave vs our constitution, did cal our mother England an harlot, & vppon a false ground made our Seperation from her: For although it be necessary that we Seperate from England, yet no man can Seperate from England as from a false Chu. except he also do Seperate from the baptisme of England, which giveth England her constitution: & whosoever doth retaine the baptisme of England doth withal retaine the constitution of England, & cannot without sinne cal England an harlot as we have done: & this we desire may be wel minded of al that Seperate frō England: For if they retaine the baptisme of England, viz: the baptisme of infants as true baptisme, they cannot Seperate from England as from a false Chu. though they may Seperate for corruptions. & whosoever doth Seperate from England as from a false Church, must needs Seperate from the baptisme of England, as from false baptisme: For the baptisme of England cannot be true & to be retayned, & the Chu. of England false & to be rejected: neither can the Chu. of England possibly be false except the baptisme be false, vnlesse a true constitution could be in a false Chu. which is as impossible as for light to have felowship with darknes: It is impossible that contraryes or contradictions should be both true: & so it is impossible that a false Chur. should have a true constitution or a true baptisme: To say thus:

England hath a false constitution.

England hath a true baptisme, is as much as to say thus.

England hath a false constitution.

England hath a true constitution, which is to contradict:

But the Seperation they say England hath a false constitution, & is a false Chu. & to be Seperated from: & yet they say also: England hath a true baptisme (that is a true constitution) which is not to be Seperated from: For a true constitution & true baptisme are one & the same: So is a false constitution & a false baptisme: So

that the speeches & actions of the Separation are contradictory in this particular. Finally, they that defend the baptisme of infants cannot with any truth or good conscience Separate from England as from a false Chu. though they may separate for corruptions. & they that do Separate from England as from a false Chu. must of necessity Separate from the baptisme of England, & account the baptisme of England false, & so account the baptisme of infants false baptisme: Therfor the Separation must either goe back to England, or go forward to true baptisme: & al that shal in tyme to come Separate from England must Separate from the baptisme of England, & if they wil not Separate from the baptisme of England their is no reason why they should separate from England as from a false Church: & this is more at large proved in the second question of this discourse, whither the Reader is to be referred. Now concerning this point of baptising infants we do professe before the L. & before al men in sincerity & truth that it semeth vnto vs the most vnreasonable heresy of al Antichristianisme: for considering what baptisme is, an infāt is no more capable of baptisme then is any vnreasonable or insensible creature: For baptisme is not washing with water: but it is the baptisme of the Spirit, the confession of the mouth, & the washing with water: how then can any mā without great folly wash with water which is the least & last of baptisme, one that is not baptized with the Spirit, & cannot confesse with the mouth: or how is it baptisme if one be so washed: Now that an infant cannot be baptized with the Spirit is plaine, 1. Pet. 3: 21. wher the Apostle saith that the baptisme of the Spirit is the question of a good conscience into God, & Heb. 10. 22. wher the baptisme which is inward is caled the sprinkling of the hart from an evil consciēce: seing therfor infants neither have an evil conscience, nor the question of a good conscience, nor the purging of the hart, for al these are proper to actual sinners: hence it followeth that infants baptisme is folly & nothing. Againe: Iohns baptisme was the baptisme of repentance: infants have not repentance: & therfor cannot have the baptisme of repentance. That infants cannot have repentance is



evident, seing repentāce is knowledg of sinne by the Law, sorrow for sinne by the gospel, mortification of sin & new obedience, al which are asmuch in the basen of water, as in the infant baptized. Now I confesse the Pedobaptists have many showes of reason for the maintenance of their heresy, & one man shapeth them into one forme, another man into an other, as every mans wit & learning teacheth him, but indeed they are al built vpon the self same sandy fondacions, the wresting of some places of Scripture: al which (in a manner) are discovered in some measure in this treatise: whereby the reader may perceave the manifest perverting of the scriptures from their true sense: Now bicause men cal for antiquity, & except they see antiquity they wil not beleve, though the Scriptures be the most auncient, I have thought good therefore to propound two pregnant testimonies of Antiquity (besides that which is alledged in the pag. 30. & 31. of this treatise) against baptisme of infants: that men may know that this truth also hath her footsteps among the Fathers.

Tertullianus lib. de baptismo adversus Quintillam  
hath these wordes:

Then which nothing is more playne.

Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione, dispositione, etiam ætate cunctatio baptismi vtilior est precipue tamen circa parvulos: Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? qui & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, & proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem dominus. Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire: veniant ergo dum adolescent: veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: Fiant Christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionē peccatorū. Cautius agitur in secularibus vt cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, vt petenti dedisse videaris.

That is to say in English.

Therfor to defere & not to hasten baptisme is more profitable for the condition, disposition, & age of every

person: but especialy as concerning yong children: For what necessity is ther to bring suertyes into daunger for the baptising of infants, if ther be no such necessity of hastning the baptising of infants: Seing the suerties ofttymes are disabled to performe their promise both by reason of mortality, & of the evil disposition of some children. whē they come to yeres, for whome they promised in baptisme. Indeed the L. saith, forbid them not to come vnto me: Therfor let them come to Chr. but let them come when they are growne, when they learne, & when they are taught to what they come. Let them by baptisme be made Christians when they can know Chr. by instruction: why doth the innocent age hasten to the remission of sinnes: we deale more safely in worldly matters: Shal we commit heavenly things to yong children vnto whome we dare not commit our earthly substance? let thē first know how to ask salvation that so we may seem to give to him that asketh.

Euseb. Ecclesi. Hist. Lib. 10. Chap. 15.

Athanasius his baptising of children in sport that answered according to the custome of the Catechumeni, is aproved by Alex. Bb. of Alexa. & his Clerks: whence it is to be noted that these children baptized by Athanasius were vnbaptized, & yet knew the manner of baptisme, as being children borne in the Chu. So that by this place & al other places of the Ecclesi. Hist. wher like mention is made of the childrē of Christians first Catechized & then baptized, it may easily be discerned that baptisme of infants was not yet vniversaly receaved, but by litle & litle prevailed, as other Antich. heresies have done: in respect wherof Origen, August. Ciprian, & al the Papists with one consent acknowledg it a tradition of the Church.

And thus much for the Testimonyes of Antiquity which hereafter shalbe produced more plentifully vpon further occasion offered: if the Separation or any other dare adventure the tryal of the matter out of Antiquity: but ther is one, & indeed but one argument which the seperation principaly stand vpon, & that is the covenāt which say they if it be āswered they must ne[e]ds yeeld vnto the truth: now although this Argument be answered in

this writing even to the satisfaction of every indifferently mynded man that loveth & seketh the knowledg of the truth more then the defence & justification of error: yet seing many things are variably alledged concerning the covenants made with Abrah. & his seeds, & concerning Abrah. Fatherhood & concerning circumcision which is called a seale of the righteousnes of Faith: I have thought good to referre these particulars to a more ful discourse intertaind vpon occasion with another of the Mrs. of the seperation, not doubting but very shortly through Gods goodnesse that treatise also shalbe published, wherin the reader shal find larger instruction & satisfaction concerning the forsaid particulars of the covenants or Test. & other matters therto aperteyning. In the meane tyme I desire the reader to make vse of this writing, & to reade without prejudice or partiality, & I doubt not but that through Gods mercy much light of truth shal shine in his hart even by this present discourse: & for the seperation who are the stiffest & most obstinate adversaries of this truth of the L. I could wish as the Tyrant wished concerning the people of Rome, that al their heads were joyned into one, & al their strength comprised into one writing, that with the sword of the Spirit it might bee smiten of[f] at once, that so we might have an end of this controversy, & that we might not be troubled & charged with the writing & printing of many books: Howsoever it be, wee professe our readnesse to imploy our time & cost for the manifestation of the truth, & we desire the Sep. that they wil not in craftines withdraw from the combat, as hitherto they have done in the mater of the translation, wors. & the Presbitery: but we require them in the feare of the L. that seing they have suffered so much for so much truth as they professe, they would not now subtilly (being guilty in their consciences of their dishability to defend their errors) draw back, & pretend excuses as they do: but we require them, nay we chardg them, yea we challendg them to the defence of their errors: Loe: we protest against thē, to be a false Chu. falsely constituted in the bap. of infants, & their owne vnbaptized estate: we protest against them to have a false wors. of reading books: we protest

against them to have a false govern. of a triformed Presbytery: we protest against them to have a false Minist. of Doct. or Teachers: Finally, wee protest against them that seing their constitution is false, therfor ther is no one ordinance of the L. true among them: These things wee have published, & of these things we require answer. For we proclaime against them as they proclaime against their owne mother England: That the Seperation the youngest & the fayrest daughter of Rome, is an harlot: For as is the mother so is the daughter: Now furthermore we desire the Sepera. & al men that they would not impute vnto vs vntruths, & condemne the innocent without cause: For we disclayme the errors commonly, but most slaunderously imputed vnto vs: we are indeed traduced by the world as Atheists by denying the old Testament & the Lords day: as Trayters to Magistrates in denying Magistracy: & as Heretiques in denying the humanity of Christ: Be it knowne therefore to al men, first that we deny not the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but with the Apo: acknowledg them to bee inspired of God: & that wee have a sure worde of the Prophets wherevnto wee ought to atend as vnto a light shining in a dark place: & that whatsoever is written aforetyme is written for our instruction, that wee through patience & comfort of the Scriptures might have hope: & that wee ought as Christ counselleth to search the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as the men of Beræa did, bicause that in them wee may find everlasting life, & that they do testifie of Christ: This wee beleeeve according to these Scriptures. Iohn. 5. 39. Act. 17. 11. Roman. 15. 4. 2. Timoth. 3. 16. 2. Pet. 1. 19. yet neverthelesse wee affirme all the ordinances of the Old Testament, viz: The Church, Ministry, VVorship, & Government of the Old Testament, to bee abolished al which were Types & shadowes of Gods things to come, but the body is in Christ. Col. 2. 14-17. 20.

Secondly we acknowledg that according to the president of Ch. Disciples & the primitive Churches, the Saints ought vpon the first day of the weeke which is caled the Lords day, Revel. 1. 10. to assemble together to pray, prophecy, praise God, & break bread, and

performe other parts of Spiritual Communion for the worship of God, ther owne mutual edification, & the preservation of true Religion & piety in the Church: & that we might be better enabled to the forsaid duties we ought to Seperate our selves from the labours of our callings which might hinder vs therto, & that according to these Scriptures, Ioh. 20. 19. Act. 2. 1. 41. 42. & 20. 7. 1. Cor. 16. 1.

Thirdly, concerning Magistrates, we acknowledg them to be the ordinance of the L. that every soule ought to be subject vnto thē: that they are the ministers of God for our wealth: that we ought to be subject vnto them for conscience sake: that they are the ministers of God to take vengeance on them that do evil: that we ought to pray for thē that are in authority: that we ought not to speake evil of thē that are in dignity: nor to despise government: but to pay tribute, tol, custome, &c. & that according to these Scriptures, Rom. 13. 1-7. 1. Tim. 2. 2. 1. Pet. 2. 13-15. 2. Pet. 2. 10. Iud. vs. 8. but of Magistrates converted to the Faith & admitted into the Chu. by baptisme, ther may many questions be made, which to answer neither wil we if we could, neither can we if we would: when such things fal out, the L. we doubt not will direct vs into the truth concerning that mater, in the meane tyme we are assured according to the Scrip. that the Kings of the Earth shal at the length bring their glory & honor to the visible Church, Revel. 21, 24.

Finally, concerning the Flesh of Chr. we do beleve that Chr. is the seed of Abrah. Isaac, & Iacob, & of David, according to the Prophecyes of the Scriptures, & that he is the Sonne of Mary his Mother, made of her substance, the holy Ghost overshadowing her: So have other children ther bodyly substance from their parents: also that Chr. is one person in two distinct natures, the Godhead & manhood, & we detest the cōtrary errors: our grounds of Scripture are these: Gen. 22. 18. & 26. 4. & 28. 14. Psal. 132. 11. compared with Act. 2. 30. Rom. 1. 3. 4. Heb. 1. 8.-10. & 2. 11. 14. 16

Breefly to conclude let the Separation be advertized: That wheras they do so confidently through their self love & self concept, fil ther mouths with heresy & heretiques,

as if therby they would feare babes: That herein they tread in the steps of all the Antichristians their predecessors: do not the Papists cal the Protestants heretiques, & cal for fire & fagot? do not the Protestants proclaime the Seperation Schismatiques & Heretiques, & judg them worthy the gibbet? not the affirmation of mē without proof, but the evidence of wilful obstinacy in error maketh men heretiques: And let them take heed that they notwithstanding their Syrenes songs prove not cages full of most ougly & deformed Antichristian Heretiques: Thus desiring the Seperation not to be wise in their owne eyes through pride, but to become fooles that they may be made wise through humility, & desiring the forwardest preachers & professors of the English nation wel to weigh what is the true constitution of the Church, & what is the subject of true Christian baptisme, & accordingly to measure a true & a false Church, I cease: wishing the light & love of the truth to every one that Readeth.

IOHN SMYTH.

CERTAYNE REASONS PROPOVNDED TO Mr.  
Rich. Clifton: concerning the two propositions following.

1. That infants are not to bee baptized.
  1. Bicause ther is neyther precept nor example in the new Testament of any infants that were baptized, by Iohn or Christs Disciples: Only they that did confesse their sinnes, & confesse their Fayth were baptized. Marc. 1. 4. 5. Act. 8. 37.
  2. Bicause Christ commaundeth to make Disciples by teaching them: & then to baptize them: Mat. 28, 19. Ioh, 4. 1. but infants cannot by doctryne become Christs Disciples: & so cannot by the rule of Christ be baptized.
  3. Bicause if infants be baptized, the carnal seed is baptized: & so the seale of the covenant is administred to them vnto whom the covenāt aperteyneth not. Rom. 9. 8. which is a profanation.
  
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by Baptisme.
  1. Bicause Churches are so to be constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: But in the constitution of Churches the Apostles receaved in the members by baptisme: go: So must wee doe now.
  2. Bicause true baptisme is but one: but the baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme, & so not that one baptisme of Christ: but all members of Christ must have true baptisme.
  3. Bicause as the false Church is rejected & the true erected: the false ministry forsaken, & the true receaved: So false worship, (& by consequent baptisme) must be renounced, & the true baptisme assumed.

Iohn Smyth.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

AN ANSWERE TO TWO ANABAPTISTICAL  
opinions: viz.

1. That Infants are not to be baptised.
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

Although with great sorrow I am forced to vnder-  
A take this busines against him that was deere vnto  
me: yet being therevnto provoked by the sending  
to me these two positions with certayne reasons annexed  
vnder the Authors owne hand: I thought it my part  
(although the vnablest of many) to contend for the  
maintenance of the faith which was once given to the  
Saints. Iud. 3. And by the help of God to put a brieffe  
answere to these opinions, which by the Churches in al  
ages have bene & are condemned for heretical: the  
practise whereof I could wishe might never have befallen  
to any of myne owne country, especially to them that  
were partakers with me of the afflictions of Christ for the  
witnessing of his truth. And cheefly vnto him, to whose  
charge both I & diuers others had once purposed to have  
committed our soules had he not besydes these broached  
some former opinions, both erronious & offensive, whereby  
the truth (for which we suffer) is like to be the more  
blasphemed of the wicked & many hindered in our owne  
country, that shall heare thereof, of whom wee had great  
hope that they would have walked in the same fayth  
with vs. Notwithstanding for as much as I am informed,  
that the author hath promised vpon the sight of his errors  
to confesse the same, I do the more willingly take vpon  
me this labour, praying the Lord to give a good issue, to  
his glory, for his mercyes sake Amen. Now I wil come  
to answeere the positions with the reasons thereof, & first  
concerning the former, which is this.



Iohn. Smyth.

A REPLY MADE IN DEFENCE OF TWO  
truths, viz :

1. That infants are not to be baptised.
2. That Antichristians cōverted are to be admitted into the true church by baptisme.

These two truthes are by you, Sir, in your answer intituled Anabaptistical, which reproach I do no more account of thē you doe of the imputatiō of Brownisme, nor then Paul did of Heresy: but rather as Paul professed himself joyful in susteyning that blasphemy for the truth, & you rejoyce in that you for the truthes you professe, are calumniated with such vndeserved imputations: even so doe I blesse God that I am accounted worthy to suffer rebuke for Christ his truth: but know you, Sir, for your humiliation that your reproach shal light vppon your owne head, & that Christ & his truth are by you evil spoken of.

In your preface you avouch that you are provoked to write, I mervayle you should so speak: seing your conscience telleth you, that you did make the first request or motion to Mrs. Bywater: & I could doe no lesse then I did, for if I had refused the motion, it would have bene thought that I distrusted the cause: & whereas you alledg, Iud. 3. for justifying your course in answering, I say you pervert the Scripture: for although you are to contend for the mayntenance of the faith which was once given to the Saynts, yet you are neyther to plead for Baal, but to lett him plead for himself, neyther are you to contend for defence of Antichristian errors, but rather as you have in a very good degree rased the Temple of Antichrist, even so you should now proceed to vndermine the very foundation, & to blow it wholly vp at once: which is done by entertayning the baptisme of Christ to be administred vppon persons confessing their sinnes, & confessing their faith: neyther will it help you to say that these two truths have bene condemned for heresy by the churches in al ages, for if the Apostles age aford contrary to the succeeding ages, I say that which is most

auncient is the truth: & you know that many of your truths wherto you are come, have bene condemned for hereticall in as many ages as these truths which I defend.

Againe, whereas you affirme that by the broaching of these opinions & some former erroneous & offensive, the truth is like more to be blasphemed, & therefore you could wish that wee your countrymen & frends had never fallen into them: I answer, that although I shal not rejoyce that any truth be evil spoken of, yet if it shall fal out by occasion of publishing the truth that wicked men blaspheme, let them know that Christ is a rock of offence, & a stone to stumble at: & if any be hindered from the truth by publishing the truth, it wilbe their corruption & sin, & the truth or the publishing of the truth is not in fault: but if you feare hereby that your Antichristian Church wil fal to the ground, I say, it is that which is appointed to perdition, & to perdition let it goe. I will never vse meanes to support it. Finally although I have professed my readines publicquely & privately, to forsake my errors vppon their discovery. (& as I have already practised for the which I am reproached among your brethren) yet I never professed my readines to bee perverted from the truth, which you cal heresy: & therefore if you did vndertake to write vppon this ground, you might wel have spared your paynes, & saved your self from so greevous a sinne as you are fallen into by pleading for Antichristian corruptions, & by praying the Lord to overthrow his own truth, by blessing your labours in opugning it: & this breefly shal suffice for your preface general.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

1. That infants are not to bee Baptised.

Answer.

Touching this first position, that Infants are not to be baptised, I read that Auxentius one of the Arrians sect with his adherents was one of the first that denyed the baptisme of Infants, & next after him Pelagius the heretike, against whom Augustine & others of the auncient Fathers have opposed & condemned for heresy, & that according to the Scriptures, which by Gods grace we shal

together with them also further manifest, & prove by sound reasons out of the word the lawfulness of baptising infants, which first I will vndertake, & then answere the reasons to the contrary.

Gen. 17. 10. God made his covenant to Abraham & to his seed: from whence I reason thus,

1. That covenant which God made with Abraham he commaunded to bee sealed to him & to al his seede, yea even to infants.

But the covenant that we vnder the gospel doe receive is the very same that was made to Abraham, &c.

Therefor that is commaunded to be sealed to vs & to our seede, yea even to our infants, for so was that to Abrahams.

The Major can not be denied, see Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12.

The Minor is likewise as true, for the Apostle speaking of this covenant, Act. 2. 39 sayth, the promise is made to you & to your children, & to al that are a farre of, as many as the Lord our God shal cal. In which words it plainly appeareth that this is the very same covenant & promise that was made to Abraham, which they that were a far of, that is the Gentiles beleeving, doe receive & were baptised into. And therefor is Abraham called the Father of many nations, Gen. 17. 4. also Gal. 3. 13. 4. Christ is said to redeem vs from the curse of the Law, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Ies. Chr. that wee might receive the promise of the Spirit, see vers. 8. 9. Now then if wee bee partakers of the same covenant (for otherwise Abrahams covenant should not be an everlasting covenant, Gen. 17. 7. seing his posterity after the flesh is cut of for a tyme, Rom. 11, 15. 17. 20.) it must follow that the same must be sealed to vs, & to our infants, (els is it not the same) & that by the commaundement of God. For the abolishing of circumcision, & the bringing in of baptisme vnder the gospel, doth not abrogate or disanulle the commaundement of sealing the covenant to the beleeving parents with their infants, which was once commaunded to Abraham, but onely sheweth a changing of the outward signe. And therefore as the covenant belongs to the

Gentiles beleeving so doth the seal thereof to them & to their seede, as that did to Abraham & to his seede: The outward ceremonie onely changed.

Iohn Smyth.

Now in the next place you make a special preface to the first point, affirming that baptisme of infants was denied by Auxentius the Arrian, & by Pelagius whom Augustine & others refuted & condemned for heresy, & that by Scripture: I say that one heretique condemned another contrary to the Scriptures for the truths sake: & whereas you bring in the Fathers in this particular point in your 6. pag. I answer I can prove that Augustine, Cyrill, Ciprian, Origen, Nazianzen, Ambrose, & many others were almost as grosse heretiques (if he be an heretique that holdeth an heresy) as Auxentius & Pelagius, & you your selves account thē all Antichristians: & therfor the auncient practise of pedobaptistry in auncient antichristian Churches is no more to be respected then the auncient practise of the Prelacy & read prayer in the same: but these are but Florishes: let vs heare your arguments from the Scripture proving.

1. That infants are to be baptised,

Your first argument is taken from Gen. 17. 10 & is framed thus:

That covenant which God made with Abraham, he commaunded to be sealed to him, & to al his seed, yea even to infants.

But the covenant that we vnder the gospel do receive is the very same that was made to Abraham, &c.

Therfor it is commaunded to be sealed to vs, & to our seed, yea evē to our infāts for so was it to Abrahams.

To this argument I make answer thus: first distinguishing the two covenants or testaments (for a covenant & testament is al one in the originals though the English words are two): one covenant was made with Abraham & his carnal seed & of that covenant was circumcision a seale: another covenant made with Abrahā & his Spiritual seed, & of that covenant the holy Spirit of promise is the seale: for the carnall covenant had a

carnal seale vpon the carnal seed: the Spiritual covenant had a Spiritual seale vpon the Spiritual seed: For things must be made proportionable, & circumcision which was a carnal seale, could not seale vp the Spiritual covenant to the Spiritual seed, for to say so, is to leap over the hedg, & to make a disproportion betwixt the type & the truth.

These things being thus distinguished let thē bee remembred & applyed orderly & the argument wil appeare of no value: for the major is thus to be vnderstood if it be true: that the carnal covenant which God made with Abrahā & his carnal seed, was to be sealed vp to his infants with a carnal seale, viz: circumcision: if it be not so vnderstood it is false: Now the minor, if it be assumed out of the major, (as it must be, els it is a Sophisme) is very false & flatly contradictory to the Scripture: for we vnder the gospel do not receave that carnal covenant which was made to Abraham & his carnal seed, whereof circumcision was the carnal seale: but that carnal covenant & seale together with the subject of that seale, viz: a male of 8. dayes old is taken away by Christs crosse: & in the rome thereof we have the Spiritual covenant typed by that carnal covenant, & the Spiritual seale viz: the holy Spirit of promise signified by that carnal seale, & the Spiritual infant, viz: a new borne babe in Christ, in whom Christ typed by the male is newly formed, signified by that carnal infant.

That al these particulars are so: I prove vnto you plainly by these places of Scripture.

1. There are two Testaments made with Abraham, Gal. 4. 24. For Agar that is the old Testament, & Sara that is the new Testament, were both maryed to Abrahā, & Abraham had them both.

2. There are two seedes: Ismaell (of Abraham & Hagar) who typed the carnall seed borne after the Flesh: & Isaac (of Abraham & Sara) who typed the Spiritual seed borne by promise vers. 23.

[3.] There are two seales: Circumcision a seale of the carnal covenant vpon the carnal children: Gen. 17. 11. & the Holy Spirit of promise a seale of the Spirituall covenant vpon the Spiritual seed, 2. Cor. 1. 22. Eph. 1.

13. & as circumcision was a seale from God to the carnal seed of the promise & from the carnall seed to God in obedience: So the Spirit of promise is a seale from God to the Spiritual seed of the promise, & from the Spiritual seed to the Lord in obedience, Eph. 1. 13. Ioh. 3. 33. these things are evident: but now you, I am perswaded of mere ignorance, mistaking the covenant, doe make circumcision a seale of the everlasting Spiritual covenant, which is an error, & therevppon you build all your false building of pedobaptistry which is as a howse built vppon the sand by the foolish builders.

Now for your places of Scripture I expound them in order.

Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12. this place proveth that circumcision was a seale of the carnall covenant made with the carnall seed, & not a seale of the Spirituall covenant made with the Faithful: For the Spirit is the seale thereof, who is therfor called the Spirit of promise, & the seale. Eph. 1. 13. & if the place of the Rom. 4. 11. be objected to prove that circumcision sealed the righteousnes of Faith to Abraham: I answer, that is not the scope of the place: but this: viz: that circumcision had one specialty in Abraham differing from al other, that by circumcision he was sealed vp to be the Father of al the Faithful as cōcerning the matter of their justificatiō, namely, that as he was justified by his actual Faith so should all the beleevers bee justified by their actuall Fayth whither they beleved in their vncircumcision or in their circumcision.

Act. 2. 39. the promise is offered to the impenitent Iewes, & to their posterity, & to the Gentils a far of: & it was exhibited only to so many as yeilded obedience to the Fayth: & whereas in rehearsing the Apostles speech, you say, the promise is made I say, therein you ad to the text. For if you intend that the promise of the Spirit was exhibited to al the Iewes & their infants, & to the Gentils beleaving & their infants & that this place afordeth it, I say the place doth not intend any such thing, but only an offer of the Spiritual covenant, to the carnal Iewes & their children, according to the Flesh, & also the Gentils: but a true conferring or exhibiting of it to so

many as should be effectually called by the offer of it in the preaching of the Gospel.

Further whereas you seem to assume that seing the covenant was made to Abraham & his infants, it is therfor made to vs & our infants. I deny that ever the covenant Spiritual was made that is conferred to al Abrahams infants according to the Flesh: neyther therfor is it made that is conferred to al our infants: this you should prove, but it is vndone: I confesse the promise was offered to all Abrahams carnall seed vnder that carnal covenant of the Old Testament, & so it is offered now to all our carnal children by the preaching of the gospel in the new Testament: but as the Spiritual covenant was only exhibited to the Faithful, the true seed of Abraham, so is it now only exhibited to the Faithful which are the only true seed of Abraham, who is the Father of vs al, & wee al his children, & justified by actual Faith as he was: in respect whereof infants wanting actual Fayth cannot bee truely said the Children of Abraham, but are that they are in secreat to the Lord whatsoever they are.

Thus much for the Scriptures by you alledged in your first argument: From that which I have answered I reason against pedobaptistry thus.

1. As it was with Abraham the Father of the Faithful, so must it be with the Children of Abraham, Rom. 4. 11.

But Abraham the Father of the Faithful, first beleevd actually, & being sealed with the Spirit of promise, afterward received the signe of circumcision.

Ergo: The Children of Abraham the beleeving Gentils, must first beleevd actually, & be sealed with the Spirit of promise, & then receive the baptisme of water.

2. As in the Old Testament, the carnal children were carnally circumcised & so admitted into that Church of the Old Testament. So in the New Testament the spiritual children must be Spiritually circumcised, that is in hart, & then be admitted by baptisme into the Church of the New Testament.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in the truth.

3. As in the Old Testament carnal infants were

carnally begotten & borne by the mortal seed of generation by their carnal parents, & then were carnally circumcised, & received into the carnal covenant. So in the new Testament Spiritual infants new borne babes in Christ, must be Spiritually begotten & borne by the immortal seed of regeneration, by the Spiritual parents, & then being Spiritually circumcised they shal by baptisme with water be received into the New Testament.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in the truth.

4. If the carnal infants in the Old Testament were circumcised, then the carnal infants in the New Testament must not be baptized: bicause that as circumcision is abolished which was the signe or seale, so the infant is abolished which is the subject of that signe or seale, & a proportionable infant introduced: which is one regenerate by the Spirit & the word.

But the carnal infants in the old Testament were circumcised.

Ergo the carnal infants are not now in the New Testament to be baptised.

5. As in the Old Testament when the male appeared the 8. day, ther was a painful circumcising & mortifying of the superfluous forskinne when the party was received into the covenant actually: So in the new Testament when the Lord Ies. Ch. (typed by the male) appeareth: & when ther is a painful circumcising & mortifying of the superfluous forskinne of the hart, the party so qualified shalbe by baptisme received into the new Testament actually.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in truth.

And this shal suffice for answer to your first argument.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Col. 2. 11. 12.

[2.] If circumcision belonged to Faithful Abraham & his seed, yea to such as were but infants, then doth baptisme also appertayne to al beleevvers & to their seede being infants.



But the first is true, Gen. 17. 10. Ergo the second.

The consequent wil follow, seing baptisme cometh in place of circumcision sealing vp vnto vs & to our seed the same promises that circumcision did to Abraham & to his seede, Coll. 2. 11. 12. & that in as large & ample manner (if not more ample) then to the Israelits, for of them only were the males circumcised, but by baptisme are both males & females sealed. And this must follow necessarily, or els the covenant by the coming of Ie. Chr. should be more restrayned, then it was vnder the law, who came to ratify & confirme that wholly, as the Apostle saith, 2 Cor. 1. 20. The promises of God are in him, yea & Amen, &c. For God gave it with the seale thereof, to Abraham & his infants. & if Christ should give it vnto vs onely & not to our infants, this were to lessen & infringe the covenant, & not to confirme all, but to take away part of that which God before had given.

John Smyth.

Your second argument followeth: from Coll. 2. 11. 12. which is framed thus.

If circumcision belonged to Faythful Abraham & his seed, yea to such as were but infants: then doth baptisme also aperteyne to all beleevers & to their seed being infants.

But the first is true, Gen. 17. 10. Ergo the second.

The reason of the consequent is double: 1. for that baptisme cometh in place of circumcision as a seale of the same promises to vs & our seed: Col. 2. 11. 12. 2. For that the covenant must be as largely sealed vp to vs as to thē, therfor to our females as wel as males, & infants as wel as persons of yeeres: For the covenant in Christ is not lessened but of as larg extent now as then: 2. Cor. 1. 20. Seing in Christ all the promises of God are yea & amen.

I answer that this argument is built vppon the same false ground with the former a meer mistaking of the covenant, & seale, & seed: & their is manifest violence committed vppon the Scripture by perverting & wresting it to false consequents: first therfor I deny the consequence. & I give reasons of my deniall.

1. Bicause circumcision did not aperteyne to Abraham & his infants as a seale of the everlasting covenant of life & Salvation, but of the external temporary covenant of the land of Canaan, & of obedience to the Law of Moses: & therfor though circumcision aperteyned to Abraham & his carnal infants as a seale of the external covenant yet it doth not follow that baptisme belongs to the Faythful & their carnal infants as a seale of the Spiritual covenant of the New Testament made in respect of Christ.

2. Secondly bicause the beleevvers do not occupy Abrahams place in the covenant of the New Testament, bicause Abraham is the Father of all the Faythfull, but no man though never so Holy hath that prerogative to bee the Father of the Faythfull: Therefore Abraham receaveth the Faythfull into his bosome. Luk. 16. 23.

3. Thirdly, bicause the infants of the faithful do not possesse the place of the true children of Abraham the Father of the Faithful: but possesse the place of the typical children of Abraham according to the Fleshe, & therfor the disproportion being in al these particulars the consequence of the argument is weake & insufficient,

But if you wil make true consequents you must reason frō the type to the truth proportionably, & not from the type to the type as this argument importeth: neyther must you confound the covenants & seales as you do: but must make al things distinct & proportionable the one to the other. as thus.

Abraham the Father of the carnal infants: Abraham the Father of the Faithful: Carnal Abraham & his carnal seed, carnally circumcised: So Faithful Abraham & his Faithful Children, Spiritually circumcised. The carnal infants of the old Testament carnally circumcised: The Spiritual infāts of the new Testament, that is, men regenerate baptized.

Thus you se the disproportion of your argument, & the true proportion that you ought to have made if your argument had been good.

But let vs see the reasons of your consequence, & the Scriptures you do produce for the confirmation of them: you say that baptisme cometh in the rome of circūcision

as a seale of the same promises to vs & our seed: I vtterly deny it: & I prove the contrary vnto you: Seing that the circumcisiō of the hart succeedeth in the place of circumcising the flesh: Rō. 2. 29. & circumcision made without hands cometh in the place of circumcision made with hands, Col. 2. 11. compared with Eph. 2. 11. & circumcision the seale of the flesh, hath the H. Spirit of promise which is the Spirituall seale to succeed in place therof, Eph. 1. 13. 14. which seale of the Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, as circūcision of the flesh was an earnest of the inheritance of the land of Canaan to the carnal Israelites: & I desire to be enformed in al the Scriptures where baptisme is called a seale, for I deny that the baptisme of water is the seale of the new Testament, though I cannot deny that the baptisme of the holy ghost is the seale.

I say therfor that the seale of the Spirit must go befor the baptisme of water: & as al the ordinances of the new Testament are Spiritual, & yet visible, so is the seale of the new Testament Spiritual, & yet visible: & thervppon men being visibly sealed with the Spirit as Cornelius company was. Act. 10. 47. may challendg the baptisme with water, as Peter there teacheth: this visible seale of the new Testament is confession: as in the old Testament circumcision was their confessiō: & baptisme is not a seale but a manifestation of the seale. You see therfor that baptisme is not the seale of the new Testament, & that circumcision did not seale vp the everlasting covenant to Abraham, & al his carnal seed: now the place of Col. 2. 11. 12. which you produce to prove that baptisme cometh in the rome of circumcision, is not so to be construed, but the Apostle teacheth the vertue of Chr. circumcisiō & baptisme, which is mortifying & burying of sinne & resurection from sinne: & the Apost. doth not intend to teach that in the new Testament baptisme succeedeth for circumcision: but hee teacheth the vertue of Ch. circumcision & baptisme in the Faithful: so that seing circumcision was a seale of the promises of the old Testament to the carnal seed, & that the Spirit is the seale of the promises of the new Testament to the faithful seed of Abrahā, therfor neither doth baptisme

of water succeede circumsion, neither doth baptisme with water seale vp any promises to the Faithfull, but onely doth visibly declare what promises they already are partakers of, viz: of the Spirit of promise.

Againe: in your second reason you would insinuate a restraynt in the new Testament, if baptisme be not due to infants seing circumsion was due to infants in the Old Testament: I answer many wayes: 1. Seing that baptisme doth not succede circumsion, this alegation is nothing to the purpose: 2. Seing baptisme is both to male & female it is larger then circumsion which was only vppon the male: 3. seing that baptisme is both to Iew & Gentil, therfor more larg then circumsion: but these things are almost nothing to the purpose: Therfor I say more pertinently, That the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ is now as larg as ever it was: For that was never made with Abraham & al his carnal children, but only with Abraham & the Faythful, & so it continueth in the same tenor stil: & it is enlarged now since Christs comming only in respect of the cleerer, & more vniversal publication of it: for then the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ was shadowed out darkly in types, now since Christ it is preached plainly: then it was only to the Iewes, now to al nations, Mat. 28. 19. besides I affirme that circumsion was never a seale of that covenant that God made with Abraham in respect of Christ, for the Holy Spirit of promise is the seale of it: but circumsion only was a seale of the external covenant: & the seale of the Spirit is as large as the seale of the Flesh: For all the carnal Israelites were carnally sealed, al the true beleevers are sealed by the Spirit: al the males were carnally sealed, al that have the male Christ formed in them (whither men or weomen) are sealed by the Spirit: For in Christ ther is neyther male nor female: Gal. 3. 28. al the carnal seed were carnally sealed whither yong or old, so all the Spiritual seed are Spiritually sealed whither new borne babes in Christ, or perfect men that are come to the measure of the age of the fulnes of Christ: & so the covenant is not lessened, taking things in their due proportion, & not perverting them. & whereas you say in Christ all the promises of

God are yea & amen, 2. Cor. 1. 20. thereby insinuating that in the new Testament the covenant must be as large as in the old, I confesse it to be as larg, but this place is strayned to the proving thereof: For the meaning of it is that vnto the Faythful all the Lords promises are verified, but his promise was never that al their carnal seed should have baptisme as a seale of life & salvation, but that al the beleeuers should have the Spirit of promise which is the new Testaments seale.

From that which I have answered to your second argument I reason thus.

1. If al the carnal infants of Abraham were never actually vnder the everlasting covenant in respect of the actual possession of it, then they never had title to the seale of the everlasting covenant.

But al the carnal infants of Abraham were never actually vnder the everlasting covenant in respect of the actual possession of it: Seing that Abrahams children according to his actual Fayth were only vnder it, Rom. 4. 11.

Ergo: al the carnal infants of Abraham never had title to the seale of the everlasting covenant, & therfor not to baptisme.

2. If baptisme doth not succede circumcision, then baptisme doth not pertaine to carnal infants though circumcision perteyned to carnal infants.

But baptisme doth not succede circumcision, because the seale of the Spirit is correspondent to the typical seale of the Flesh, & baptisme with water is only the manifestation of the seale.

Ergo, baptisme doth not aperteyne to the carnal infants.

3. If circumcision did not seale vp the everlasting covenant to Abraham & al his carnal infants: then (by your proportion) baptisme doth not seale vp the everlasting covenant to the Faithful & their carnal infants.

But circumcision did not seale vp the everlasting covenant to Abraham & all his carnal infants.

Ergo: (by your proportion) baptisme doth not seale vp the everlasting covenant to the Faithful & their carnal infants.

4. If beleeuing parents do not stand in Abrahams

rome to conveigh the covenāt to their infants, then though they be baptized themselves, yet their children shal not.

But the beleevers do not stand in Abrahams rome, to conveigh the covenant to their infants: For no man is the Father of the Faythfull as Abraham was, & he did never conveigh the everlasting covenant to his carnal infants.

Ergo: though beleiving parents be baptized themselves, yet ther infants shall not be baptized.

5. If infants of the Faythful do not occupy the place of the true children of Abraham, but only occupy the place of the carnal children: then though the true children of Abraham, the actual beleevers be baptized, yet the infants shal not which cannot actually beleewe.

But the infants of the Faithful do not occupy the place of the true children of Abraham, seing the children of Abraham do the workes of Abraham, Ioh. 8. 34. which infants cannot doe.

Ergo though actual beleevers be baptized, yet infants shal not.

And thus much may suffice for answer of this second argument which you see is as weake as the first being built vppon the same sand.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Marc. 10. 13. 14. & Mat. 19. 13. 14.

3. They that are of the Kingdome of God have right & title to all the Holy things therto belonging, & may participate of so many of them as they are capable to receive.

But the infants of beleiving parents are of the Kingdome of God.

Therfor the infants of beleiving parents have right & title to al the holy things therto belonging, & may participate of so many of them, &c. And consequently of baptisme, seing they are capable of that.

The major proposition I thinke wil not be denied, it is written 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. Al things are yours, &c. Rom. 9. 4.

The assumption is Mat. 19, 13–17. For of such is the Kingdome of God, meaning that this Kingdome

stood not only of such as being of yeeres that beleaved, but also of their infants. And this he declareth not only in this saing, but also by his displeasure against his Disciples for hindering their comming vnto him: by commaunding to suffer them to come, & by putting his hands vppon them, & blessing them. Mat. 19. 13. 14. 15. For would Christ have blessed them that were not of his Kingdome? or do not the blessings apperteyne only to the children of the Kingdom, even to the seed of Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. 18.

If it be objected that children are not capable of baptisme. I answere, they are as capable thereof as the infants of Israel were of circumcision, being both pertakers of the same promises with them, & in al respects as capable of the outward seales of the covenant, as they were. And therefore the infants of beleeuers are to bee baptized.

John Smyth.

Your third argument followeth, from Marc. 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14.

They that are of the Kingdome of God, have right & title to al the holy things therto belonging, & may participate of so many of them as they are capable to receave.

But the infants of beleeuing parents are of the Kingdom of God.

Ergo, the infants of beleeuing parents have right & title to al the holy things therto belonging, & may participate of so many of them &c. & consequētly of baptisme, seing they are capable of it.

The major you say is written, 1. Cor, 3. 21. 22. Rom. 9. 4.

The assumption is proved Mat. 19. 13. 14,

To this argument of yours I make answer diversly: first you have not proved that the visible Chur, & al the ordinances therof perteyne to infants of the faithful: For the infants of the Iewes that were presented to Chr. were not infants of beleuers for ought that I see: neither can it be proved that they were infants of the Iewes, but their is some likelihood to the cōtrary: seing the disciples

repelled thē that brought thē: it may be they were the children of some of the Romane soldiers, or some Cananiticish persons: but suppose they were children of the Iewes, how is it proved that their parēts were belevers? seing that the people of the Iewes were for the most part stifnecked & vncircumcised in hart, & if they had beē the childrē of beleving Iewes that were baptized by Ioh. or Chr. disciples (by your doctryne the infants were already baptized) what need was ther to bring thē to Chr. except it were for popish confirmation? & so hence you cannot conclude baptisme. I avouch constātly against you that either they were not the children of Iewes: or that they were not the infants of beleving Iewes: or if their parents beveled, yet it followeth not that therfor these infants were of the Kingdom of God, or to be baptized: for Chr. doth not say, of these, but, of such is the Kingdom of God: & so he doth expound himself Mat. 18 3-6. besides how can you prove that by the Kingdome of God Chr. vnderstandeth the visible church of the new Test? or how can you prove that Chr. blesseth none but members of the visible Chur? or how can you prove that the blessing of Abraham aperteyneth only to the members of the visible church? or that from this particular of Chr. praying for infants Mat. 18. 13. baptising of infants followeth? or how cā you prove that Christ obteyned for them, & prayed for remission of sinnes, the H, ghost, faith, everlasting life? for many were brought to Chr. for releef of bodily infirmities.

Secondly: I deny that, bicause Christ blessed some of the infants of the Iewes or Gentils vppon special intreaty, therefore it may hence be concluded that generally the covenant & seales of the covenant (as you cal baptisme) doth aperteyne to them: for ther is not the same reason of al infants, as of some specialy blessed: as of Iohn Baptist, Jeremy, Sampson.

Thirdly if baptisme doth aperteyne to infants bicause Chr. blesseth some particular infants, & bicause Chr. saith the Kingdom of God doth aperteyne to such, then the L. supper also: for if you say, they are not capable of the L. supper in two resp[er]cts: 1. for that they cannot eate it, 2. for that they cannot examine themselves:



I answer they must have it as soone as they can eate it: & they cannot confesse their sinnes & faith, & so cannot be baptized.

Fourthly: I would know why the Apo. put infants back, & why Chr. did not commaund them to be baptized: Surely, if they had been the infants of belevers, or if the Apo. had known Chr. mynd for baptisme of infants he having so fit an opportunity would have put it in practise: but the deep silence of baptisme in this place where ther is so just an occasion doth instruct vs evidently that Chr. either did not deale faithfully which to say were blasphemy, or that he never purposed the baptisme of infants.

You see therfor by that which hath beē answered that both your major & minor are weak & the Scriptures alledged by you do not confirme them: for the place 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. declareth that al things are yours: that is theirs that actually beleve & are baptized: & al the ordinances of the visible church are theirs both in title vse & possession: So that hence you must nedes prove if your arg. be good that infants must have the vse of al: only your caution helpeth you, viz: that they may pertake so many meanes as they are capable of: but wher is this caution expressed in al the scriptures do you think that the members of the Church are not capable of al the meanes of salvation? but I avouch vnto you that this place perteyneth only to baptised persons not to persons vnbaptized, & therfor it fitteth not your purpose.

Rom. 9. 4. The covenants & promises perteyne to the Israelites: I deny the word aperteyneth, it is put into the Text, & perverteth the meaning of the Apo. For Paull intendeth not to prove that the carnal Israelites were al actually within the covenāt of grace & salvation by Chr. being really possessed of it, but that vnder the outward covenant & promise wherof they were really seased, the Spiritual covenant & promise was offered & presented vnto them, the one preaching the other, the law being a scholemr. to Christ.

Lastly, wheras in the answer of an objection you intimate that infants now are as capable of baptisme as infants were of circumcision, being both equally capable of the

covenant & seales, I answer: that baptisme is not the seale of the covenant of the new Test. as circumcision was the seale of the old Test. & that infants of the old Testa. were capable of circumcision absolutely seing that to be circumcised ther was nothing required but a fore-skinne apt to be cut of: but to baptisme in the new Test. ther is required actual faith & repentance confessed by the mouth, Mat. 3. 6. Act. 4. 37. & 10. 47.

From this answer I collect arguments against pedo-baptistry thus.

1. They that are not members of the visible Church, have no title to the holy things of God, & therfor are vncapable of them: & so of baptisme.

Infants of the Faythful are not actually members of the visible Church: For these places. Marc. 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14. do not prove that the parents of these infants were beleiving Iewes, or if they were beleevers their infants were already baptized with their parents according to your doctryne, & so Christ cannot intend baptisme to aperteyne to them, but the rest of the ordinances.

Ergo: Infants of the Faythfull have no title to the Holy things of God, & so are vncapable of them, and by consequent vncapable off Baptisme.

2. If the Apostles by putting back infants presented to Christ declare plainly that infants were not to bee brought to bee baptized of Christ: then infants were not baptized by Christ, nor commaunded to bee baptized by him.

But the first is true: that the Disciples put back infants presented to Chr. &c.

Ergo: The latter is true: that infants were not baptized or commaunded to be baptized by Christ.

3. If the persons presenting infants to Christ to be blessed & prayed for: do not desire baptisme for them: then they knew no such custome vsed by Christ to baptize them.

But the first is true: that persons presenting infants

to Christ to be blessed & prayed for, do not desire baptisme for them.

Ergo: they knew no such custome vsed by Chr. of baptising infants.

4. If Christ receaving infants, praying for them, blessing them, doth neither baptize them, nor commaund his Disciples to baptize them: then eyther Christs pleasure was they should not be baptized, or els hee forgatt his duty, in not Teaching baptisme off infants vppon so just an occasion.

But Christ receaving infants, praying for them, blessing them, doth neyther baptize them, nor commaund his Disciples to baptize them: neyther did forgett his duty in not teaching baptisme of infants occasioned.

Ergo: Christs pleasure was (and is) that infants should not be baptized.

5. They that are not actually possessed of the promises or covenant, are not actually to be invested with baptisme.

Infants are not actually possessed with the covenant: Seing they performe not the condition, viz: confession of their sinnes & their Fayth actually.

Ergo: infants are not to be invested with baptisme. This shal suffice for answer of your third argument.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

1. Corinth. 7. 14.

[4.] Iff the children of beleaving parents be holy, then are they within the covenant off Abraham, and so consequently have ryght to the seale thereof.

But the first is true, 1. Cor. 7. 14. Ergo the second.

Touching the former proposition. I take it, that none wil affirme holines in any that are not of the covenant, for in that respect, Israel was called a holy nation. Exo. 19. 6. 1. Pet. 2. 9. & al others vncleane, Act. 11. 3. & 10. 15. that were without. Iff infants be within the covenant, then can not the seal be denyed to such, seing the Lo. hath joyned the promise & seale together, Gen. 17. 10. which no man may or ought to Seperate, Mat. 19. 6.

What can be objected against the assumption, I see not, seing the Apostle plainly affirms, but now are your children holy. Vnlesse it may be said, as of some I have heard, that as the vnbeleeving wyfe is sanctified to the husband, so are the children viz: to the vse of their Father: but this to affirme is a great abusing of the Scripture. For the Apostle in that place answering an objection that the Faithful is defiled by the society of the vnfaithful: proveth that the faithful husband may with good conscience vse the vessel of his vnfaithful wife, by an argument from the effects, namely because their children, which are borne of them, are accounted holy or within the promise, God having said to al the Faithful, I will be thy God, & the God of thy seed. As for that other straunge exposition, that the Children of a beleeving Father are no otherwise sanctified then the vnbeleeving wife is vnto her husband, viz: to their Fathers vse only, that cannot stand with the meaning & purpose of the Apost. For so much may be said of an vnbeleeving servāt, that he is for the vse of his master to do him service: if children be no more holy then so, then have they no prerogative in being the children of a beleeving Father, neither is the objection removed by this answer.

If it bee further pressed that the vnbeleeving wife is said to be holy, as wel as the children, yet is she not within the covenant. I answer, that she indeed is not holy, as be her children, for she being an infidel is without Gods covenant, & therfor she is said to be sanctified in her husband, the Apostle respecting their mariage, which though it was contracted before either party beleeved, yet stands firme & not dissolved when either of them is called to the Faith, so that the beleeving husband may lawfully vse her as his wife, if she be content to dwel with him, 1. Cor. 7. 12. Now the children cannot be sanctified or Seperate to such vse to their Father, as the wife is to her husband. And therfor are the children called holy, because they are the seed of a beleeving Father.

Iohn Smyth.

Your fourth argument is from 1. Cor. 7. 14. thus.

If the Children of beleeving parents be holy: then

are they within the covenāt of Abraham, & so consequently have right to the seale thereof.

But the first is true: 1. Cor- 7. 14. Ergo the second.

I answer: First denying your majors consequent: Seing that al the nation of the Iewes were holy, & yet not within the covenant of Abraham, I meane as you do of the everlasting covenant in respect of Christ: that they were not al within that covenant is plaine, Rom. 9. 6. al they are not Israel which are of Israel: vs. 7. neyther are they al Children bicause they are the seed of Abraham, vs. 12. God revealed, that the Elder should serve the yonger, Act. 7. 51. yee have alwayes resisted the holy ghost, as your foreFathers have done so do you: if it be objected that the place of the Romanes is spoken in respect of Gods secreat election, & not of mans knowledg, I answer, the vs. 12. is plaine of that which was revealed vnto the Church, & yet Esaw was holy & circumcized when he was borne, being not vnder the covenant of Abraham in respect of Christ: & for proof of this point that the whole Church of the Iewes was not vnder the possession of the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ: but only vnder the offer of it, I vse these reasons.

1. First: The condition or obedience of the matter or members of the New Testament is not the condition or obedience of the matter or members off the old Testament.

Faith & repentance is the condition & obedience of the matter or members of the new Testament, Marc. 1. 15.

Ergo: Faith & repentance is not the condition or obedience of the matter or members of the old Testament.

The reason of the major is evident, seing that as the ministry, worship, & government of the Church of the old Testament was of another nature then the ministry worship, & government of the new Testament is, so the constitution, viz: the matter & Forme of the Church of the old Testament was of another nature, then the constitution that is the matter & forme of the new Testament is: Seing therfor that the ministry, worship, & government

of the old Testament was carnal, the constitutiō must also be carnal: Therfor the matter & forme must be carnal: Therfor Faith & repentance was not required to the matter of the old Testament, but only a carnal holines, viz: The circumcision of the foreskinne, whereby the carnal forme, that is the carnal covenant or commaundement was induced vpon them, & wherto they were tyed in obedience, Heb. 7. 16. Gal. 5. 3.

2. Secondly. The type, shadow, figure, similitude of a thing is not the truth, the substance, the thing it self: True is nature & reason.

The constitution, viz: the matter & forme of the Church of the old Testament is the type, &c. The constitution or the matter & forme of the church of the new Testament is the truth, &c. Heb. 10. 1. & 9. 19. 23.

Ergo: The constitution, viz: the matter & forme of the Church of the old Testament, (that is the members, & covenant) is not the truth: that is the members are not truly holy, but ceremonialy holy, the covenant is not the everlasting covenant, but the typical carnal covenant or commaundement: & so true holines that is Faith & repentance was not required to the mēbers or matter of the Church of the old Testament.

3. Thirdly, that which was not nor could not be accomplished, performed, effected or produced by the walking or communion of the Church off the old Testament, was not required, or exacted, or presupposed to the constitution of the Church of the Old Testament.

Iustification & Faith, Sanctification & repentance, were not effected, performed, accomplished, or produced by the walking or communion of the Church of the Old Testament, Heb. 9. 9. Gal. 2. 15. 16.

Ergo: justification & Faith, Sanctification & repentance were not required to the constitution of the Church of the old Testament: & so by consequent, the members of the Church of the Old Testament were not truly holy in their constitution.

4. That which brought not perfection & life to the members, presupposed not Fayth & repentance to the members: and so not reall or true holynes. But the Old Testament, the Law, & the obedience of the Law brought not perfection & life to the members of the Church of the old Testament, Heb. 7. 19. Gal. 3. 21.

Ergo: The Old Testament, or the Law, or the Church of the old Testament did not presuppose, Fayth, Repentance, or true Holynes in the members.

5. That which was a Schoolmr. only to teach Christ, did not presuppose that the Schollers had already learned Christ or put on Christ, which is only done by Faith & repentance.

The law or old Testament was a Schoolmr. only to teach Chr. Gal. 3. 14. Rom. 10. 3. 4.

Ergo, The Law or Old Testament did not presuppose that the Schollers had learned Christ or put on Christ, which is only done by Fayth and Repentance.

6. That which was hidden, kept secreat was a Mystery & not revealed, the members of the Church of the old Testament, in their constitution were not indued withal.

Faith, or obedience to the gospel was a mistery, & not revealed, but kept secreat from the beginning. Gal. 3. 23. Rom. 16. 25.

Ergo, The members of the Church of the Old Testament were not indued with Fayth or obedience to the gospel in their constitution.

7. Ther is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, Rom. 8. 1.

Ther is condemnation to them that are vnder the Law, Gal. 3. 10. For it is the Ministry of death or condemnation, 2. Cor 3. 7.

Ergo: The Law or old Testament doth not presuppose Christ: or they that are vnder the Law are not in Christ: & so the members of the church of the old Testament were not truly holy.

Finally, the whole disputation of Paul to the Romanes

& Galatians concerning justification by Faith in Christ without the workes of the Law doth evidently confirme this excellent truth. Teaching that seing the vtmost obedience of the Law did not effect or produce justification, therfor of necessity it followeth that the Law or old Testament did not presuppose it, or true holines in the members therof: For it had been a vanity to have given them a Law which should not or could not preserve & produce that which was in them in ther first constitution: wherfor I doe bouldly defend against all men, that the Church of the Old Testament in the matter or constitution of it was not really Holy, but only Typically: & therfor the members therof admitted in by circumcision were not truly holy or sanctified, or in actual possession of that everlasting covenant which God made with Abraham in respect of Christ: but only vnder the offer of it in that typical Testament given to Abraham, & afterward assumed written & amplified by Moses, Ioh. 7. 19-23. compared with Heb. 8. 8. 9.

Having sufficiently confirmed this truth, I returne in particular to answer your objections saying stil that the nation of the Iewes was holy, not truly but typically & that their holines was this, that by that external covenant whereinto they were by circumcision admitted, they were trayned vp, or Schooled to Christ, being by all the ceremonial law & old Testament, or carnal commaundement, as it were by so many meanes consecrated or dedicated to that holy end & purpose, which was tipped & shadowed by those figures & similitudes of heavenly things. Therfor as the word sanctifying or hallowing is vsually taken in the old Testamēt for the setting of any thing apart to a holy vse: so were the people of Israel holy: even an holy natiō above al the nations of the Earth, See: Exod. 19. 10. 14. 15. Iob. 1. 5. Deu. 14. 1-4. compared with Act. 21. 28. & for the place which you aledg, Ex. 19. 6. to prove the Israelites an holy nation, I say, that either the meaning is that they were typically, holy, trayned vp to holines, or that they by attayning the end of the law should attayne true holines in Christ: So that this place is nothing to your purpose of the holines of the eternal covenant which God made with Abraham:



So that though infants be vnder offer of the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, yet shal not baptisme be administred vpon them, as your consequent doth import, bicause that in the old Testament none were circumcised but those that were actually seased vpon that external covenant: & therefore none in the New Testament shalbe baptized but those that are actually possessed of the covenant of the New Testament: but the actual possession of the promise is by obedience to the Faith: For by Faith (saith the Apostle. Gal. 3. 14.) we receive the promise of the Spirit, & we receive the Spirit by the hearing of Faith preached, Gal. 3. 2. & Faith cometh by hearing of the word preached, Rom. 10. 17.

Secondly, I answer concerning the consequent of your Majors consequent that it shal not follow that bicause children are vnder the covenant (as you suppose, but we deny) that therfor they shal have the outward signe or seale therof: for you know vnder the law the females were actually vnder the covenant of the old Testamēt, & yet were not signed with the seale: & before the law was given al that were actualy vnder the covenant vntil the tyme of Abraham had no external signe or seale therof. if you say in opposition to the circumcision of the female that she was vncapable of it: I answer the L. had abundance of Spirit, & if it had been his wil that al vnder the covenant should be pertakers of the signe or the seale therof, he could in wisdom & would vndoubtedly have appointed such an external signe or seale that might have bene administred vpon al vnder the covenant, but seing the L. chose out the male only for circumcision, therby he purposed to teach in a type that only the male (that is, one that is in Christ) shalbe sealed with the Spirit of promise vnder the new Test: But if you say in op[p]osition to that before the Law, that ther was no seale or signe appointed by God for them vnder the covenant, bicause the L. thought it not meet or needful: I say that herby it apeareth that, to be vnder the covenāt, was not the cause of title to the seale, but the particular expresse commaundement or wil of God: & so the insufficiency of your consequent appeareth, which importeth that to bee vnder the covenant is reason sufficient to prove a partie

to be intituled to the seale or signe of the covenant: & this excellent truth herby is manifested, that if it should be granted that infants were actually vnder the covenant yet it could not follow thervppon that therfor they should have the signe or seale of the covenāt, which you say is baptisme, except it could be proved by expresse commaundement otherwise: for this argument you see proveth it not: Hence therfor appeareth the weaknes of your argument, viz: that if infants were holy, & so vnder the covenant, yet it doth not follow that therefor they shall have the signe or seale of the covenant which (you say, but we deny) is baptisme.

But I passe vnto your assumption: which you say is evidēt, 1. cor. 7. 14. but now are your children holy: you affirme that infants of one of the parents Faithful are holy: I except many things here: first: I desire that you expound vnto me what this holines is which the Ap. here mentioneth: happily you wil say it is to be vnder the covenant, then I demaund what it is to be vnder the covenant? perhaps you wil say (though this be to runne in a circle) it is to be justified by imputation of Chr. righteo[u]snes. Thē I demaund which of these three, viz. to be holy, to be vnder the covenāt, to have Ch. righteousness imputed, is first in nature? happily you wil say: First, they are vnder the covenant. Secondly, they are justified by the imputed righteousness of Chr. Thirdly they are sanctified or holy: Then I proceed, & demaund when do infants come vnder the covenant: when they are conceived: or when they are borne? or when the parēts are converted being already borne? It wilbe answered: That these infants that are begotten of Faithful parents come vnder the covenant in their conception: & these infants that are already borne come vnder the covenant when their parents are regenerate: hereby then it appeareth that the covenant is conveighed to the children from the parents by generation, & by filial relation: herevnto add that if it be true that some say, that children vnder the government of the faithful also are vnder the covenant, that the covenant is conveighed also by pupilship or adoption: & if bondslaves or servants being infants be vnder the covenant because

of their beleving Mrs. then servitude is also a meanes or instrument of conveighing the covenant from Mr. to Servants: this being propounded then as the truth you hold, that plead for Pedobaptisme, then you maintayne, that seing generation, filial relation, pupilship, adoptiō & servitude are meanes to bring infants vnder the covenant, then they are meanes to bring infants vnder justification, & vnder sanctification: So that it followeth that we must account al the infants of beleving parents that are childrē by nature & by adoption, al infants of beleving Mrs. that are borne in slavery or servitude to be justified & Sanctified, bicause the covenant is communicated vnto them by the foresaid relation: Then I proceed & demaund why may not all the infants borne vnder one King, if his subjects, bee all his Servants & Vassals (as they say) bee by that relation brought vnder the covenant, & so be accounted justified & sanctified: For relation of a King & a subject borne so is as neer as the relation of a Mr, & Servant, or an adopted Child: And then I demaund, seing the relation of a mā & a wife is neerer a great deale then any relation of adoption or servitude, why the wife shal not be vnder the covenant for the relation of mariage: happily it will bee said the wife being of yeeres cannot bee admitted bicause of her vnbeleefe: & I say that infants of parents & Mrs. cannot bee admitted, bicause of their want of Faith being vnder yeeres: but it wilbee said that the covenant with Abraham was with him & his seed only: I say, that it was made (by your confession) with him and his adopted infants, with him & his pupils being infants, with him & his Servants being infants: & therfor not only with him & his seed: & seing some not of his seed may be admitted into the covenant, & those that are further of, why shall not those that are neerer as his wife: but you wil say bicause infants do not refuse the covenāt, they may be admitted to baptisme, though adopted childrē, though pupils, though Servants: but wives refusing the covenant may not: I further insist that as infants do not resist, so they do not consent: & that al the Children, Servants, & Wives, that do not resist, may bee admitted, though they cannot make declaration of their Fayth & repentance: if you say: not

so: because that in them that are of yeers Faith & repentance is required, but of infants no such thing is required: I answer, first shew that by Scripture, & then I say ther is no reason why Faith & repentance should bee required of one to make him capable of the covenant of justification, & Sanctification more then of another, except you wil say that God is acceptor of persons: & further the covenant is only with Abraham & his seed, not with his adopted Children, not with his pupils, not with his Servants, & therfor in thē Faith and repentance must necessarily be had, & so they cannot bee baptized til they shew their Faith & repentance which is contrary to your doctryne: besides you cannot shew in al the Scriptures that persons may be said to be partakers of the covenant actually, except actually they fulfil the condition of the covenant: & if you say that infants being vnder the covenant, justified, & sanctified, therfor they have Fayth & the graces of God in them, I say that is contrary to the Scriptures which say that Faith commeth by hearing: & that the word is the immortal seed of regeneration, wherby new borne babes vnder the gospel are regenerate: & if it be said that infants have a kind of Faith wrought in them invisibly, & after an hiddē manner: I say what God worketh invisibly, & secreatly we dispute not nor regard, but what he worketh visibly & to our knowledg, & by the meanes appointed for the communion of the Church: For ther is but one Faith, which is the common Faith of the members of the Church, which is visibly seen by speaking & confession, according as is written I beleevd & therfor I speake, Tit. 1. 4. & if it be objected that then wee doe condemne al infants dying before they be converted: I say No: wee pronounce nothing of infants, but leave the secreat of them to the Lord, who hath reserved secreat things to himself: Hence then I conclude that seing you cannot declare what this holines is which infants have, seing they cannot have actuall holynes: Seing you cannot declare that they have Faith or justification, seing they cannot have actuall Fayth: Therfor you cannot declare that they are actually vnder the covenant, by actuall Faith and holines: & so if they bee not actually vnder it, but vnder the offer of it onely, that is it which

wee affirme, & which wil help you nothing to baptisme of infants.

Secondly, I desire that you would prove vnto me by Scripture, that in this place. 1. Cor. 7. 14. Holines signifieth true sanctification, or to be actually vnder the covenant, having it really invested vpon them. You endeavour to declare it out of the text: For you say Paul answereth an objection, viz, that the faithful are defiled with the Society of the vnfaithful, & proveth that the Faithful husband may vse the vessel of his vnfaithful wife with a good conscience by an argument drawne from the effects, namely, bicause their Children are holy, & vnder the covenant: God having said to the Faithful I wilbe thy God, & the God of thy seed. Wel, let vs see the force of your reason: your fourth argument was this.

If infants be holy then are they vnder the covenant.

Infants are holy: Ergo infants are vnder the covenant.

Your proof that infants are holy is this.

If infants be vnder the covenant, then infants are holy.

Infants are vnder the covenant. Ergo infants are holy.

I ask you Sir, in good sooth, is this circular reasoning sound: you say infants are Holy, bicause they are vnder the covenant, & you say they are vnder the covenant bicause they are holy: Let al men judg whither you have proved infants Holy or not.

Thirdly I answer that (Holy) doth not so signify as you expound, neither is the argument taken from the effects, but from the greater to the lesse after this manner.

If your children (in your owne judgment) be holy, & you do not put them away when you are converted to the faith, but vse thē stil as your Children to al those vses wherto children are apointed, the relation natural of Father & sonne remayning, though you beleve: then much more the relation of mā & wife remayneth, & you may vse your wives, they being of a neerer natural bond then your children.

But the first is true by your owne confession, & by the light of nature.

Ergo the second is true by the light of nature much more.

And whereas you say that by this exposition an vnbeleving servant is in as good an estate, & as holy as children in respect of the covenant, I confesse it to be so: & you that plead for pedobaptisme say so likewise, seing that you wil have servants vnder the covenant by their Mrs. Faith: but I would know whither the Apostle speaketh only of infants or of al Children generally: if generally of al Children, then all the Children of the Faithful are holy, yea even those that are vnbelevers & then would I know how vnbeleiving children can be holy, if not as the vnbeleving wife is holy: that is to the vse of their parents in the relative duties of children & parents. If the Apostle speaketh only of infants, then he speaketh not so generally as God speake to Abraham saying I wilbe thy God, & the God of thy seed, for in that speech you say al the seed is comprehended whither of yeeres or vnder yeeres, yea servants, pupils, children by adoption, &c. So that expound it as you wil, it cannot be vnderstood of holines in respect of the covenant as you pretend: but you wil say they are to bee esteemed Holy & vnder the covenant til they manifest the contrary: & I say, that they must manifest that they are Holy before they can bee esteemed Holy: & that you cannot prove that assertion from the Scripture: & the people of the Iewes Abrahams carnall Children were Holy when they declared the contrary by their sinnes, Exo. 19. 6. compared with Exod. 32. 9. & 33. 3. 5. so are the children of the Faithful holy though they be vnbelevers as the wife is holy though an vnbeleever.

Finally you say: God hath said to all the Faithful, I wilbe thy God & the God of thy seed: I deny it vtterly: God said that only to Abraham, Genes. 17. 7. & whither you expound it literally, or Spiritually, I avouch confidently against you & al men that the meaning of it is not, that God made his covenant with the faythfull man, or the Faythful woman & their infants begotten of their Bodyes: but that literally the meaning is, I willbe God

vnto thee Abraham & thy seed according to the Flesh to give them the Land of Canaan: & so it is expounded Genes. 17. 8. Or Spiritually the meaning is, I wil give vnto Abraham the Father of the Faithful, & al that are his Spiritual seed, everlasting life, which is the true Land of Canaan: The latter which is the truth being signified by the former which is the type: & shew mee in all the Scriptures that God said to every Faithful man & woman (for you must prove it spoken of women aswel as men) that he wilbe God vnto them & their seed: For I would fayne know why the covenant should passe vnto the infants of the Faithful: it wilbe said bicause of the Fathers Faith: this is false doctryne: For the Prophet teacheth that every man shal live by his owne faith & that one mans faith cānot conveigh the covenāt of justificatiō to another neither can one mans sin cut of another from the covenant as this doctrine importeth: but the soule that sinneth it shal dye.

Neither wil it avayle to plead that the covenant made with Abraham was an everlasting covenant: For berith gnolam in the original doth not import a covenant of everlasting continuance, but a covenant that doth continue his proper tyme: For gnolam signifieth any hidden tyme, or any set tyme of any length, as 50. yeeres the tyme of the jubile: But let it be graunted that the covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. was the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, (which yet I do not see proved) what then? shal it follow that bicause it was with Abraham & the Faithfull whither Iewes or Gentils beleaving actually as Abraham the Father did: Therfor it is made with the Faithful men who is the child of Abraham: & with his children begotten of his body which have not Abrahams actuall Faith, & so are not the children of Abraham? I deny it vtterly: For the Apostle saith the seed is but one to whome the promises were made, viz: Christ or the actual beleivers: For Christ dwelleth in the harts of men by Faith onely. Gal. 3. 16. Eph. 3. 17. But if it bee made with the Faithful who beleeve actualy which is one seed whither Iew or Gentil, & the infants of the Faithful carnally begotten of their body, which is another seed, (for they are not

begotten of the immortall seed of regeneration :) then the covenant is made with the seedes which are many: & that is directly contrary the Apostles wordes, Gall, 3. 16. Therefore the one seed is persons actually beleiving, & actually justified by the righteousnes of Fayth, as Abraham the Father of al the Faithful was, Roman. 4. 11. whence this Argument may bee framed.

Abraham is the Father of al them that actually beleive.

Infants do not actually beleive.

Ergo, Abraham is not the Father of infants: & so infants are not vnder the covenant of Abraham.

Againe. Abrahams covenant was only to Abrahams one seed, that is only to the beleivers.

Infants are not actually beleivers.

Ergo Abrahams covenant is not to infants: & so infants are not vnder the everlasting covenant of Abraham.

Againe. They that are the children of Abraham, do the workes of Abraham.

Infants cannot do the workes of Abraham.

Ergo infants are not the children of Abraham: & so not vnder the covenant of Abraham.

Againe. I reason thus: They that are not vnder the everlasting covenant made with Abraham shal not be baptized.

Infants are not vnder the everlasting covenant of Abraham.

Ergo: infants are not to be baptized.

These & many other such Arguments may be col[lect]ed out of the answer to this fourth Argument of yours: but these shal suffice.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

1. Corinth. 10. 1. 2.

[5.] If the infants of the Israelites were baptized in the cloud & in the sea, aswell as their parents, what letteth the infants of beleiving parents vnder the gospel, to bee likewise partakers of baptisme aswel as they?

The former the Apostle affirmes, 1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. &



therefore good warrant must bee shewed, that our infants are cut of from this priviledg that the Iewes Children had. And if the former Baptisme of the Iewes was a Type of our Baptisme, then must there bee an agreement betweene the Type, & the thing Typed, which is not, if our Children bee not baptized, as well as theirs.

The depriving of our Children of the Sacrament, is to shorten the Lords bounty towards his people of the New Testament, that being denyed to their children, which God gave to his people, & to their infants vnder the Law, is to deny them (in regard of their seed) the like assurance & comfort, which the Israelites had of theirs. And so to make our estate worse & more vncomfortable then theirs was: & yet the Prophets prophecyed of the grace that should come to vs, & did inquire & sea[r]ch after the same. 1, Pet. 1. 10.

Glad tydings were preached to Abraham & his seed to infants of eight dayes old Gal. 3, 8. And this before Christ came in the Flesh, therefore much more he being come, is joyful tydings brought vnto vs & our infants. & so are we to beleve that the grace of God is not lessened either towards vs or our children, but enlarged by his comming.

John Smyth.

Your 5. argument is taken from 1. Cor. 10. 1. 2, framed thus.

If the infats of the Israelites were baptized in the cloud & in the sea, aswel as their parents, what letteth the infants of beleving parents vnder the gospel to be likewise partakers of baptisme aswel as they?

The former the Apostle affirmeth, 1. Cor, 10. 1. 2, & therfor good warant must be shewed that our infants are cut of from this priviledg that the Iewes children had: that baptisme being a type of our baptisme,

To this argument I make answer: by framing the like argument.

If their infants did eate the same Spiritual meate & drink which the parents did eate: then why may not our infants being able to eate & drinck, eate & drinck the Lords Supper?

The former the Apostle affirmeth, 1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. & therfor good warrant must be shewed that our infants are cut of from that priviledg: & those sacramēts were types of our Sacraments.

Againe, I answer more properly thus: That ther shalbe a proportion betwixt the Type & the truth, that baptisme of the cloud & sea, & our baptisme, viz: that as yong & old carnal Israelites were baptized in the cloud & sea, so yong & old Spiritual true Israelites shalbe baptized by the baptisme of repētance: & as the carnal parents with their carnal children were baptized in type: So Spiritual parents with their Spiritual children, that is such as are regenerate by the word & Spirit, shall bee baptized with the baptisme of repentance for the remission of sinnes, which is baptisme in truth.

Further I say: That our infants shal have a priviledg farr greater then the infants of the Israelites had in that typical baptisme: For they by it were only baptized into Moses & the Law: That by it they might learne Moses, & in Moses the truth in Chr. as it were vnder a vele: but our infants vnder the gospel shal have the dayly institution & education of Faithful parents, which is infinitely superior to that darke pedagogical baptisme, & al the baptismes & ordinances of the old Testament: Seing that with open face they may in the preaching of the gospel see Christ Iesus, & not vnder the vele of Moses.

Moreover I deny that the baptisme of the cloud & sea was a type of the external baptisme of the new Testament, in the abstract: but it was a type of our baptisme in the concrete: that is the baptisme of the cloud did Type out our baptisme in the 3. parts therof, viz: 1. The baptisme of the Spirit, 2. The declaration of Faith & repentance the antecedent of baptisme with water, 3. The outward washing with water a manifestation of the foresaid particulars: & all these to bee conferred vppon infants proportionable to those infants, that is, New borne babes in Christ.

And whereas you further alledg that if your infants bee not baptized, the Lords bounty is shortned to vs & our infants: our confort is diminished in respect of our infants which they had in respect of theirs: & the gospel

is not preached to our infants as it was to theirs: I answer that Gods bounty, our confort in respect of our infants, & the preaching of the glad tydings of the gospel is as large & ample every way to our infants as to theirs: For Gods bounty of the actual exhibiting and sealing the everlasting covenant to Abraham & al his carnall infants was never extant in the Old Testament: Neither were the parents in circumcising their infants comforted in the assured conferring of it vpon their infants: & circumcision did not so plainly preach Christ then as he is preached now to infants: but what could the preaching of Christ profit infants either then in types or now in truth? Neyther doe I think that the Lord ever intended to teach the infant any thing at that instant, but afterward hee was to learne that which the Schoolemr. circumcision vpon his Flesh taught him: viz: the circumcision of the hart: & if you say that so infants baptized are to be instructed, I answer, that in the New Testament by baptisme wee manifest what wee have, namely, the inward baptisme, whereas in the Old Testament by circumcision they learned what they had not but ought to have, viz: The inward circumcision of the hart, & mortification of the sinnefull Flesh.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Mat. 28. 19.

[6.] If Christ gave a commaundement for the publishing of his covenant & administring of baptisme the seale therof to al nations: then are the beleving Gētils & their infants to receive the same.

But the first is true, Mat. 28. 19, Ergo the latter also is true, Act. 13. 48. & 16. 14. 15. 32. 33.

It wil be objected against the Major, that it followes not, that the infants are any more bound to receive baptisme, then they are bound whylest they are infants to receive the word, but the word they cannot receive, ergo. I answere, that the commaundement is general to al nations, & therfor as Abraham if he should not have obeyed to the Lord commaunding him to circumcise himselfe, & al his family, yea the infants, he should grevously have rebelled against God: So whosoever of the Gentils

shal not beleve & be baptized both himselfe & his seed, shall have no part nor portion in the inheritance of Christ: Seing he cuts himselfe of & his seed from the covenant of God, Gen. 17. 14.

And though infants bee not capable of the preaching of the covenant, (which notwithstanding they are bound vnto, as they shall come to yeres of discretion) yet are they capable of the seale, as before is shewed, & therefore by vertue of this generall commaundement. Mat. 28. 19. are to bee Baptized.

### Iohn Smyth.

Your 6. Argument from Mat. 28. 19. is framed thus. If Christ gave a commaundement for the publishing of his covenant & administring of baptisme the seale thereof to al nations: then are the beleieving gentils & their infants to receave the same.

But the first is true: Mat. 28. 19. Ergo the latter also is true, Act. 13. 48. & 16. 14. 15. 32. 33.

The errors of this argument I wil discover in order: First I deny that baptisme is the seale of the covenant of the new Testament: Secondly I deny that circumcision was the seale of that everlasting covenant that was made with Abraham in respect of Christ: Thirdly, baptisme therfor doth not succeed in the place of circumcision, ther being only a chandg of the ceremony (as you pretend) the covenant being the same, these thre particulars are already proved. Fourthly I deny, that though Abraham who had a special commaundement, did circumcise his male infants, therefore Christians vppon this general commaundement, Mat. 28. 19. shal baptise their infants. Fifthly, I say rather the contrary is hence proved, bicause Christ commaundeth to baptise only those that are by teaching made Disciples (for so the word matheteusate signifieth) therfor infants are by expresse prohibition excluded, & it is as if Chr. should say, I wil have you make them Disciples & baptise them that are made Disciples by teaching & no other: & so Christ expresly excludeth infants. Lastly, I deny that infants are capable of baptisme, for they cannot confesse their faith & their sinnes, neither declare that they are baptized inwardly

with the Spirit, & so cannot outwardly by the baptisme with water declare the same, but are in every respect vnable therto, & vncapable thereof.

Hence therfor I reason against baptising infants.

1. They only are to be baptized that are made Disciples by teaching.

Infants cannot be made Disciples by teaching.

Ergo, Infants are not to be baptized. Secondly I reason thus.

2. Every precept affirmative conteyneth a negative vnder it.

Make Disciples by teaching & baptise them, is an affirmative conteyning vnder it, baptize not those that are not made Disciples by teaching.

Ergo, those that are not by teaching made Disciples, are by Christ forbidden to be baptized: & so infants are not to be baptized.

3. Thirdly I reason thus.

They that are vncapable of baptisme are not to be baptized.

Infants are vncapable of baptisme: Seing baptisme consisting of the inward baptisme of the Spirit, expressed by confession in word, & washing with water in action: infants are vncapable of the two former parts of baptisme.

Ergo infants are not to be baptized with water which is the latter.

4. If the new Testament be as cleer & perspicuous as the old, & Christ the Mediator of the new Testament as faithfull as Moses the Mediator of the old Testament: then the persons to be baptised, & the conditiō of baptisme, & the tyme of baptisme are as cleerly & faithfully described in the institutiō of baptisme, as the person, condition & tyme of circumcision.

But for pedobaptisme, ther is no expresse description of the person, condition, or tyme of their baptisme: & for true baptisme: ther is most evidently, & faithfully set downe the persons, condition, & tyme of administring it, viz: persons confessing their sinnes, Mat. 3. 6. wheras persons impenitent were put by, Mat. 3. 7-12. compared with Luk. 7. vs, 29-30. Persons beleeving. Act. 8. 12.

13. & vs. 36–38. persons that had received the holy Ghost, & expressed the same by prophecyng, Act. 10. 46–48 persons penitent, Act. 2. 38. persons that are by teaching made Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. Ioh. 4. 1. persons borne againe. Ioh. 3. 3.

Therfor such persons are to bee baptized who are thus particularly described, wherein the new Testament is as cleer as the Old, & Christ the Mediator as Faythfull as Moses: & no other but these: For if others bee, then is not the New Testament so cleer as the Old, nor Christ as Faithful as Moses, which to say is to blaspheme.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

[7.] Lastly, the Apostles practise is our instruction, but they baptized not onely the master of the family which beleived, but al his howsehold. Act. 16. 15. 33. Therefore now also the like is to be done: & so consequently the infants are to be baptized, for they are a part of the family. & that infants are of the family, see Gen. 45. 18. where Ioseph bad his brethren, take their Father, & their howseholds, & come to him, now in chap. 46. 5. 7. it is said they caried their Children & wives in charets, nothing hereby, that children were of the howsehold, els had they no commaundement to have caried them into Egypt, see also vs. 27. & Exo. 1. 21. it is said, bicause the Midwyves feared God, therefore he made them howses, in 1. Tim. 5. 8. the Apostle saith, he that provideth not for his owne, & namely for them of his houshold, he denyeth the faith, &c. Now I would aske if childrē be exempted from the howshold in any of these places, or in any other where is mention made of a particular howshold. Therefore this argument wil prove that children were baptized, vnles it can bee shewed that they were specially exempted. & if the holy ghost have not exempted them, who dare do it against a general commaundement of baptising al nations.

Iohn Smyth.

Your 7. argument is taken from Act. 16. 15. 33. framed thus.

The Apostles practise is our instruction.

But they baptized not only the Mr. of the Family which beleved, but al his howshold: Act. 16, 15. 33.

Therfor now also the like is to be done: & so consequently infants are to be baptized, for they are a part of the family.

I make answer to this argument confessing it wholly, but yet denying the consequent of your conclusion: For it doth not follow bicause al the howshold of Lydia & the Gaylor were baptized, that therfor infants were baptized: you shal see what exceptions I take.

First, I say though infants are a part of the family when the family hath infants in it, yet it doth not follow that whersoever ther is mention made of a Family, that therefore that Family had infants in it: except therefore it bee proved that the family of Lydia, & the family of the Gaylor had infants in it, this allegatiō is nothing.

Secondly, by this reason you might prove that Lydias Husband, & the Gaylors wife, & their children of 40 yeeres old, & their Servants of 60. yeeres old, were baptized: For al these are parts of a Family, yet I sup[p]ose you wil not say they were al of them baptized, except you can prove, that Lydia had a Husband, or the Gaylor had a wife, or children of 40. & servants of 60. yeeres old: your argumēt therfor is weak presupposing the thing that is in question.

Thirdly, if it were yeilded that ther were infants in Lydias Family, & in the Gaylors, doth it therfor follow that they were baptized? nothing lesse: & that I will declare thus.

1. You say that to the baptising of the Gaylors wife, & children of yeeres of discretion ther was necessarily required Faith & repentance, or els they were not baptized: So say I that bicause infants cannot beleeve & repent, though they were in the Family yet shal they not be baptized: For ther is one conditiō required for al persons to be baptized.

2. I say: that although it be said that al that perteyned to the Gaylor were baptized, yet it is also said vs. 32. That the word was preached to all that were in his howse: & vs. 34. That al his howshold beleved, & how came their faith but by the word preached vs. 32.

Seing therfor that al that were baptized in the Gaylors hows beleaved by the preaching of the word: infants that could not beleave by the preaching of the word, were not baptized if he had any: besides it was a mervailous distempered tyme at midnight to wake children, & to bring them before the Apostles for baptisme.

3. I say: That for Lydias Family it is not said that all her howsehold was baptized: or if it had been so said, yet it followeth not that every particular person off her Family was baptized. For Mat. 3, 5. 6. it is said that al Iudea went out to Iohn & were baptized of him, confessing their sinnes: yet hence it cannot bee concluded that all & every one that went out were baptized: or that all & every one went out to bee baptized: no more can it bee proved that bicause it is said that Lydias Family was baptized, that therefore all & every particular person was baptized, but as Mat. 3. 6. only they that confessed ther sinnes: & as Act. 16. 32-34. onley they that beleaved by the word preached were baptized, so was it with them of Lydias Family that were baptized: For the Apostles I doubt not kept one order, & required the same conditions in al that they baptized: So that by that which hath been said the vanity of this argument is manifested: & it is proved plainly that none were baptised in the Gaylors Family, but only they that beleaved after the word preached: & so infants specially are exempted, if he had any in his family which yet is not manifested.

Hence therfor I reason thus against baptising infants.

1. The Apostles practise is our instruction.

But the Apostles in baptising howseholds, first preached the word to al that were in the Family, Act. 16. 32. & then the beleaving were baptized, vs. 34. 33.

Ergo: They only that by the preaching of the word were converted & beleaved were baptized. Againe I reason thus.

2. That which the Apostles practised in one Family, they practised in all Familyes that they baptized.

But in the Gaylors Family, according to Christs commission, Mat. 28. 19. They first made them Disciples by preaching the VVord: Act. 16. 32-34,



Ergo: So they practised in al Familyes: & therfor in the Family of Lydia, of Crispus, Act. 18. 8. of the Ruler: Iohn, 4. 43. & so no infants were baptized. And this shal suffice for answer to your arguments.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

[8.] Herevnto I wil adjoyne some testimonyes of the Fathers, not to prove that children ought to be baptized, which is to be done, & is by the Scriptures already proved: but to shew the practise hereof in auncient Churches. Augustine (as I find alledged) writing to Ierome, Epist. 28. chap. 5. Saith Cyprian not making any new decree, but firmly observing the Fayth of the Church, judged with his fellow Bishops, that as sone as one was borne, he might Lawfully bee baptized. See Cyprian Epist. to Fidus. And writing against the Donatists, Lib. 4. Chap. 23. & 24. saith, that the baptisme of infants was not deryved from the authority of man, neither of counsels, but from the tradition or doctryne of the Apostles. Ciril: vpon Lev: Chap. 8. approveth the baptisme off infants, & condemneth the iteration of baptisme. Origine vpon the Roman: sayth, that the Church received baptisme of infants from the Apostles. Nazianzenus in Orat. in S. Lavacrum. 3. saith: That baptisme agreeth to every age, to every condition of life, to all men, if thou hast an infant, that is Sanctified from his infancy, yea from the finger ends it is consecrated. After hee saith: Some man wil say, what sayest thou of infants which neither know what grace is nor payne, what shal wee baptize those? & he Answeres, yea verily. Amb: Lib. 2. de Abrah. Chap. 11. Speaking of baptisme, saith, nether Old man nor prosolite, nor infant is to be excepted, bicause every age is guilty of sinne, & therefore stands nede of the Sacrament. These & many others of the Fathers doe beare witnesse according to the Scriptures of the Lawfullnes of the baptising of infants.

Iohn Smyth.

And heerfor a conclusion you produce the Fathers: I say that the producing of Fathers who al of them held plenty of Antichristian heresies, shal avayle you nothing

in your cause: & you that deny the testimony of Fathers contrary to the scriptures, how can you with any color of equity produce Fathers against vs in a case cōtrary to the Scripture, is it not to set darknes against light? doe not you know that al the Fathers even every one of them brought his stone to the building of the Temple of Antichrist: but I know your drift in the producing of Fathers, viz: First to set a gloze vppon your Antichristian heresy of baptising infants. Secondly to draw the world into dislike of the L. truth: but if a mā should produce testimonyes of Fathers against our Seperation, against you in the case of Prelacy, Preisthood, & Deaconry, read prayer, & other parts of your cause, what would you answer? would not you say, that they were testimonyes of men living in cor[r]upt tymes, contrary to the Scriptures, &c. Even so say I to you: but you say that you do not bring testimony of the Fathers, to prove any thing: wel then: you confesse they prove nothing: remember that, & let al men take notice that you produce testimonyes that you say prove nothing: but why do you produce testimonyes of the Fathers: Forsooth, to shew the practise of auncient Churches: but al those Churches were Antichristian by your owne confession: & what doth antiquity Antichristian, or vniversality antichristian help you against the truth? Therfor I say: The truth needeth not the testimony of Antichrist: & old vniversal antichristian errors shal not prevayle against the truth: I have shewed you that from the beginning it was not thus: [er]go: baptisme of infants is a Novelty: but let vs shew you some footsteps of the bringing in of baptising infants, & that out of the Fathers.

Henricus Pantaleon: Chronolog. fol. 16. saith: Victor Apher in the yeer 193. ordeyned: that at Easter baptisme should be indifferently administred to al: hence then it followeth that before his tyme only such as were Catechised in the Faith were baptized: For he would not decree that heathen should be baptized.

Eusebius. Eccles. Histor. Lib. 7, Chap. 8. saith that Novatus rejected the Holy baptisme, & overthrew the Fayth & confession which was accustomed before baptisme: whereby it appeareth that Fayth & confession

were required before baptisme, and therefore the rudiments thereof still remayne, that in Baptising of infants, a confession of sinne, and Fayth is required of the suretyes or parents.

The same Euseb. Lib. 10. Chap. 15. reporteth the story of Athanasius baptising children in sport: which baptisme was approved (though done in sport) by Alexander Bb, of Alexandria, after that he by examination had found that the children had questioned & answered according to the manner of the Catechumeni in baptisme: wherby it appeareth that then only persons by confession of their Faith & sins were admitted to baptisme in Alexandria.

Hosius: Petricoviensi confess. de fide. chap. 27. saith that these two are Apost[ol]ical traditiōs, which the Scripture teacheth not: viz: that ther are 3. persons & one God: & that Dionisius & Origen doe testifie baptisme of infants to be an Apost[ol]ical tradition: Now you know that their Apost[ol]icall traditions were antichristian inventions.

Polydor. Virg. Lib. 4. Chap. 4 de inventoribus rerū. saith thus: It was in vse with the auncients, that persons of yeeres (sere) in a manner should be baptized clad with whyte garments: Lactantius.

Candidus egreditur nitidis exercitus vndis:

Atque vetus vitium purgat in amne novo.

And this was performed at Easter & whitsontide except in necessity: in the meane tyme til the Feasts of Easter & whitsontyde came they were catechised: this testimony is of good instruction.

Ludovicus Vives, writing vppon the first book of August: de Civitate dei, chap. 27. saith: that in auncient tymes no man was baptized but persons of yeeres, who could vnderstand what the mystical water signified, & required baptisme offer then once: & therfor now the infant to be baptized is demaunded three tymes, if hee wil be baptized, for whome the suertyes answer, yea.

Erasmus Rotrodamus in his annotations vppon the fifth of the Roman. saith, that in Pauls tyme it was not receaved, that infants should bee Baptized.

Thus have I thought good to shew you testimonyes of men: & so by setting mā against man, to lead you & vs al from man to the holy Scriptures, which is the

rock wherevpon we may safely build: which as you have heard flatly forbiddeth the baptising of infants, who cannot bee made Disciples by teaching. Mat, 28. 19. Iohn. 4. 1.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now let vs come to consider of the reasons alledged to the contrary, [page 574:] the first of them is this.

1. Bicause there is neither precept nor example in the New Testament of any infants that were Baptized by Iohn, or Christs Disciples, onely they that did confesse theire sinnes, & confesse theire Faith, were baptized, Marc. 1. 4. 5. Act. 8. 37.

Answer.

First, this reason being brought into forme, wil be-wray the weakenes of it: For suppose that should be graunted that there were nether a special commaundement or example in the practise of Iohn or Chr. Disciples, for the baptising of infants, yet may it notwithstanding be lawful to baptize them, namely, if by some consequēce it may be gathered out of the Scripture. And this may be done by good warrant from the example of our Saviour Christ, Mat. 22. 31. 32. wher reasoning against the Saduces concerning the resurrection, proves it by an argument necessarily drawn from Exo. 3. 6. where no such thing was expressly mentioned. And thus he taught vsually & refuted his adversaries, as the History of the Gospel witnesseth. After the same manner doth Paul in his Epist. to the Romanes & Gal. prove justification by Faith onely without works of the law: this he did not prove by alledging any place in al the old Testament in plaine termes affirming so much, but by conclusions of necessary consequence from the Scriptures. & to this purpose might divers other instances be alledged. So likewise if we prove the baptising of infants by vnanswerable arguments out of the Old & New Testament (though we cannot shew any playne precept or example,) yet may we vpon warrant thereof, not feare to baptise them. For the author of this reason him selfe cannot deny, that both he & we must beleve diverse things which wee gather out

of the Scriptures by necessary consequence, that wee shall not find in expresse words. As that there bee three persons in one Godhead, that the sonne is Homousios, that is of the same substance with the Father: Now such expresse words cannot bee shewed in the Scripture, & many such like.

2. Secondly, also if this argument be sufficient to barre children from the Sacrament of baptisme, then is it as sufficient to kepe back women from the Lords Supper, for there is no speciall precept, nor yet example that VVomen should pertake of the Lords Supper, but the Lawfullnes thereof is onely proved by consequence, bicause they are within the covenant, & are pertakers of the Sacrament of baptisme, thus the weakenes of this reason being manifested, I will thirdly answeere vnto it.

3. Thirdly, that ther is both precept by Christ & example by his Disciples for the baptising of infants as hath bene proved by my two last reasons alledged to prove the Lawfullnes of baptising of infants: Commaundement, I say, Mat. 28. 19. Goe teach al natiōs, baptising them, where is no exception of the children of faithful parents: & therfor ther being a Law once given, that the covenant should be sealed to the infants aswel as to the beleiving parents, the same Law of sealing the covenant must stand stil in force to the parties (though the outward signe be chāged) except the Lawmaker do repeale it, or have set downe some ground for the repeale therof which must be shewed: or els this commaundement doth bind vs & our infants to receave this seale of the covenant. And as for examples we read that the Apostle baptized Lydia & her howshold. Act. 16. 15, & the Keper, & al that belonged vnto him, vs. 33. both which seming to be great Families, it is not likely that they were without children, though the Evang: mention them not.

But the exception is that only such as did confesse their sinnes, & confesse their Faith, were baptized. I desire that to be proved that only such & no others were to be baptized. Cōcerning Iohn, indeed he was sent to cal the people to repētance, & so to prepare the way of the L. Mat. 3. 3. & so many as did repent & confessé their

sinnes he baptized, but did Iohn refuse their children if they brought them to him? but it wil be said, ther is no mentiō made that he did baptise thē, no more say I, is ther that they were offered vnto him. Ther is no mention that the Disciples of Chr. were baptized, & yet it were t[o] bold a part, & no doubt very false to affirme that they were not baptized: Not al things that Iohn did, nor yet that Chr. did, in the particulars, are written Ioh. 20. 30. but the sūme therof: & therfor to gather an argument frō hence, bicause ther is no mention that children were baptized by Iohn, therfor they ought not to be baptized is a larger conclusion, then the premisses wil beare. & so the reason taken from the baptising of the Evnuch, (Philip baptized no childrē, when he baptized the Evnuch) is of no waight, to prove that therfor childrē ought not to be baptized. Was not the Evnuch a strāger far from his country, now in jorney homeward & therfor not likely that he should have children with him specially in such a tedious jorney, & not knowing of this accident.

#### Iohn Smyth.

Now in the next place you proceed to make answer to my three arguments against baptising of infants: In answer to the first argument you say that if it bee brought into forme it will bewray the weakenes of it: Wel I will bring it into forme, & then let vs strengthen it where it is weake: as thus

That which hath neither precept nor example, is not to be done.

Baptising of infants hath neither precept nor example.

Ergo, baptisme of infants is not to be done.

Againe another part of my Argument may bee brought into forme thus.

That which hath precept & example must be practized.

Baptising of persons confessing ther sinnes & their Faith is commaunded, & was practised by Christ, Iohn, & the Apostles.

Ergo, those persons are the persons to be baptized. My argument therefore consisting of an affirmative

which includeth a negative is as I take it a forcible Argument: Let vs see your answer & exceptions.

First, you say that a consequence necessarily drawne from the Scripture is sufficient to prove the baptising of infants, though ther were no special commaundement or example as Christ proveth the resurrection, Mat. 22. 31. 32, out of Exod. 3. 6. by necessary consequent: & as Paul in the Epistles to the Rom. & Gal. proveth justification by Faith only without workes, by necessary consequents: & wee beleeve many things that are not expressed in words: as 3. persons in one Godhead, & that Christ is coessential or consubstantial to the Father: this is your answer or exception: wherto I reply thus.

Although a necessary consequence in al cases shal prevayle, yet I say the Lord can not leave vs in this particular to necessary consequence he dealing plainly & Faythfully with vs: For seing the new Testament is more manifest then the old, the Gospel being with open face, the Law being hid vnder the vele: & seing Christ is as Faithful, yea much more faithful then al men, & therfor is called Amen, the Faythful & true wisse: & so hath as faithfully prescribed al the ordinances of the new Testament as Moses did the ordinances of the old Testament: & seing Moses hath set downe distinctly & most plainly, the persons with their qualifications to bee circumcised, & the circumstance of the tyme when circumcision was to be administred: either Christ hath as plainly & fully set downe these particulars in the new Testament, or else the new Testament is not so plaine as the old, & Christ is not as Faythful as Moses: For it had been easily said, goe teach, make Disciples, & baptise them, & if they have any infants baptise them without teaching them: or thus: baptise mē of yeeres when they confesse their sinnes & their faith, but baptise al the infants of the faithful, though they cannot confesse at al their sins & faith, or it had beē easily said: Iohn baptized them that confesse their sinnes & ther yong children also: but to say that Christ, Iohn, & the Apostles leaveth direction for this maine ma[t]ter, only by darke obscure, far fetcht, probable conjectures & consequents from the old Testament which was only typical, & is abolished in

respect of the Types, & that hee hath not left evident & vndeniable ground for it distinctly & expresly in al the foresaid particulars, is to say that Christ is not so plaine & Faithful in his office propheticall, as Moses was, who hath taught al these particulars so distinctly as nothing is more plaine: & therfor though I must needes yeeld that necessary consequents are true, yet I deny that in this case the Lord hath left vs to consequents, & it is against his truth, his Faythfulness, & the evidence of the new Testament, so to do.

Moreover seing that the new Testament was wrapt vp & preached obscurely in the old Testament, & the types therof, it was necessary that Christ should out of the old Testament prove the resurrectiō, & Paul out of the old Testamēt prove justification by faith without works: for the Iewes would not beleeeve any thing contrary to the law or without warrant of the law: & the Gentils, namely the Galatians especially, being seduced by them of the circumcision, Act. 15. 1. must needes have their mouths stopt by the law: & ther were no Scriptures but the old Testament, & the ordinances of the new Testament could not be so plainly drawne out of the old Testament without consequents: but now the new Testament being written, & al the ordinances therof plainly taught by Christ & his Apostles: why shal wee bee sent to obscurities, & conjectural consequents, seing that wee may with open face look into the glory of Christ, as it were into a glasse, & therein see al the beauty of the new Ierusalem as cleer as Christal, Revel. 21. 11. 2. Cor. 3. 18. & whereas you would fetch arguments from the old Testament to prove the baptisme of infants, we having the cleer light of the new Testament, you therin set vs to Schoole to the rudiments of the world, & put aside the light of the sunne at noone, & set vp a candle as the Papists do in their funerals: for although it be meet that we attend vnto the Prophets as vnto a light shining in a dark place, yet seing the day star is come, & the sunne of righteousness is risen vppon vs, let vs walk in this cleer light, & vse the other when we want light as with the Iewes who deny the new Testament: & in other like occasions.

Besides the trinity of persons, & vnity of essence in



the Godhead is proved by playne words, 1. Iohn. 5. 7. & hereby the Homoiousia of Arrius is confuted: as also: Phil. 2. 6. & for the word person it is, Heb. 1. 3. & the word Godhead is Roman. 1. 20. So that hereby you gett nothing: but I say still that whatsoever cannot bee playnly shewed in the New Testament, is not needfull for vs to know in the New Testament, if it bee an ordinance of the New Testament as baptisme is: but the trinity & vnity is no part of the New Testament more then of the Old Testament, & being common to both may be sought out of both, & so any other common truth.

Finally, I say shew mee any necessary consequence for baptizing infants, eyther out of the Old Testament or New Testament, & I yeeld: but I desire it may wel bee observed, first, that you are driven to consequents for this matter, & therein simple witted people may easily bee mislead by a Logician: Secondly, that the Gospel of Christ is for babes: Mat. 11. 25. & therefore the most simple person is capable of it: & so ther shal need no obscure consequents out of it: for they are not able to comprehend them: & lastly, that the consequents that are brought I avouch to be meer hallucinations & sophismes, as I have already declared & shal doe hereafter more fully as they shalbe produced.

Your second answer & exception is, that if want of Special precept & example, barre infants from baptisme, it shal also barre weomen from the Lords Supper: I deny it, for in playne termes it is said: 1. Corinth. 11. 28. Let Anthropos, viz: eyther man or woman eate after examination: & Gal. 3. 28. Ther is neither male nor female in Christ Iesus, but al are one, & 1. Corinth. 10. 17. wee that are many are one bread, & one body, being al pertakers of one bread, & 1. Corinth. 12. 13. whee have been al made to drink into one Spirit, & Dorcas is a Disciple: Act. 9. 36. & the Disciples meet together to break bread, Act. 20. 7. & the Disciples continued in breaking bread: Act. 2. 41. 42. being first 3000. then 5000. amongst whom ther was Sapphyra, & the VVidowes of the Grecians, Act. 2. 41. & 5. 1. & 6. 1. & so this exception is nothing to the purpose.

Your third answer & exception followeth, wherein you

doe affirme that there is both precept & example for baptising infants, the Commaundement is, Mat. 28. 19. The example is of the infants of Lydia, & the Keper of the prison: Act. 16. 15. 33. To these I have already given answer in the 6. & 7. reasons going before, & therefore hold it needles to repeat it heer againe: onely one thing is heer to bee answered that you object. viz: That the Law once given of sealing the infants aswel as parents, must bee retayned, except a repeale can bee shewed: I answer, (besides that baptisme is not the seale of the New Testament, but the Spirit: & that circumcision was not a seale of the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ but of the Old Testament) that when Princes & common wealths make Lawes to endure but for a tyme, when the tyme is expired then they are repealed if they be not reestablished: So, though it were graunted that infants of the Old Testament were by circumcision sealed to the covenant made in respect of Chr. which I peremptorily deny, yet seing the tyme of circumcision is expired therfor infants are not now to be sealed (as you say) by baptisme: for the expiring of the tyme is the repealing of the Law: therfor vntil you can shew that baptisme of infants male & female is in the new Testament established: I wil defend that they are not to be baptized especialy the female infants which were never appointed to be circumcised: but I count these but slender exceptions.

In the last place you require proof that only persons that confessed their sinnes & their faith were to be baptized: I prove it vnto you thus.

1. They only were to be baptized that Christ commaunded to be baptized.

Persons made Disciples by teaching, were only commaunded to bee baptized by Christ, Mat. 28. 19.

Ergo: persons made Disciples by teaching, were only to be baptized.

The minor of this argument is evident, Mat. 28, 19. wher this being the affirmative you shal make them Disciples by teaching them, & then baptise thē: this must needes be the negative, you shal not baptise them

til you have made them Disciples by teaching: & so persons taught were baptized & they only.

2. Againe: considering that in every affirmative ther is included a negative: therfor whersoever an example is that persons cōfessing their sinnes and their faith were baptized, ther is signified that those that did not confesse their sins & their Faith, were not baptized: For wee must know that the body is one: & the Fayth is one, & the Spirit one, & the baptisme one, & the seed one: & that there is not two in Christ but one: For in the new Testament they know God from the least vnto the greatest, Heb. 8. 11. & they are al taught of God, Ioh. 6. 45. & the least in the Kingdome of heaven is greater then Iohn. Mat. 11. 11. & this do I take to be a plaine proof of the point which you desire.

You say further that the reason why Iohn baptized no children, is for that they offered them not. wel: I say that his preaching was such as peremptorily excluded infants: For it was the baptisme of repentance for the remission of sinnes: Marc. 1. 4. & he required confession of sinnes, & repentance of them that he baptized, Mat. 3. 6-11 compared with Luk 7. 29. 30. otherwise he would not baptise them: & therfor Chr doctryne is the same with Iohns, Mar. 1. 15. both therby signified vnto their hearers, that whosoever would be baptized & enter into the Kingdome of God, must repent & beleve the gospel. For being not regenerate (though they were Iewes, & begotten of Faithful parents) yet they could not enter into the Kingdome of God, Ioh. 3. 3. 5. & heer it would bee considered vnto whome Christ & Iohn Baptist preached: did he not preach vnto the Iewes the Lords owne holy people: & yet he said repent & beleve: & required of them amendement of life: Now if they had been truly regenerate in their com[m]union as is pleaded, Iohn needed not thus have preached, nor Christ have required such conditions of them, but onely they might in few words have said: come you Faithful & beleiving Iewes, you & all your infants be baptized at once: For baptisme is for circumcision: but Iohn saith, think not to say you have Abraham to your Father: & Christ saith, you are of your Father the Devil: & Iohn saith the Lord wil purge his floore: wherby it is evident that the Iewes were not

Faithful in their communion: & that they perceaved plainly that seing repentance & Faith were required by Iohn & Christ particularly, which must bee declared by confession, therefore it was in vayne for them to offer their infants whom they knew Iohn & Christ would not baptise, but excluded from baptisme by their doctryne.

Againe, wheras you say ther is no mention made that Christs Disciples were baptized, & yet it were boldnes to affirme they were not baptized: & so al Christs & Iohns actions are not written but only the summe: & therfor though it be not mentioned that infants were baptized, yet in the summe it may be collected they were: I answeare, for the Disciples of Christ it is plaine they were baptized, Ioh. 4. 1. & Ioh. 1. 35. 40. & for the summing & particularizing of al Iohn Baptists or Christs actions, I say it was not needfull to set downe the particulars but the kinds: & if ther had been any commaundement or example of baptizing any one infant, it had been sufficient, though it had not been mentioned how many particular infants: but as it fel out in circumcision that one particular precept was sufficient, though it were not written how many thowsand were circumcised, so likewise of baptisme.

Finally, for that you say of the Evnuch, though I intend it not as you answeare it, me thinks that some mention should bee made of Philip to the Evnuch or of the Evnuch to Philip, his infants or children being at home far of concerning infants: or at least of some other that had infants, or did baptise persons that had infants, & that after this manner: What have you any infants? let them bee brought to baptisme aswel as your selvs: For they have title to it through your Faith, or thus, I have infants I pray you let them be baptized aswel as my self: or thus, do you repent & you shalbe baptized & your infants: but the deep silence of infants baptisme, yea the exclusive condition of beleaving & repenting necessary to the Kingdom of God, yea & the confession of sinnes & confession of Faith performed by persons baptized, yea & Christs commaundement of making Disciples before baptisme, all these & many mo are strong pro[o]fes vnanswerable against baptisme of infants.

Mr, Rich. Clifton.

The next reason is this.

2, Bicause Christ commaunded to make Disciples by teaching them & then to baptise them, Matth. 28. 19. Iohn. 4. 1. But infants can not by Doctryne become Christs Disciples. And so can not by the rule of Christ bee baptized.

Answer.

1. The Apostles were indeed commaunded to make Disciples, & to cal vnto the Faith & fellowship of the Gospel, not onely the Iewes, but the Gentils through out the world, Mat. 28, 19. & gave them power to preach the Gospel, which before had been preached to Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. & to baptise al that did receive it: & thus we graunt that faith must go before baptisme, in al such as are to be made Disciples, & brought into the covenant of God: So went Faith before circumcision, Abraham first beleved, & after was circumcised, & likewise must al they which with Abrahā enter into Gods covenant, first beleve & then be baptized as the Evnuch, Aēt. 8. 37. Lydia. Aēt. 16. 13. & the Keper of the prison, Aēt. 16. 33. But when such have received the Faith, then are their infants & howshold capable also of baptisme as Abrahams Family was of circumcision, he beleving the promises, Gen. 17. & therfor it is written, that when God opened the hart of Lydia, that she did atend to the VVord that Paul preached, & beleved, not only she her selfe, but al her howshold were baptized, & yet is ther no mention of the Faith of any of them, save of Lydias onely: & so the Kep beleving al his received baptisme, & this is proportionable to the example of Abraham, whose Faith we find sufficient to interest al his seed in the covenant, & make them capable of the seale.

2. Secondly, Christ taketh the same course (in giving out this commission to his Disciples, Mat. 28. 19.) in bringing the Gentils into Gods covenant, that the L. tooke with Abraham, for making his covenant with him, that he should be the Father of many nations, &c. He did not first commaund him to be circumcised, but preached to him the gospel or covenant. Gen. 17. 1-8.

& he beleeving was circumcised & his howshold: So here is a commaundement, first, for the publishing of the Gospel to them that were not in Christ, & then for baptising such as beleevd with their Familyes, for that is included in this Commaundement, els had not the Apostle baptized the Familyes of Lydia, & of the Kep. as before hath been noted.

3. Thirdly, if children shalbe excluded from baptisme bicause they cannot be made Disciples by teaching, & so beleve, then by as good reason may they be excluded from salvation, for he that saith, he that beleeveth & is baptized, shalbe saved, saith also, he that beleeveth not shalbe damned, Mar. 16. 16. if therfor want of faith be sufficient to exclude infants from baptisme: then likewise the want of Fayth is sufficient to exclude them from Salvation, for if the former be held to be the meaning of Christ, then must the latter also bee graunted, a thought whereof is to bee abhord.

Lastly, general rules must bee taken with their sence & meaning. It is a generall rule given by the Apostle: 2. Thess. 3. 19. That if any would not worke hee should not eate: yet if any should gather from hence, that the impotent & infants should not eate, bicause they doe not worke, this were to offer violence, & to wrest the Apostles doctryne: So Christ giving a general rule for the making of Disciples, & baptising them, now to deprive the infants of beleeving parents of baptisme, bicause they cannot receive instruction, which is intended onely of them that bee capable thereof & vnconverted, is to diminishe the commaundement of Christ, even like as hee that should say, infants cannot beleve, & therfor cannot be saved.

Againe, that can never be the true meaning of a Scripture whē it is expounded so as it contradicteth other Scriptures, or any sound conclusion gathered out of the Scriptures, as this exposition of the Anabaptists vpon this place of Mat. 28. 19. doth, as my former reasons for the baptising of infants, doe playnly manifest.

Iohn Smyth.

Next followeth your Answere to my second reason: which reason of myne is framed thus.

They that cannot by Teaching bee made Christs Disciples, ought [not] to be baptized.

Infants by teaching cannot be made Chr. Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. Ioh. 4. 1.

Ergo infants ought not to be baptized.

Your answer to this argument of myne consisteth in 4. particulars.

First, you say, that as Abraham first beleved, & then was circumcised, & then al his houshold receaved circumcision with him: So al the beleving gentils must first be baptized, & then through ther faith al ther howshold must bee baptized as in the example of Lydia, & the Gaylors family: of whose faith ther is no mention made, as neither of the faith of Abrahams family.

To this first particular of your answer I say, that you erre mistaking the Scriptures. For Abrahams faith did not go before his circumcision as a necessary antecedent to establish him a member of the Church of the old Testament, but as a necessary president, example, type, or paterne of justification: & circumcision in Abraham was not a seale of his justification, or of the everlasting covenant God made with him in respect of Christ, therby to establish him into Christ, (for he was in Christ & sealed in Christ many yeres before, by the seale of the Spirit:) but Abrahams justification in vncircumcision, was a type of the justification of the Gentils who are vncircumcised: & Abrahams circumcision after his justification sealed him vp to bee the Father of all the beleivers circumcised: & so circumcision had a triple vse in Abraham one generall & two speciall & particular: the two speciall are these:

First circumcision sealed vp Abrah. forme of justification to be a paterne to al the beleivers in vncircumcision: that the beleiving gentils should be al justified by actual faith, as he was.

Secondly, circumcision sealed vp Abrah. forme of justification to bee a paterne to al the beleivers in

circumcision, that the beleving Iewes should be al justified by actual faith as he was.

The general vse of Abrah. circumcision was common with him to Ismael & al the persons of his family. & al the carnal Israelites, viz: to seale him vp to the old Testament, & to the observation of the whole Law, wherby Chr. in that vele of the old Testament was preached vnto the Iewes, it being ther Schoolmr. to teach them Christ.

Now for the place. Rom. 4. 11. which I am assured you wil ground your assertiō vppon, I say, it is both falsely translated, & expounded: for (tes en te acrobustia) is vsually translated which Abrah. had when he was vncircumcized: & this I say is a false translation: For this is the true translation, viz: which (is or was or shalbe) in the vncircumcision: meaning that circumcision vppon Abrah. the Father of al the beleving Gentils was a seale of justification to al the vncircumcision that beleve: & the end of his circumcision is his Fatherhood of the Faithful: & the righteousnes of faith is not sealed vp to Abrah. particular person, but to the vncircumcised that beleve: & that which was sealed vp in special to Abrah. was his Fatherhood or presidentship of justification: So that circumcision in Abrah. was to establish him the Father of the Faithful Gentils, & his circumcision doth teach the Gentils that if they wil partake Chr. they must by their actual faith apprehend Christs righteousnes, as Abrah. their Father did, otherwise they cannot be justified, & so Pauls intent is plainly proved, namely, that al men must be justified by faith without the works of the law: & this do I confidently affirme to be the true translation & exposition, & that the common acceptation & translation of the place is the mother of this heresy of pedobaptistry.

Againe, al the persons of Abrah. Family were not circumcised, bicause of Abrah. faith, but the males, al & only the males, were circumcised bicause of the special cōmaundement of God: Gen. 17. 10. the males being assumed as types for to teach thē figuratively the male Ch. & circumcision of the hart by him. & the females were vncircumcised as they were also put out from being the matter of the burnt-offring (for the males only were



offered in burnt-offring) to signifie that those that had not the male Chr. in them were not fit eyther to be members of the church of the new Testament, or to be sacrificed vnto the L. Mal. 1. 14. but if Ch. the male were in thē whither male or female in Chr. it was nothing: they were accepted, Gal. 3. 28.

Further you say that as it was with Abrah. & his family in circumcision, so was it with Lydia & the Gaylor, & their families in baptisme: that is not so: I shew the difference in divers particular.

1. They of Abrahams Family were circumcised vppon particular precept in obedience of the Commaundement: Genes. 17. 23. You cannot prove that the infants of Lydias & the Gaylors family were baptized vpon particular precept, but only you say it, & indeavour to justifie it by the example of Abra. family: but if Abra. family be an example then you must bring a particular precept (as he had) for baptising infants.

2. They that were males only were circumcised, but you wil have both males & females baptized: this is another difference.

3. They that were circumcised of Abrah. Family, were al the males being of yeres, though they were never so lewd & wicked persons: So were not al the persons of Lydias & the Gaylors family, but only the beleeuers being of yeres according to your opinion.

4. As Faith did not intitle the female to circumcision, & as infidelity did not deprive the male of circumcision in Abrahams Family: So faith did intitle the female to baptisme in the Family of the Gaylor & Lydia: & infidelity in the male did exclude him from baptisme: you see therfor that the proportion is not alike betwixt baptisme & circumcision.

The second particular in your Answer to this Arg. is, that the same order is kept in Chr. cōmission, Mat. 28. 19. in bringing the gentils into Gods covenant, as was kept with Abrah: he & al his Family were brought in by circūcision, after the gospel preached to him. Genes. 17. 1-8. so Lydia & the Gaylor were brought into the covenant with all ther Family, & were baptized after the Gospell preached to them.

I answer, that in this particular there are differences betwixt the one act of Abrah. & the other of Lydia & the Gaylor, according to the commission of Chr. Mat. 28. 19.

First, Abrah. & al his family by the Lords commaundement, came vnder the covenant of the Old Testament actually, & the males only were circumcised: but Chr. doth not commaund all persons of a Family in the New Testament to be baptized, but only such as are made Disciples, & al them though they bee weomen, as Lydia was.

Secondly: The gospel was only preached to Abrah. owne person by the L. but in the Gaylors case Paul preached the gospel to al that were in his howse. Act. 16. 32. & so Chr. commaundeth to make them Disciples by preaching: So were not Abrah. Family, who being first circumcised afterward were taught the Law being a Schoolmr to teach Christ.

Thirdly, the gospel was not preached to Abrah. therby to prepare him to circumcision, as if therby it should follow that circumcision was a seale of the Gospel or New Testament: for it is not so as I have already manifested: but Chr. in the new Testament commaundeth the gospel to be preached to every creature, that is to every particular person, that is to be admitted into the Church by baptisme, & so Paul did to the Gaylors Family, & this is another difference.

The third particular in your answer to this argument is, if infants be excluded from baptisme for want of faith by hearing the word, then they shal also be excluded from salvation by that reason: Marc. 16. 16. I deny it vtterly: For Christ speaketh only of such as to whom the gospel may be preached, which only are men of yeeres For when he saith go preach the Gospel to every creature, he doth not bid them preach to beasts, byrds, Fishes, or infants, which have no eares to heare, but he biddeth them preach the Gospel to every creature that hath an eare to heare, that is, to al that are of a docible age & nature: & then he addeth, whosoever (of them that have eares to heare) do beleeve, & vppon their faith be baptized shalbe saved, whosoever (of mē that have eares to heare) do not beleve (though they be baptized) shalbe damned: now I pray

you Sir, how doth this sentence include infants to baptisme, or exclude them from Salvation? or how doth your consequent follow: & for infants I say that either they are al saved, though they cannot come to faith by hearing, or that they are one of the L. secrets, & so not to be searched into: & that the Scripture doth speak only to & of thē that have eares to heare, & of things visible & known, & not of things invisible & secreat: therfor this particular of your answer is vaine.

Your last particular in the answer to my arg. is, that general rules must bee taken with ther sence: as 2. Thes. 3. 10. that as infāts or impotent persons though they cānot work yet may eate, bicause that speech is not directed to infants, &c. so Mat. 28 19. though infants cannot be made Disciples, yet they may be baptized, seing that speech is not directed for infants: & such an exposition of that place must bee given as doth not contradict other Scriptures or necessary consequents from Scriptures.

Wel Sir: I answer you, that first you confesse heer that this place of Mat. 28. 19. is not vttered of Christ in respect of infants that they should be taught, & then I say he never intended that by this place you should gather that they should be baptized as you have done in your 6. arg. & heer you do evidently contradict your self as you see: & let that be remembred of you wel.

Next I say, that general rules shalbe expounded with ther sences: & as impotent persons & infants shal eate though they cannot work seing that is spoken of these that are able to work: so infants shalbe saved though they cannot be baptized, seing they cannot by teaching be made disciples: & this is not to diminish the comaundement of Christ or wrest it frō the sence: but to make the cōmaudemēt of baptising larger then the cōmaundement of teaching (as you do that wil have the infants baptized that cannot be taught) is to seperate those things that Chr. hath joyned, & to wrack the cōmaund: of Chr. out of joynt, & to break thē in peeces: & woe be to thē that so do without repētāce. Finally, I confesse that it is not the true sence of a place that contradicteth either Scripture or true consequēt: but this truth of the L. which you

blaspheme with your title of Anabaptistry, doth not contradict either Scripture or sound conclusion frō Scripture: but is agreeable to the constant & most evident practise of Ioh. Chr. & the Apo. (for you cannot produce an instāce of an infant baptised by any of them) & most agreeable to al the precepts of the Ap Chr. & Ioh. for baptising persons confessing their faith & their sinns: & you are driven to most miserable shifts, & most narrow straights for your pedobaptistry, which you see cannot stand without scraping together al the wrestings & pervertings of Scriptures which you have heaped together in your answ: your principal foundation being a sandy molehil fetcht from the old Test; even a false ground, that circumcision was a seale of the new Testament, & that the covenant made with Abrah. in respect of Chr. was made with al his carnal infants, who were al in Chr. Iesus visibly in their byrth & conception by vertue of the covenant: which I have proved to bee manifest vntruths, & so you see your building tottereth & wil never be able to endure the storme.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now followes the third reason.

3. Bicause if infants be baptized, the carnal seed is baptized, & so the seal of the covenant is administred to them, vnto whom the covenant aperteyneth not, Rom. 9. 8. which is a profanation.

Answer.

1. This reason semeth to imply, that the seed of the faithful is part carnal, & part Spiritual, (for I cannot imagine that the Author holdeth al the seed of the faithful to be carnal, & that the covenant aperteynes not vnto any of them, seing so to affirme contradicts Act. 2. 39.) & therfor bicause the Spiritual seed is not discerned vntil it manifest it selfe by outward profession, therefore may not be baptized, lest in baptising them, the seal should be set also vpon the carnal seed, vnto whom belōgs not the covenant. To affirme this first is to deny that which is due to the seed to whom the promise belongs, for the

wickeds sake, & so to injurie them. Secondly, this reason also serves as wel against the circumcision of the infants of the Israelites, seing at eight dayes of Age they could not be discerned, whether they were of the carnal or Spiritual seed, & so the seale of the covenāt not to be administred to thē, to whom the covenant did not belong. But as then the not discerning hereof, did nothing hinder circumcision to bee administred to al the infants of the Israelites, no more now can the not knowing of the Spiritual seed from the carnall, hinder baptisme.

2. Touching the seed of the faithful, thus I conceive therof that it is carnall & Spiritual in divers respects, carnal as they do naturally descend of their parents, so are they al alike in sinne, Psal. 51. 3. Spiritual, in respect of the covenant wherein they are comprehended with their parents. Gen. 17. 7. Act. 2. 39. in which regard also, al the children of the Faithful are said to be holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. & thus considered I deny the children of the faithful to be carnal seed, & do affirme that to such belongs the covenant & the seale therof. & though some of them in the sight of God be known for none of his, yet to vs it sufficeth for the administration of baptisme, that they be the seed of the faithful: & therfor as the Israelites circumcised all their children, (though some of them proved to be carnal afterward, as Ismael, Esau, &c.) so are wee to baptise al our infants, leaving secreete things to God, Deuteron. 29. 29.

3. If this be sufficient to cleere vs from profaning of the Sacrament if wee baptise them that make confession of their faith, bicause they so doe, though they bee not the children of God, as S. Magus, Act. 8, 13. then it is not simply a profaning of baptisme, to administer it to them vnto whome belongs not the covenant, but to doe it to them which plainly appeare to vs to bee without: Therefore, if no man dare take vpon him to say this or that infant is carnall & without the covenant of grace, it shalbe no profanation of the Sacramēt, if it be administred vnto such, seing we ought to hold the seed of the faithful, holy, 1. cor. 7. 14. If it be objected (as some have done to me, that al the seed of the faithful are carnal, & so to be held vntil they beleve & make confession of

their faith, I answer, first, if they take carnal, as it is opposed to the children of promise in Rom. 9. 8. I vterly deny it, for the children of the Flesh can never be the children of promise, Rom. 9. 8. 13. These two seeds are made so opposite by the Apostle, as that the one can never be the other. Secondly, if by carnal they meane nothing els, but that natural corruption wherein we are borne: That hinders infants no more from baptisme, then it doth those that can give an account of their faith, seing natural corruption remaineth stil in the purest professor, Rom. 7. 23 & if it be replied, that their natural corruption is not imputed to them that beleeve, no more (say I) is it to infants, els Christ dyed not for them, neither could they be saved, dying whilst they be yong.

Lastly, if Abrah. knowing that God would establish his covenant to Isaac Genes. 17, 19. yet circumcised Ismael, vs. 24. & Isaac knowing that God had chosen his yonger sonne, Gen. 25. 23. with 27. 33. yet circūcised Esau aswel as Iacob, & in so doing neither of them profaned the Sacrament: much lesse is baptisme profaned, when it is administred to the seed of the faithful to whom belongeth the promise, Act. 2. 39. And thus having shewed the weaknes of these 3. reasons against the baptising of infants, let vs come to the second position, which is this.

Iohn Smyth.

In the next place followeth your answer to my third Argum: which Argum: of myne may be framed into this forme.

The carnall seed is not to bee baptized: For the covenant perteyneth not to them.

Infants are the carnal seed, Rom. 9. 8.

Ergo infants are not to be baptized.

To this Argument you make Answer also in 4. particulars.

First, you expound my meaning, but I can expound myne owne words best: & therfor by the carnal seed I vnderstand al children borne by carnal generatiō whatsoever, though they afterward do beleeve: For they are carnal visibly to mee whosoever they bee that doe not shew their Fayth by their workes, that doe not the

workes of Abrah. yea though they dye in their infancy, & are saved with the Lord: For I must judg according to that which I see, & which is manifested: & I call them carnal as Paul calleth himself carnal, Rom, 7. 14. & the Corinthians carnal, 1. Cor. 3 1. 3. & as in opposition to the Spiritual seed, that one seed of Abrah. vnto whome the promise was made: Gal. 3. 16. & the Phrase is taken from Rom. 9. 8. where the children of the Iewes are called the children of the Flesh: & Gal. 4. 23. wher Ismael is said to bee borne after the Flesh, & Heb. 7. 16. the commaundement is called carnal: So children borne of their parents naturally are carnal, such were al the Iewes infants, who were after the manner of Ismael: Gal. 4. 23. Such are al our infants, for our infants are in no better estate then the infants of the Iewes: They were al borne according to the Flesh (except Isaac, who was in type borne after the Spirit) Gal. 4. 24. 25. 28. & I say that the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ did not actually sease vpon any infant of the Iewes in deed & truth: & the place Act. 2. 39. doth not prove that it did: For that place is to be vnderstood of the offer of Christ & the New Testament to al the carnal Iewes & their children, but of the real exhibiting it to al that are called only: & therefore I say that to baptise infants is to baptize the carnal seed, for al infants are carnal, being conceived & borne in sinne, being the Children of wrath, vntill the Lord work his work in them, which when he doth I know not: when I see it wrought in them by the fruites according as it is written, shew mee thy Faith by thy workes, then dare I pronounce them the Spirituall seed of Abrah, for they that are of Faith, are blessed with Faythfull Abraham: Therefore I affirme that infants are not to bee esteemed actually vnder the possession of the new Testament, which new Testament is visible in the visible ordinances therof: why then they are damned you wil say: God forbid: doe you condemne al the men that are not of your Faith: & yet they are neerer condemnation in the judgment of the Scripture to you then infants: for Chr. saith that he that beleveth not (speaking of them that heare the gospel & do not beleve) shalbe condemned, but the Scripture teacheth vs nothing concerning the final

estate of infants, except it be the salvation of them al: This is my exposition.

Now according to your exposition, I should intend that bicause it is not discerned which children are Spiritual seed which the carnal, therefor both of them must be deprived of baptisme, lest by giving baptisme (which you falsely cal a seale, & I therin speak according to your opinion) to al, it should bee profaned by the carnall seed: wel suppose that this were my meaning: what then: you except against this exposition two things: one that the Spiritual seed should be injured by denying baptisme to it for the carnal seeds sake: & I reply by giving baptisme to all indifferently, wee should injury baptisme that is to bee administred only vpon them that confesse their Faith & sinnes, & that are made Disciples by teaching: another thing you except is that this reason should avayle against circumcision seing the males of 8. dayes could not be discerned to be the Spiritual seed: & I insist that it was not then needful that they should be discerned to be the Spiritual seed for that carnal seale of the carnal covenant: it was enough for investing of them with that carnal & typical seale, that they were the carnal & typical seed, & that they were male Israelites or Proselytes: & shew me in al the old Testament, but especially in the institution of circumcision that the Lord required any thing of any person to be circumcised, but to be a male: but now in the new Testament we having the truths of those types, it is plainly taught vnto vs, first that Christ the male must bee in vs, & 2. that ther must bee circumcision of the hart, & mortification of the Flesh, & 3. wee must attayne to & learne all that the Schoolmr. of the Old Testament could teach vs: before wee can bee baptized, for Iohn & Chr. expresly require Faith & repentance in them that are to be baptized: & I do infinitely wonder at you & at my self, & at the whole Earth, that wee should not see so evident a truth all this tyme.

The second particular you bring in answer to my reason is a distinction of the respects of the seed of the Faithful: For you say as they are borne of their parents they are carnal & sinful: Psal. 51. 5. as they are vnder



the covenant they are Spiritual, Gen. 17. 7. & are called Holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. & so are not the carnal seed: & so they may be baptized aswel as the Iewes infants were circumcised though some of them prove wicked afterward, as Ismael & Esaw, &c. I answer: First, your distinction is without warrant of Scripture: & I deny that infants of the Faithful are to be considered in these two respects: & whereas you bring two places Gen. 17. 7. & 1. Cor. 7. 14. to prove the latter part of the distinction I have answered these two places already shewing your false exposition of them, & that the infants of Abraham were not in their byrth vnder the actual possession of the everlasting covenan[n]t made in respect of Chr. but only vnder the offer of it, & that the infants & al the childrē of the faithful are holy only as the wife that is an vnbeleever is holy: & so this exception of yours is frivolous.

The third particular you bring in answer to my reason, is, that it is not simply a profaning of the covenant to administer the seale of it to them to whom it belongeth not: as to Simon Magus, Act. 8. 13. but it is then profaned when it is administred to them that are wicked, &c: I answer, the Sacrament of baptisme is profaned when it is administred vpon a wrong subject whatsoever it bee: as to give the Lords Supper to an infant of two year old: So to baptise an infant is a profanation: For as profession & confession of Fayth shall intitle any man to all the ordinances of the Chur. & first to baptisme: So absence of confession of Faith shall debarre every one from all the ordinances of the Church in communion: & although I will not say that Children are damned, yet I dare say that they are borne & dead in trespasses & sinnes, & that they doe not nor cannot shew any sparke of grace to mee, & therfor although I dare not say this or that infant is not vnder the election of God, yet I dare say that never an infant in the Earth is actually seased of the New Testament which is onely atteyned by confession of sinne & Faith: For so saith Christ: the tyme is fulfilled, the Kingdome of God is at hand: repent & beleve the gospel: Marc. 1. 15. & except a man bee borne againe hee cannot see the Kingdome of God.

Iohn, 3. 3. & Christ dwelleth in our harts by Fayth, Eph. 3. 17. & as I cannot deny but that many infants are elected, yet I cannot say which infants shal beleeve & confesse their sinnes & Fayth, & so I know not vpon which to administer baptisme: & I must be assured that they do beleve before I can baptise them, for whatsoever is not of Faith is sinne, & to know nothing to the contrary, but that they do beleeve[,] is not sufficient warrant for baptisme: yea & I doe know certainly that seing Faith cōmeth by hearing, therfor they do not beleve to me, yea though they could heer & did beleve that is nothing to mee except they can shew mee their Faith by their confession. I say therfor that al infants are carnal to me. Rom. 9. 8. For the Apost: vs. 5. saith plainly that to be borne of Abrah. according to the Flesh is not to be borne according to promise, or to be as you say Spiritual, for your distinction before was that every infant of Abrah. & so of the faithful was borne Spiritual aswel as carnal: but heer the Apostle saith directly contrary to your assertion that they are not all Children of the promise & covenant, bicause they are the Children that lineally descend of Abrah. & you say peremptorily that al that lineally descend of Abrah. & the Faithful man are children of the promise & covenant, & so to be baptized: I desire you with al your knowledg reconcile these contradictions: & whereas you say the Children of the Flesh are so opposed, that they can never bee the Children of the promise, & that therfor the Children of the Faithful cannot bee so called carnal: I answer that al the children of the Iewes Church were borne according to the Flesh, Gal. 4. 23-25. & so were carnal, & so are the Children of the faithful: & yet as many of the Iewes were afterward regenerate, & children of the promise though al at the first children of the Flesh, so many of the infants of the Faithful may prove Children of the promise by Faith, though at the first al are the children of the Flesh that is carnal: but I confesse indeed that Esaw can never be Iacob: & one so carnal can never be Spiritual: & whereas you say, that carnal corruption doth not hinder infants from baptisme, no more then men of yeeres that make confession of their Faith, I answer yes: For men of yeeres confessing their

sinnes & their Faith, declare the mortification of sinne & regeneration by the Spirit, infants being borne in sinne, cannot nor doe not declare their regeneration at al to vs: & so with them wee have nothing to doe: & whereas you say natural corruption is not imputed to infants no more then to men beleeving, let it bee so, & yet you cannot defend that without the opinion of vniversal redemption, & then I say, that if the infants of the Faithful being delivered from their natural corruption may therefore bee baptized, then al infants shal be baptized who are partakers of the same benefit, evē the infants of Turkes: if you say no: Seing the infants of the Faithful are only redeemed & vnder the covenant, then you condemne al the infants that dye who are not borne of Faithful parents: & yet you cannot prove that the infants of the Faithfull are vnder the actual possession of the covenant, which is only by Faith, & so the scruple stil remaineth vnlosed.

The fourth particular you bring in answer to my reason, is, that Abrah. circumcised Ismael, & Isaac circumcised Esaw, & yet they knew that the Lord would establish his covenant with neither of them: much more may infants bee baptized to whom the covenant belongeth, Act. 2, 39. I answer: that the external seale of that external covenant was particularly enjoyned by God to every male, & the knowledg of the reprobation of Esaw & Ismael did not hinder that carnal seale: nor disanul the precedent expresse commaundement of circumcising every male of 8, dayes old: but now seing wee have no expresse commaundement for baptising infants, but an expresse commaundement & many examples to the contrary, that only persons made Disciples by teaching, confessing their Faith & their sinnes, are to be baptized: & considering that infants borne of Faithful parents are the children of the Flesh, Rom. 9. 7. Gal. 4. 23. & are not actually vnder the possession of the everlasting New Testament, therefore baptisme which you call the seale, can not bee administred vpon them, & the place Act. 2. 39. hath off tymes receeved Answer.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

The Second Position.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

Answer.

As the former position denied the baptising of infants, so doth this annihilate that baptisme which wee have received in the Apostate Church, & establisheth re-baptisation. & this also I wil shew to be an error by proving the contrary, & then answer the reasons herevnto annexed.

That the baptisme administred in the Apostate Churches of Antichrist, is baptisme not to be reiterated, thus I prove it.

If the Apostacy of Israel did not so pollute circumcision that it ceased to bee the seale of Gods covenant to so many of them as repented: no more doth the Apostacy of our fore-Elders, so pollute baptisme that it ceaseth to be a Sacrament to so many of them as repented.

But the first is true, 2. Chron. 30. 11. 18. 21. els could not so many of Israel as came to Ierushalem have eaten the Passeover, seing no vncircumcised might eate therof.

Ergo, the second.

If it be objected that the Apostacy is not alike, then let it be shewed, that the Apostacy vnder Antichrist did make a nullity of baptisme, & not the Apostacy of Israell of circumcision: For Israell played the harlot soo deepely, that the Lord denyed her to bee his wife, or him selfe to bee her Husband: Hos. 2. 2.

Iohn Smyth.

And thus having shewed the vanity of your answeres to my reasons against pedobaptistry, let vs come to your answer made to my second position: which is this.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

The first thing that in your Answer you intend to prove, is, that the baptisme administred in the Apostate Churches of Antichrist is not to be reiterated.

And for this purpose you produce 6. Arguments.

Your first Argument is framed thus.

If the Apostacy of Israel did not so pollute circumcision that it ceased to be the seale of Gods covenant to so many of them as repented: no more doth the Apostacy of our forefathers so pollute baptisme that it ceaseth to be a Sacrament to so many of them as repented.

But the first is true, 2. Chron. 30. 11. 18. 21. Ergo the second.

I Answer that the Apostacy of Antichrist is deeper then the Apostacy of Israell, for first Antichristians are not called Israelites, but Babyioniās, Egyptians, Sodomites Gentils in the Revelation, wherby the holy Spirit of wisdom giveth vs to conceive that he doth account the Apostacy of Antichrist equal to Paganisme it self: yea to the very worst kind of Paganisme.

Secondly, I declare plainly the differences betwixt the Apostacy of Antichrist & Israel, in this, that Israels Apostacy did not destroy the true constitution of the chur: But Antichrists Apostacy did rase the true Apostolique constitution: For the true constitution of the Church of the old Testament was of carnal Israelites or Proselites circumcised: Gen. 17. 10–14. Exod. 12. 48. 49. & so long as they retayned circumcision in the Land of Canaan, they retayned a true constitution, though their Apostacy was never so great in the worship, ministry, & Government, as is to be seen Hos. 4. 6. 8. 12. therfor Abijah doth not chardg the Israelites with a false constitution, but declareth vnto them their false Government, 2. Chron. 13. vs. 8. Their false ministry vs. 9. Their false worship, vs. 8. & declareth the true government, ministry, & worship of Iudah. But it is manifest that Antichrist hath not only set vp a false Government of Prelacy, a false ministry of Priesthood, & a false worship of reading, but also hath set vp a false constitution of the Church: For whereas the true Apostolique constitution was of baptized Disciples that confessed their Faith & their sinns[,] he hath foysted in a false matter of the Church, viz: infants: & persons vnbaptized: & so a false forme: for infants are no more capable of baptisme then is a foole or mad man or Pagan: neither can they expresse

any more repentance or Faith then such persons doe: & seing the true forme of the Church is a covenant betwixt God & the Faithful made in baptisme in which Christ is visibly put on: & that infants cannot receave the covenant which is only done by actual visible Faith, nor cannot seale back vnto the Lord that hee is true, Ioh. 3. 33. as God sealeth vnto them his truth by his Spirit, Eph. 1. 13. For the covenant is this, I wilbe their God: 2. Cor. 6. 16. & they shalbe al taught of God, Ioh. 6. 45. & shal al know God from the least vnto the greatest: Heb. 8. 11. & the covenant is this: I wilbe their Father, 2. Cor. 6: 18. & wee shalbe his sonnes calling him Father by the Spirit, wherby we are sealed, Gal. 4. 6. Hence it followeth that the Church of Antichrist being constituted of a false matter, viz: infants vncapable of baptisme, & of a false forme, viz: infants vnable to enter into the New Testament by sealing back the covenant vnto the Lord, & consenting vnto the contract, therefore they can have no title to Christ or any of his ordinances, but are as pagans or Gentils in the Lords account. Circumcision therfor in the Israelites Apostacy was true circumcision, because it was performed vppon carnal Israelites or Proselytes the eig[h]th day: but baptisme in Popery is false baptisme, & so in the Lords account no better then Pagan washing, being administred vppon infants a subject that God never appointed to baptisme: a subject that is as vncapable of baptisme as an infidel, a mad man, a naturall foole, or any other subject that cannot confesse their Faith or sinnes, or be made Disciples by instruction.

Thirdly I declare that Israel was the true Church of God, or a member or part of the true Church of God though infinitely corrupt aswel as Iudah in the dayes of her Apostacy, see Ezechiel 8. toto. & Ezech. 16. toto: & Ezech. 20. 28-31. & therfor if Iudah retayned true circumcision in her Apostacy when the L. calleth her a harlot Ezech. 16. 35. & the Apostacy of Iudah is worse in the L. account then that of Israel Ezech. 16. 47-53. Surely the circumcision of Israel was also true, & Israel a true part of the Church aswel as Iudah: & for the bil of divorce which some plead was given to Israel by Hosea: Hos. 2. 2. I say that was after the passeover

of Hezechiah which was in the first yeer of his raigne, 2. Chron. 29. 3. 17. & 30. 2. & the bil of divorce was given the sixth yeer of his raigne, 2. King. 17. 23. compared with 2. King. 18. 10. yet neverthesse Hosea calleth Israel the Lords people after he had prophesied of the bil of divorce to be given, Hos. 4. 6. 8. 12. & when the bil of divorce was given, divers of Israel I doubt not, kept themselves pure from Samaritanisme, & retained circumcision, & came vp yeerly to Ierusalem even til the dayes of Iosiah, 2. Chron. 35. 18. compared with 2. Chron. 34. 6. 7. 3-33. So that hereby it is most manifest that no manner of sinne made the Church of the old Testament a false Church, so long as they retayned circumcision in the Land of Canaan, yea if they retayned circumcision though in Babylō, wherevppō I am perswaded that if the Papacy, or England, or the Greek Churches did only baptise men confessing their Faith & their sinnes into Chr, the Sonne of God, or into the Trinity, though they retayned their false ministry, worship & Government, & other ther abominations yet the baptisme was true & not to be repeated: as their circumcision was good notwithstanding al their abominations & horrible Idolatryes, & fearful Apostacy in Israel.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Babylon in Chaldea (which was a type of Spiritual Babylon, Apoc. 18. 2.) though they did abuse & profan the vessels of the L. Dan. 5. 3. yet did not that make a nullity of them that they ceased any more to be the vessels of the house of the Lor. but were brought vp with them of the captivity that came vp from Babel to Ierusalem Ezra. 1. 11. Even so although Spiritual Babylon have profaned the Holy things of God, as baptisme & the rest, yet remaine they stil Gods ordinances to al them that come out of her, Apoc. 18. 4. & returne to the celestial Ierusalem. & as these vessels of the howse of the L. need not to be new cast, bicause of Babels polluting them: no more is baptisme to be reiterated to the people of God, bicause it passed thorow the polluted hands of the Papists.

If it bee objected, that they that administred baptisme in Babylon, were Idolaters, & had no calling therto.

I answere: That they which circumcised in the Apostacy of Israel were Idolaters, & so standing in that estate could not be fit Ministers of Gods holy ordinances. & that the wanting of a lawful calling to administer the Sacrament makes not a nullity therof, the circumcising of Moses Sonne by his mother Zippora, Exod. 4. 25. doth plainly teach. For as the Lord makes effectual his word to his people, though comming vnto them, by the hands of a false ministry, so doth he baptisme to al that bee his, though administred by them that have not a Lawful calling thervnto. The sin of the minister makes not a nullity either of the word or Sacraments, els should the efficacy of the word & Sacraments, depend vpon him that administreth thē, which is not so, for both have their effect from the Lord.

If againe it be objected, that baptisme was not administred in the Apostate Chur. of Antichrist to a fit subject. I answer that the children in the Apostacy were as fit subjects to receave baptisme, as the infants of Israell in the dayes of Ieroboam & Ahab, were to receave circumcision: Seing the covenant of Abraham (after the comming of Christ) belonged as properly to the Gentils, Gal. 3. 14. as before it did to the Israelites.

Iohn Smyth.

Your second argument followeth which is this in effect.

As the Babilonians abuse of the vessels of the L. howse did not make a nullity of them, but they were vsed after the captivity, Ezra. 1. 11. so the Antichristian abuse of baptisme cannot disanul it, but it may bee retayned when men come to the Fayth: & it needeth not to be reiterated, no more then the vessels of the howse of the Lord be new cast.

I answer many things: First, this arg. is an excellent arg. for the retayning of idoll Temples, the worship, government, ministry of the ecclesiastical assemblies of England: if it be said they were never apointed by God,



so say I, that baptisme of theirs was never apointed by God: but is the devise of Antichrist.

Secondly, I answer, that the vessels of the Lords howse were his owne ordināces, & therfor need not to be new cast: but the baptisme of Antichr. is not the L. owne ordinance: who never ordeyned it: for you must distinguish them thus: The vessels of the L. howse were substances framed by art into particular shapes at the L. apointment but the baptisme of the L. is a compound or concrete ordinance or action limited in certaine essential particulars: not being a substance but an accident in definition: now if Antich. had retained the essential parts of baptisme, I confesse it needed not to be repeated, no more then the vessels of the L. house need to be new cast after the abuse of the Babilonians: but seing baptisme in popery & Antichristianisme, is not the L. ordinance in the definition of it, but Antich. invention: Therefor though the vessels of the L. howse may be retayned, yet baptisme may not: That baptisme is Antichr. invention in the definition of it, I manifest thus: The matter of baptisme, & the forme of baptisme is invented by Antich. go: it is an invention of antichrist in the definition: The matter of antichristian baptisme is a carnal infant: The forme is, washing one into the covenant that cannot consent to the covenant: or baptising without a contract & sealing the covenāts on both parts for the L. doth not seale to the infant, and the infant cannot seale to the Lord: As I have manifested already in the answer to the former argum. of yours: Therefore the baptisme of antichr. is in the definition of it the meer devise of antichr. For the Scripture describeth true baptisme which is the Lords owne ordinance thus: The matter must bee one that confesseth his Fayth & his sinnes, one that is regenerate & borne againe: The forme must bee a voluntary delivering vp of the party baptized into the Name of the Father, Sonne, & Holy Spirit, by washing with water, Mat. 28. 19. Mat. 3. 6. Iohn. 4. 1. Act. 2. 41. & 8. 36. 37. compared with Roman. 6. 17. & Mat. 28. 20. & 18. 20. & Gal. 3. 27. & Roman. 6. 2-6. VVherein ther must be a mutual consent of both persons contracting together: & that this is so, the forme of baptisme retayned

in popery yet, teacheth plainly: wher they say. Credis? Credo: Abrenuntias? abrenuntio: which other persons speak for the infant that cannot speak, therby declaring that ther must needs bee a mutual contract of both the parties contracting: This ordinance of the L. therfor is abolished both in the matter & forme, & an other straunge invention of man is in the rome therof substituted, which is not the L. & therfor a nullity, & as if the Babylonians should have framed a Temple altar, arck, or candlestick, after their devise, & given them to the people of the Iewes, they could not have retayned them & vsed them to VVorship God withall: So cannot true Christians retayne Antichristian baptisme which is devised in the definition of it.

Thirdly, I answer, that if the Antichristians had baptized persons confessing their sinnes & their Faith into the name of the Sonne of God, & the Trinity, it had then been true baptisme though in the hands of the Antichristians, as the vessels of the L. howse, in the hands of the Caldees, & therfor needed no repetition, as these vessels needed no new casting: Therfor we keep the Scriptures still though they abuse them, & the Church, ministry, worship, & government taught in the Scriptures though they have poluted thē: but their devised word, that is their Apocrypha writings & false doctrine, & their devised church consisting of carnal infants & persons vnbaptized, & their devised worship of the masse, & their devised ministry of the sacrificing Priesthood, & their devised government of the Prelacy we abhorre, & vtterly reject, as the very devised Idols of antic. & we wil no more retaine thē thē the Shrines of Diana, then the Iews would the wedg of Achā: so say we of his baptisme.

And heer you answer two objections.

First, that though the Antichristians that administer baptisme bee Idolaters, yet it may bee true baptisme aswel as circumcision true by the Israelites that were Idolaters: & that the efficacy of the word & Sacraments dependeth not vpon the worth of the minister: as circumcision by Zipporah declareth, Exod. 4. 25. I answer: First, what say you to Ciprian the auncient Father, & all the counsel of lea[r]ned Bbs. who concluded that

the baptisme of Heretiques was a nullity & decreed rebaptising.

Secondly I say that the Israelites circumcision was in a true church & antich. baptisme is in a false Church: & that is a dissimilitude.

Thirdly, I know nothing to the contrary, but Zipporah might circumcise her Sonne, her husband commaunding her (for where is it said in al the Old Testament that a woman shal not circumcise) for Moses indeed did circumcise though Zipporah was the hand of Moses in the action, as it is the Kings action, if the L. Chauncellor or the judg of an assise do it. Fourthly I yeeld that the Minister shal not prejudice baptisme: if the baptisme bee the Lords owne ordinance, that is, if a person bee invested with baptisme true in the definition: & yet you know that the baptisme of weomen is strongly questioned, & I beleeve it would trouble you to satisfie a doubt made of a midwifes baptisme in England, that it ought not to bee repeated, or of a Child baptising others as Athanasius did in sport, (which Alexander Bb. of Alexandria with his Clerkes did approve) whither it ought to bee repeated yea or nay: but I leave this point as being but off small importance.

The second objection you answer is, that although baptisme be administred in a false Church of Antichrist vppon an vnfit subject, yet it shal not be repeated, no more then circumcision in the dayes of Ieroboam & Ahab, it being administred vppon an vnfit subject: I say, as I have said divers tymes, that the Israelites infants in their defection were the subject that God commaunded to be circumcised, viz: the seed of Abrah. males of 8. dayes age: So are not the infants in Antichristianisme, both for that they are 1. infants, 2. members of a false Church, 3. The seed of vnbelevers which by your owne confession have no title to baptisme: & whereas you say that the covenant of Abrah. in respect of Chr. did as truly belong to the Gentils after the comming of Chr. as it did to the Israelites though both in defection: I deny it: For the carnal covenant belonged to the Israelites the carnal seed of Abrah. even in their parents Apostacy, & the Spiritual covenant made with Abrah. in respect of

Chr. did never aperteyne to the 1. Apostate parents,  
 2. much lesse to the infants of them in their Apostacy,  
 3. no nor to the infants of the faithful as I have already  
 proved, & Gal. 3. 14. is not to be vnderstood of the blessing  
 of Abrah. to come vpon any of the Gentils in their  
 Apostacy, but only being in Christ, as the words are, also  
 vs. 7. & 9. but the externall Covenant was made with  
 Abraham & the carnall Israelites onely vppon the con-  
 dition of circumcision carnally vppon the males of eig[h]t  
 dayes old, Gen. 17. 10.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

If the word of God passing through the false ministry  
 of Antichrist, was of force to convert Gods elect in Babylon,  
 thē is baptisme passing likewise thorow their false  
 ministry of force to seale vp Gods covenant vnto them,  
 & so consequently not to be reiterated.

But the first is true Apoc. 18. 4. For in Babylon were  
 Gods people converted, other ordinary Ministry was ther  
 none, but that false Ministry of the Papists: & therfor  
 it is apparent that God made thereby his word effectuell  
 to all them that beleve.

Ergo &c.

If it be objected, that if God should convert his people  
 by an Antichristian ministry, it were to give approbation  
 to a false ministry, & to teach that men might lawfully  
 vse it, which is absurd: I answer, for vs to vse a false  
 Ministry is vnlawfull, but it is no more absurd or yet  
 any approbation of a false ministry, for God to worke  
 therby the good of his owne people, then it was his  
 approving of the evill service of Iosephs brethren selling  
 him into Egypt, bicause he vsed their Ministry, for the  
 saving of Iacob & his household, for God can worke good  
 by an evill instrument.

If it bee still vrged, that the Antichristian Ministers  
 had no calling to baptise, I say no more had the Iewes  
 to put Christ to death, yet was his suffering avayleable  
 to save all that beleve: & so is the Sacrament to al Gods  
 people avayleable to seale vp salvation vnto them.

John Smyth.

Your third Argument followeth which is this in effect.

The word in the false Ministry of Antichrist is avayleable to convert: Ergo: The baptisme is also avayleable to seale vp the covenant to the converted, & so need not be repeated.

I answer: First the word converteth none visibly to me particularly known: So cā baptisme seale vp none visibly to me: what they do both in secreat the L. knoweth & what the word doth generally I know by that place Rev. 18. 4. Also what the baptisme doth specially I know, for God saith plainly whosoever receaveth the mark of the beast in his forehead shal perish, Rev. 14. 9-11. this mark is vndoubtedly baptisme wherby they are initiated into Antichrist, & receive his mark, as Christs Servants in baptisme receive his seale vpon them: (remember I cal baptisme a seale in the concrete, or according to your opinion. For otherwise I deny it to be a seale) so that Antichristian Baptisme is rather a seale of perdition to the Antichristians, then of the covenant of Salvation by Christ: & therfor it is to be renounced.

Secondly, Antichrists baptisme false (as I have said) in the difinitiō is none of Gods ordinance no not in the hands of the most faithful minister of the world: but Gods word is the Lords ordinance, though in the mouth of the most vile Iudas or Antichristian in the world, yea though it be in the mixture of a 1000. heresies: So that in this respect also it followeth not that though Gods word may convert in popery, therfor Antichrists baptisme may seale: but stil you build vpon a false fondacion as you see, assuming that which is the question, viz: That baptisme in popery is the Lords.

Thirdly, I answer againe, that if Antichrist had retheyned the L. true baptisme, as I have described true I say in the difinition, viz: That he had baptized persons confessing their sinnes & faith into the Trinity, or into Iesus Christ, it should not have been repeated: but seing he intendeth in baptisme, to set an indelible character vpon them which is the mark of the beast, to conferre

grace ex opere operato to the infants which he washeth, another promising & answering for them Credo & Abrenuntio which the party baptized should himself performe, hence I conclude that he hath set vp his owne idol of abomination, & cast the L. holy ordinance away, having essentially destroyed the primitive Apostolique baptisme: [er]go his baptisme is a nullity or rather a seale of perdition to them that retaine it.

The amplification which you bring to this Argument I omit as a thing not denied, but yeilded vnto that God can work by a false Ministry, evil instruments, & bad meanes, but hence it wil not follow that we may retaine the mark of the beast, no more then we may retaine the ministry of Antichrist, the Church of Antichrist, the Government of Antichrist.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Those Holy things which God by his mercifull providence hath preserved for his people through the hands of profane persons, are not to be rejected for the Authors sake, Ezra. 1. 11.

But the Scriptures & baptisme hath God preserved in the popish assemblies for the benefit of his people.

Therfor not to be rejected for the Authors sake.

If it be objected against the minor, it is not true baptisme but false, that is administred in the assemblies of Antichr. I answer, though it may be said to be false, in regard of some humane devises vsed in the administration thereof: yet is it true baptisme in respect of the matter, forme, & Author therof, which causeth it to have a true being.

Iohn Smyth.

Your fourth Argument followeth, which is this.

These Holy things which God by his mercifull providence hath preserved for his people, though the hands of profane persons, are not to be rejected for the Authors sake, Ezra. 1. 11.

But the Scriptures & baptisme hath God preserved in the popish assemblies for the benefit of his people.

Therfor not to be rejected for the Authors sake.

The minor you prove thus, saying the baptisme though false in respect of humane devises vsed in the ministration therof, yet is true in respect of the matter, forme & Author therof: & in your answer to my second Arg. you say: the author of baptisme in the Kingdom of Antichr. is Chr. the matter water: the forme washing with water into the Trinity.

I answer directely, that if it could bee proved that baptisme in the Kingdome of Antichrist is appointed by Christ, & that water is the true matter of baptisme, & the true forme is washing into the Trinity, I would yeeld vnto you: but this you have not proved, & I have already proved the contrary: but yet to deale somthing more fully in this point which is the mayne pillar & cheef corner Stone of the fondacion, I say: 1. VVater is not the matter of baptisme, but onely the instrument of baptisme: For as fire is the instrument of burning, so is VVater of washing: the matter of burning is the fewel that is burnt, So the matter of washing is the party washed: For as wee say *accidentis esse est inesse*: & the subject is al the matter of an accident: & as the matter of the Church are the Disciples or Sayntes: The matter of the Ministry are the Prophets, so the matter of baptisme is the persons, vppon whome baptisme is conferred, & on whome it is. It is false therfor which you affirme that water is the matter of baptisme. 2. I say that washing into the Name of the Father, Sonne & Holy Ghost, is not the forme of Baptisme: For to wash a Turk, Iew, Foole, mad Man, or infant into the Trinity is not true baptisme: but it were so, if simply to baptize into the Trinity were the forme of baptisme: Therefore to baptise the true matter into the true Fayth, or into Christ, or the New Testament, or the Trinity, or into the true body, is the true forme of baptisme: So that the true matter of baptisme is a new creature: one regenerate: a confessor. As the true matter of circumcision was a male of eig[h]t dayes old eyther lineally descending of Abraham, or a Proselite: So the true matter of baptisme is a person that is of the Fayth of Abraham, one that hath the male Christ formed in him: The true forme of baptisme cōsisteth in three things, (1.) washing with

water, (2.) a new Creature, (3.) into the Name of Chr. or into the Trinity, for I think wee are not tyed to forme of words. & so if antichr. hath washed any, I say, I will never consent that they shalbe rebaptized, but hold that Anabaptistery true heresy.

But if an infant that is not the matter of baptisme, or a wicked man, mad man, foole, Turk, or Iew, or any Pagan bee washed with water into the Trinity, I say ther is neyther true matter nor forme of baptisme, & Christ is not the author thereof: & therfor the baptisme of antichrist is not Christs, but his owne, & so all infants baptized by antichrist are eyther vnbaptized or have the marke of the beast, & so are to renounce it, & to receave Christs marke of baptisme, or els woe bee to them: & when they shall manifest a new creature, & Christ the male is formed in them, & they confesse with their mouth & then be baptized into the Trinity, this is not anabaptistery, but the true primitive Apostolique Baptisme, & so Christ, Iohn, Christs Apostles were anabaptists with you Sir: For they baptized men that had been washed before a thousand tymes with the Iewes baptisemes, Heb. 9. 10. which baptisemes were also into the Messias (no doubt) in those that saw the end off those Figures: But if it bee blasphemy to say that Christ, Iohn, & the Apostles were Anabaptists, though they were oftymes some of them baptized into the Messiah in Type, bicause they were onely once baptized truly & indeed: So shal it bee blasphemy in all them that call the true Christians anabaptists, that baptize new Creatures once onely into Christ, though baptized before by antichrist in their infancy when they knew not the right hand from the left, or what a new creature, or the New Testament, or Christ, or Baptisme, or any thing els was: hence therefore I conclude vndenyably that seing Popish baptisme hath a false matter, & a false forme, therefore it is antichrists Idoll asmuch as a false Ministry, & a false Church is: & so the Lord is not the author of it: & therevppon though the Scriptures & Gods word bee retayned by Gods providence & in the word all the Holy things of God, through Popery: yet in the Popish Churches ther is no true Church, Ministry, VVorship, or Government, nor true



Baptisme, but all false and Antichristian: and so to bee rejected, and the truth to bee assumed out of the Scriptures: and so this argument off yours is answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

If antichrist be not the author of baptisme, but of some humane devises annexed, vnto in the administration thereof: then are wee not to plucke vp the wheate with the tares, Mat. 13. 29. And to cast away that which is Christs with Antichr. but to Seperate from that which is mans invention, & stil to retayne that which is of God.

But to baptise with water into the name of the Father, & of the Sonne, & of the holy Ghost, Mat. 28. 19. is from heaven, & not from Antichrist.

Ergo, we ought not to cast it away, but those traditions wherewith Antichrist hath polluted it: as for exāple, King Iosias & before him K. Ezechias, when both the Land & Temple were poluted) 2. King. 21. 7. & 23. 7. did not pul downe the Temple but appointed the Priests to cense it, who did so, & brought out al the vnclenes that they had found in the howse of God, 2. Chro. 29. 16. 17. 18. & 34. 8. For in reformation of things, difference must be put betwene those things, wherof God is the Author, & such as are devised by man: The former is to be purged from all profanation, & the things still to bee retayned, the other to bee quyte abolished. This rule in all reformation off Religion ought to bee followed.

Iohn Smyth.

The fifth Argument followeth, which is this in effect.

We must not pluck vp the wheate with the tares, Mat. 13. 29. nor cast away that which is Christs, when we cast away that which is Antichrists.

But to Baptize with VVater into the Name of the Trinity is Christs & not Antichrists.

Ergo, wee ought not to cast that away, but only the traditions of Antichrist.

So did Iosiah & Hezechiah, 2. King. 21. 7. & 23. 4. & 2. Chron. 29. 16-18. & 34. 8. not pul downe the Temple, but cense it, &c. that wherof God is the Author must

be kept, & the corruption or pollution put away: that wherof man is the Author, is quite to be abolished: This is your reason.

I answer: That as when the Babylonians had vtterly destroyed the Temple, the Iewes built it againe: So when Antichrist hath vtterly destroyed the true Temple, the true Church, then must we build it vp againe, & when Antichrist hath destroyed the true baptisme, then must we reare it vp againe: Wherfor seing as is shewed befor Antichrist hath abolished the true baptisme of Chr. in the definition or in the matter & forme therof, & hath reared a baptisme of his owne, it must therfor be abolished: & as when we do renounce the false Church or Ministry, wee do not renounce that which is true in the false Church or Ministry, but onely the falsehood so in rejecting the false baptisme of Antichr. we do not renounce that which is true in it as to wash with water into the Name of the Father, Sonne & Holy Ghost: but onely the falsehood: And yet as when wee retayne the truth in a false Church, or Ministry, wee reject the Falsehood in them both, & erect both a new true Church & Ministry: So when wee retayne the truth of a false baptisme, wee reject the Falsehood & erect a true new baptisme: & this is evident if you consider it wel.

Againe, seing in the false baptisme, church, & ministry, the corruptions are essential, & the truth only accidental: & truth & falsehood are so intermingled as we can not divide them asunder, assuming the one & leaving the other, but we must needes in renouncing the essential corruptions reserve the accidental truths & iterate or repeate the accidental truthes if we wil have the essential truth which Antichrist had abolished: Therfor necessarily we must for having true baptisme repeate washing in to the name of the Father, Sonne, & Holy Ghost, which are but accidentals (for a Turck so washed is not baptized) & once onely wash a new borne babe in Christ, into the truth which is true essentiall baptisme which Antichrist had abolished, & which wee onely restore & nothing els: & so your argument is answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

As God hath made an everlasting covenant with Abraham & his seed, Gen. 17. 7 which through the malice of Sathan & al his instruments shal never be cut of: so hath he preserved, both in the Apostacy vnder the Law & gospel, the seales thereof, for the comfort of the Faithful.

And therfor the Anabaptists in rejecting that baptisme of Christ, whereof they were pertakers in the Apostate Church: & devising a new, do bring in a new covenant & a new gospel, taking vpon them to baptize themselves without warrant from the word: For I am sure it cannot be shewed, that any did ever baptize himself without special commaundement from God, as Abrah. had for circumcision, Gen. 17. 9. or Iohn for baptisme, Marc. 1. 3. nor yet any others without ordinary or extraordinary calling. Ioh. 4. 2. Mat. 3. 6. Act. 8. 38. & 9. 18. & 10. 48.

If it be sayd the tymes bee extraordinary. I answere, the Lord hath [not] left eyther example or rule, or ground of rule, whereby wee may in extraordinary tymes have a sure warrant out of the word, to informe vs in any thing that wee ought to doe.

John Smyth.

Your 6. argument is thus much in effect.

That seing the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, is everlasting: Genes. 17. 7. & cannot by the malice of Sathan bee cut of: no more can the malice of Sathan abolish the seales of that covenant vnder the Law or gospel, viz: circumcision & baptisme.

I answer by an argument of like nature, from Mat. 16. 18. framed thus.

If the gates of Hel shal never prevaile against the Church then ther hath alwayes been a true Church, & Antichrist could never make the church false: & so you of the Separation have sinned most shamefully in calling the Church of Antichrist false: Verum primum. Ergo secundum.

If my argument be not good against you of the Separation for erecting a new Church, no more is yours good against vs for erecting new baptisme: This is to

answer as they say *regerendo*: But I answer more properly *solvendo* thus: That the covenant is said to be everlasting not in respect of the visible real existence in the world in an established Church, but in respect of the stability & firmenes of it in regard of Sathans malice which should not so abolish it, that it should never bee recovered againe: For otherwise the Church went into the wildernes. Revel. 12. 14. & al natiōs were made drunck with the cup of the fornication of the whore of Babylon, Revel. 18. 3. & ther was no true Church in the depth of Antichristianisme, & so no true baptisme, for can any thing be true in a false Church, but the Scriptures & the truthes conteyned therein? I deny therfor, that the covenant, Church or baptisme was visible alwayes: For it was invisible when the Church went into the wildernes: & therfor as you when ther was not a true Church in the world, took vpon you to set vp a true Church (as you say, but wee say a false Church) renouncing the Church of Antichr. & yet wil not bee said to bring in a new covenant & a new Gospel (for you in your false conceitednes wil reject them for heretiques, if ther bee any that dare say so of you forsooth): So the anabaptists (as you cal them) doe not set vp a new covenant & Gospel, though they set vp a new or rather the old Apostolique baptisme which Antichrist had overthrowne: & whereas you say they have no warrant to baptisme themselves, I say, asmuch as you have to set vp a true Church, yea fully asmuch: For if a true Church may bee erected which is the most noble ordinance of the New Testament, then much more baptisme: & if a true Church can not bee erected without baptisme, for baptisme is the visible forme of the Church, as Disciples are the matter: Mat. 28. 19. Iohn. 4. 1. Then seing you confesse that a true Church may bee erected, you cannot deny (though you doe deny it in opposing the truth) that baptisme may also bee recovered: & seing when all Christs visible ordinances are lost, eyther men must recover them againe, or must let them alone: if they let them alone til extraordinary men come with miracles & tongs, as the Apostles did, then men are famelists (for that is their opinion) or if they must recover them, men must beginne so to doe, & then

two men joyning together may make a Church (as you say): Why may they not baptize seing they cannot conjoyne into Christ but by baptisme, Mat. 28. 19. compared with Mat. 18. 10. Gallat. 3. 27. but it is evident that all Christs Commaundements must bee obeyed, Ergo, this commaundement of having & vsing the communion of the Church, Ministry, VVorship & Gouvernment, those Holy meanes of Salvation which the Lord of his mercy hath given vs with his covenant, & commaunded vs to vse: & therefore if all the commaundements of God must bee obeyed, then this of baptisme, & this warrant is sufficient for assuming baptisme: Now for baptising a mans self ther is as good warrant, as for a man Churching himself: For two men singly are no Church, joyntly they are a Church, & they both of them put a Church vppon themselves, so may two men put baptisme vppon themselves: For as both those persons vnchurched, yet have powre to assume the Church each of them for himself with others in communion: So each of them vnbaptized hath powre to assume baptisme for himself with others in communion: And as Abraham & Iohn Baptist, & all the Proselites after Abrahams example, Exod. 12. 48. did administer the Sacrament vppon themselves: So may any man raised vp after the Apostacy of Antichrist, in the recovering of the Church by baptisme, administer it vppon himself in communion with others: So wee see the Lords Supper is administred to a mans self in communion with others, so is Prayer, Prophecy, Praysing of God vttered for a mans self aswel as for others. And as in the Old Testament: every man that was vncleane washed himself: every Preist going to Sacrifice washed himselfe in the Laver at the dore of the Tabernacle of the congregation: which was a type of baptisme, the dore of the Church, Tit. 2. 5. Every Mr. of a Family administred the Passeover to himself & all of his Family: The Preist dayly Sacrificed for himself and others: a man cannot baptise others into the Church, himself being out of the Church: Therefore it is Lawfull for a man to baptize himself together with others in communion, & this warrant is a plerophory for the practise of that which is done by vs: Thus are your 6. weake reasons answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Thus having set downe some reasons to prove that Apostates or Antichristians converted are not to be rebaptized, let vs come to the examination of the reasons alledged to the contrary, the first wherof is this.

1. Bicause Churches are to bee constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: But in the constitution off Churches the Apostles receaved in the members by baptisme. Ergo, so must wee doe now.

Answer.

1. The estate & condition of people now is not alike to the estate of the Gentiles or Iewes in the Apostles tymes, they differ in divers respects: First, all the people then both of Iewes & Gentiles never had bene themselves, nor were ever of the posterity of those that had bene members of the Church of Christ vnder the gospel, seing then was the first planting of Evangelical Churches: but we are now the posterity of such parents as were members of the Chu. planted by the Apo. els could we not have Apostated.

Secondly, that people, which the Apo. gathered into Churches were never baptized, & baptisme comming in the steed of circumcision, & being a seale of our entring into Gods covenant, it was fit, that they which beleved & became the seed of Abrahā should so enter into the covenāt, they & their seed, as he & his seed entred, that is, as he & his were receaved in by circumcision: So they & thers should be receaved in by baptisme, Act. 2. 38. 41, & 8. 38. but we are a people that are already baptized, & the seed of thē that wer baptized, & had receaved the gospel, & (although through Antichr. deceaveablenes, both we & they were tainted with many corruptions) yet had they or might have in that Apostacy, (& so we also) so much faith, as thereby both we & they might become the people of God, Apoc. 18. 4.

And concerning the constitution of the Churches, here it is to be noted, that the constitution of Churches set downe by the Apostles was by the immediate directiō of the Holy Ghost, & so serveth for a continual rule of

establishing Churches to the end of the world, which forme or frame layed downe by them, no man hath power to alter or change, 1. Cor. 4. 14. 1. Tim. 3. 11. But the constituting of Chur. now after the defection of Antich. may more properly be called a repaying, then a constituting of Churches, which through Apostacy have bene ruined, or a gathering together of the dispersed shepe of Israell into such formes or shapes of visible Churches (the paterne whereof is shewed vnto vs in the word) for (as before hath bene noted) our state is not as theirs was that were the first constituted Churches, & so it wil not follow (as it is alledged) that the receiving in of members into our Churches necessarily must be by baptisme, as in the primitive tyme it was, except onely of such persons as have not bene baptized before.

And herein I take it, lyeth the deceyte of this arg. that it putteth no difference between the people of God comming out of Babylon, & them that came to the faith from amongst the Gentils, equalising Antichristianisme with Gentilisme, the one being an Apostate Church, the other no Church: The one partaker of the word & Sacram: (though with much coruptiō) the other partaker of neither at all, the one professing Christ & Teaching many truths of God, & so many as the elect therby might come to faith, Apoc. 18. 4. The other neither professing Christ, nor teaching any truth of God, wherby any might be converted to Christ, & become Gods people in the estate of Gentilisme.

And thus having made plaine the different estate of the first planted Churches & ours in Apostacy, I answere first: That Churches now are to be constituted (if repairing be not a fitter speach) as in the Apostles tymes, & that al such as are receaved in as members, being vnbaptized, must be receaved in by baptisme, but for such as were baptized in Apostate Churches, their repentance is sufficient without rebaptisatiō, as it was to the Apostate Israelites, who vppon their repentance & returning to Ierusalem were receaved of the Church without any new circumcision, & therefore to adde a second baptisme, with the Anabaptists, is to Apostate from Chr. & not to enter into his covenant.

And in that the Apostles receaved in members by baptisme, they could doe no otherwise, seing the whole world was vnbaptized, but if they had met with any that before had bene baptized into the name of Chr. as they that receaved the baptisme of Iohn, & as we are, I make no question, they did not, nor would not have rebaptized them, & therfor the conclusion wil not follow, that we are now to receive in by baptisme, them that are already baptized.

Iohn Smyth.

The next thing in your answer is a solution of the arguments brought by mee to prove the truth: viz.

That Antichristians converted are to bee admitted into the true Church by baptisme.

This truth of the Lords I have proved vnto you by three reasons: The first whereof may bee framed thus.

So are Churches to be restored or constituted after the defection of Antichr. as they were erected by the Apostles at the first.

But the Churches were at the first erected by baptisme in their primitive institution by Iohn, Chr. & the Apostles.

Ergo: so are they now to be restored: & therfor the members are to be receaved in by baptisme as they were then.

As in the former point for baptising of infants you were compelled to runne to the old Testament, & from thence to fetch the cheef corner stone of your building viz from circumcision: So in this second point you vtterly forsake the new Testam. of Chr. & the true constitution Apostolique of the Church of the new Testament, & set vs againe to Schoole to Moses, as if Chr. had not beē faithful enough to teach vs his new Test. but we must go learne the new Test. of the old Testament: Chr. of Moses: The Gospel of the Law.

And first I would know why we may not aswel with the Papists & Prelates goe fetch one high Preist from Moses, a sacrificing Preisthood from Moses, succession in the ministry from Moses, & a succession in the Church from Moses, as a succession in baptisme from Moses: & in effect you do fetch a succession of the Church from



Rome: For in fetching a succession of baptisme from Rome which is the forme of the Church: & in fetching a succession of the matter of the Church which is the seed of the parents baptized you of necessity make the Church of Rome a true Church: For if infants of the Church of Rome have true title to baptisme by reason of the Faith of some of their auncesters or forfathers that were Faithful, then are they the true visible matter of the Church: & if by reason of that title to baptisme, they receive true baptisme in substance as you say in the Church of Rome then they have the true visible forme of the Church, for they that have the true matter & forme of a true Church vpon them are the true Church: & so are the infants of the Church of Rome a true visible Church in the constitution & essential causes therof: & so as in the old Testament the Church came by succession of genealogie in respect wherof they made so much account of genealogies carnal, Philip. 3. 3-5. 1. Timoth. 1. 4. So in the New Testament the Church commeth by succession of carnal Genealogie through the Church of Rome to our dayes: & then as the matter of the Church, viz infants descending of baptized parents is by Genealogie, & the forme of the church viz: baptisme vpon these infants is by descent: & therfor the Church is by succession: I demaund why may not the ministry be by descent & succession aswel as the Church? & then why is not the Church of Rome or England a true Church, the ministry of the Church of Rome or England a true Ministry? & so why may not you returne back againe into England, & take vp your former ministry, & renounce your Schisme which you have made? & so I heare that some are mynded to doe: & truly for my part I hold it as lawful to retaine the Church & Ministry of England, as to retaine the baptisme: & when I shal yeeld to the truth of the baptisme of Englād I wil yeeld to the truth of the Church & ministry of England: & I wil confesse I have been a Schismaticque, & returne & acknowledg my error: but bicause I know the ministry & Church of England is false, therfor it must needes be that the baptisme which is the forme of the Church is false essentially: & therefore having Seperated justly from the

Church & Ministry of England for the falsehood of them, I must needs also Seperate from the baptisme which is false, for the Church is false bicause baptisme the forme of the Church is false: & if baptisme the forme of the Church of England be true, the Church of England is true also: You are to know therefore (& so I wish you & all the Seperation to mynd it well, & the Lord give you eyes to see, & harts to vnderstand) that all the old Testament was carnal taken from the Elementes of the VVorld, thereby to type out & to teach them heavenly things: & therefore their Church was carnal to type to vs in the New Testament a Spiritual Church: The matter of their Church was a carnall Israelite: the matter of the Church of the New Testament is a true Israelite in whom ther is no guile: The forme of their Church was carnall circumcision a carnal seale. Genes. 17. 10–14. The forme of the Church of the New Testament is the circumcision of the hart, a new Creature, the Holy Spirit of promise whereby wee are sealed, which is manifested by confession & baptisme in water: Act. 10. 47. Ephes. 1. 13. Gallat. 3. 27. & 6. 15. Iohn. 3. 5. Matth. 3. 6. Roman. 10. 9. Act. 8. 36. 37. Their carnall Church in the matter & forme came by carnall Genealogie, & so they all of them were gendred vnto bondage vnder the rudimentes off the VVorld vnder the carnal Testament or covenant: Gallat. 4. 24. 25. our Spirituall Church in the matter & forme thereof is by Spirituall Genealogie, that is the Genealogie of the Fayth of Abraham the Father of vs all vnder the Spirituall New Testament, Gallat. 3. 7. 9. 14. Roman. 4. 16. 11. Their parents in the carnall Church was carnall Abraham & carnall Hagar, & all their carnall parents who according to the Flesh with carnall seed begate carnall Ismaell the type of the carnal Israelites: our parents in our Spiritual Church is Abrah. Spiritual, (& al our Spiritual parents) who by the word of God & by faith begat Spiritual Isaac the type of the children of promise after whose manner we are, Gal. 4. 22–28. Rom. 4. 19–21. Heb. 11. 11. 12. 1. Pet. 1. 23. Their ministry was a carnal ministry by carnal genealogie of the line of Aaron Sacrificing Preists: our ministry is by Spiritual genealogie of the election of the true Church that is Spiritual.

Thus if you would compare the Type & the Truth together, you should easily discern the sandy Fondation of your false Church ruined & your false baptisme quite abandoned: who continue a Church by succession of a carnall line, & a baptisme by succession vppon the carnall Line through Popery: VWhereas the true Church is onely by the Spirituall Line of Fayth, & true baptisme by the Spirituall succession vppon that Spirituall Line of Faythfull men confessing their Fayth & their sinnes, which was typed by that carnal Line of the Old Testament: you therefore that introduce a carnal Line into the Church to bee baptized, viz: all your Children according to the Flesh & that by succession fetch baptisme vppon that carnal Line through the Church of Rome into your Church (following the president of the Old Testament in that carnal circumcision by succession of Genealogie) doe therein vnawares make Rome a true Church, your selves Schismatiques, & set vp Iudaisme in the New Testament, & so are fallen from Christ, & are become a new second jmage of the Beast never heard of before in the VWorld: For such are you of the Seperation.

This being premised as a ground which I earnestly intreat you (even in my best love vnto you) & al the Seperation, especialy the leaders of them, well to weigh & ponder, & not to be ashamed to learne of their inferiors & juniors: I come to answer the exceptions which you take at my first Argument.

The summe of your exception is this: That seing wee are the posterity of baptized persons, & the Iewes & Gentiles in the Apostles tymes were not so: Therefore wee need not assume baptisme in our entrance into the Church, which wee had in our Apostacy, but wee may enter into the Church without rebaptizing as the Apostate Israelites did without recircumcising: & so we must not in the new Test. be framed according to the paterne taught in the new Test. in entering in by baptisme, but according to the paterne of the old Testam. & the Apostate Israelites therein, &c.

I answer divers things: First, I say that the New Testament is as sufficient for the direction of al the affaires & occasions that befall in the tyme of the New Testament,

as the Old Testament was for the occurrences that befell vnder the Old Testament: Seing Christ is as Faythful as Moses: & the New Testament as perfect as the Old. Gal. 3. 15. & therefore if the Lord had intended to put a difference betwixt the Apostolique constitution of Churches, & our constituting of them in respect of the persons to be admitted into the Church, & in respect of baptising & not baptising or rebaptising of them he could & would have done it: but seing it is not done in the New Testament, but left in silence: & seing the New Testament of Chr. is perfect & sealed with his blood, you that put this difference add to the new Testament, & bring in a new Christ, a new covenant, a new Gospel, a new Church, & new baptisme: & wo be to them that ad to the word, Rev. 22. 18. & as they were accursed that added to the old Test. Deut. 4. 2. & 12. 32. So much more shal they be subject to the curse that add to the new Test. of Chr. Heb. 12. 25. in this respect ther for your answer is insufficient.

Secondly, I affirme that (as the Holy Ghost saith) the Antichristians are in condition equall to Pagans, & therefore as I have said they are not called Israelites or Samaritanes, but Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentills: but the Holy Ghost knoweth what & how to speak: And therefore as the Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentils washings were nothing, no more is the baptisme of Antichristians any thing: For the Holy Ghost foreseeing that the Antichristians would abolish the true baptisme of Christ by baptising infants, & so by admitting into the Church the carnal seed of the Flesh, would disanul that Holy ordinance of baptisme, & so abolish the true constitution of the Church, in heavenly wisdom for our instruction calleth persons Apostating from the true constitution of the Church Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentils, therby teaching vs that he esteemeth no otherwise of their Church or baptisme, then of the Synagogues of Babylon, then of the washings of Egypt, then of the worship of Sodom & the Pagans: & these comparisons will fit you well against the assemblies & Temples of Antichrist, and I know no reason that they should not fitt vs aswell against your Babylonish,

Egyptians, Sodomitish, and Paganish washings of infants which though it bee done into the name of Chr. yet is no more avayleable in the Holy Ghosts testimony then washing of Pagans, Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites Children.

Thirdly, wheras you say that repaying the Church now after the Apostacy of Antichr. is a fitter speech then constituting: herein do you both taxe your selves off the vse of that word constitution: & plainly signifie that you incline to maintain the Churches of England & Rome to be true Churches, wherin whither you doe not forsake your first faith, & turne with the dog to the vomit look you vnto it, & let al indifferent men judg: but your writings are against you sufficient witnesses in this case.

Fourthly, I say that the Iewes that were converted to the Faith & new Testament of Chr. by Chr. Iohn, & the Apostles in your account were in a far better estate thē Antichr. For they (as you say) were of the same body with the Church of the New Testament, & their circumcision was a seale of the new Testament (as you say) & they were in Chr. Iesus (as you say) & were washed I doubt not many of them into the Messias whose blood they typically saw in their manifold baptesmes & purifications with water: & al of thē had been partakers of the word & Sacraments in the Chur. of the Iewes, & why might not they by Christ, Iohn, or the Apo. be admitted into the Church without baptesme: if therfor Chr. Iohn & the Apo. would needes baptize them, & so by baptesme constitute them into the new Testament that had all these p[r]erogatives in your judgment, much more wil they have vs to constitute Antichr. converted into the true Church by baptesme: neither can you say without great indignity to the L. ordinances in the old Test. that they were inferior to the baptesme of Antichrist.

Againe you wil needes have this to be a great priviledg to the antichr. to be the carnal seed of them that hath somtyme been members of the Church of Chr. in the new Testament, & therfor you say that in ther parents or auncestors they had title to baptesme: I deny that ever the English nation or any one of our predecessors were of the Faith of Chr. shew it if you can: but we came of a

Pagan race til Rome the mother came & put vpon vs her false baptisme: & therfor although the Roma. might plead this, yet England cannot plead it: & so your dissimilitude cannot hold in that thing: & our case is simply Paganish.

Further, you say that the repentance of Apostate Churches is sufficient for their admittance into the true Church without rebaptization, as repentance was for Israel without recircumcision: I deny it, for the Churches of Antichr. are false, & the Church of the Israelites was not false: The Churches of Antichr. were false bicause they consisted of the carnal seed baptized which was not that one seed vnto which the promise was made, that is the Faithful: The Church of the Israelites was true bicause it did consist of the carnal seed carnally circumcised, which was the true constitution of the Church of the old Testament: For otherwise if Israel had been false bicause of their Apostacy & Idolatry then Iudah was as false who had in wickednes justified Samaria & Sodom, Ezech. 16. 51. but indeed they were neither of them false so long as they circumcised the males of 8. dayes old, but the Churches of Antichr. growing false by baptising the carnal seed (which was not the true seed of Abrahams faith) therefore are to bee baptized when they come to the truth, & cannot have Israels Apostacy for ther president: wherefore an Edomite or Israelite comming to bee a proselite of the Iewes Church that had omitted circumcision is a true President of the Antichristian Apostacy: For as they omitting the circumcision of the males though of the Posterity of Abraham, yet being Proselytes were entered into the Iewes Church by circumcision: So is it in the Apostacy of Antichrist, with the Proselytes of Antichristianisme: for so I take it the Proselytes were types of Antichristians, converted to the Faith, & admitted into the true Church: & the Israelites were not so.

Moreover whereas you say that if the Apostles had met with such as we are they would have reeceived vs into the Church vpon repentance without baptisme: I answer, if such an example had been left vs wee would then have rested satisfied, but seing the Apo. have left

no such example nor precept therfor you are yet in your Apostacy, & having not repented of nor forsaken your Egyptian baptisme are stil vnseperated, do stil retaine the mark of the beast, & are subject to the woe that the aungel threatneth to persons so marked.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now let vs come to the second reason which is this.

2. Bicause true baptisme is but one, but the baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme, & so not that one baptisme of Chr. but al the members of Chr. must have true Baptisme.

Answer.

2. Ther is but one Faith & one baptisme, Eph. 4. 4. & therefore is it sufficient to bee once baptized, as it was to bee once circumcised: Secondly, That the baptisme of Antichrist is not true baptisme I graunt, & doe also affirme that al members of Christ must have true baptisme, & what then must it follow that now such as are baptized must bee rebaptized, els cannot bee members of a visible Church: I deny it & doe further answere, 1. That the baptisme which wee receaved in the Apostate Church is no more Antichrists then the word that wee receaved therein: For Antichrist did never ordaine a new kynd of baptisme, but did onely pollute (with his inventions) the Holy ordinance of Chr: & therefore if this baptisme that wee have receaved be called the baptisme of Antichr. that is to affirme an vntruth, seing the institution thereof was by Iesus Chr. who commaunded his Apo. to baptize al nations with water in the name of the Father & of the Sonne, & of the Holy Ghost. & the same baptisme for substance is stil retayned in the Apostate churches & none other. Secondly, this baptisme may also in some respect bee called true baptisme, as before I have noted in my fift reason against rebaptization: For 1. it hath Chr. for the Author, 2. it hath the true matter outward signe or element which is water, 3. the true forme of administring the same, which is, baptising into the name of the Father, of the Sonne, & of the Holy Ghost, al which is practised in the Popish Church, neither is any

baptized into the name or faith of Antich. but vnto the faith & possession of Christ & therfor our baptisme is the baptisme of Chr. & to vs that repent true baptisme, & so consequently not to be reiterated.

Iohn Smyth.

In the next place you make answer to my second arg. which may be framed thus.

Al the members of Chr. must have that one true baptisme of Chr. taught in the new Testament.

The baptisme of antich. is not that one true baptisme, taught by Chr. in the new Testament.

Ergo: The members of Christ must not have the baptisme of Antichrist, but must take the true baptisme of Christ, when they come into the true Church.

The summe of your answer is: That the baptisme we receaved in the false Chur. is not Antichr. but Christs: I make answer, that seing infants are baptized which is the false matter of baptisme, & seing in them ther is not the question of a good conscience vnto God, 1. Pet. 3. 21. Nor the hart sprinckled from an evil conscience, Heb. 10. 22. which is the forme: Seing they cannot expresse credis? Credo: Abrenuntias? Abrenuncio: which is the forme of baptisme even the mutual contract betwixt God & the party baptized expressed visibly in confession: therfor the baptisme is not Chr. but Antichrists, not from heaven but of man: & al that you object in this particular is already sufficiently taken away in answer to your 4. reason: whither I translated that which is heer answered by you vpon occasion ther intertayned.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

The third reason.

Bicause as the false Church is rejected & the true erected, the false ministry forsaken, & the true received: so false worship (& by consequente baptisme) must be renounced, & the true baptisme assumed.



## Answer.

First. I graunt, that we ought to Seperate from al false or apostate Chur. Apo. 18. 4 & to adjoyne our selves to a true Chu. reformed according to the paterne of the Apostles. 2. also every false ministry is to be forsaken, Mat. 7. 15. 2. Io. 10. gal. 1. 8. & the true ministers of God to be receaved, Ier. 3. 14. 15. So did the faithful in Israel forsake the false Preists set vp by Ieroboã, & returned to the Preists of the L. to Ierusalē, 2. Chro. 30. 11. 3. it is our duty likewise to renounce al false wor. 2. Cor. 6. 14–17. Esa. 30. 22. & to worship the L, as he taught vs in his word: & thus far do I approve of this reason, but the consequence I must deny, viz: that bicause false worship is to be renounced, therfor baptisme also. For 1. we are to consider in that baptisme receaved in apostate Churches two things, first, that which is of God therin. 2. that which is of man, that which is of God, is the substance of baptisme, as before is observed, viz: the same matter & forme that the L. instituted, & likewise the same end which is the profession of the faith of Christ, & this is not false worship, & so consequently not to be renounced.

Againe, that which in the administration of baptisme is devised by man, are those vnwarrantable ceremonies of crossing, breathing, annoynting, &c. these are to bee renounced as vaine worship, Mat. 15. 4. Now the ordinances of God are to be purged from the pollutions of men, & not with their pollutions to be renounced, for if polution might warrant men to cast away with it, that which is ordeyned of God, then might not the holy vessels polluted in Babylon have bene brought againe to Ierusa: nor yet the Tēple it selfe, that was so greatly profaned in the dayes of the Idolatrous Kings have any more bene vused as a place of worsh. to the L. Secondly, I answer that we have receaved a true baptisme in the apostate Chu. as the people of God did circumcision amongst the ten trybes: & therfor we may no more renounce it, & assume a new, then they that returned to Ierus. 2, Chro. 30. 11. might renounce their circumcision, & be recircumcised.

It is objected of some, that this comparison houlds

not, for Israel was a true Chu. & therfor their circumcision was true: but Apostate Churches have nothing true, neither are the members therof capable either of the covenant or seale in that standing, & it is not true baptisme to such.

This objection in part I have answered before, & now answer further, 1. that the Israelites in their Apostacy were not a true Church, but false: seing they Seperated from Ierus. the true & only Chu. in the world, & erected a new Church & comuniō amongst thēselves, joyning together in a false wor. & vnder a false ministry, 1. King. 12. 30–33. 20. & 18. 19–21. & so became an harlot, Hos. 2. 2. Secondly in the apostate Chur. ther be some things true in the substance as the word & baptisme, though corupted in the administration therof by false ministers, & humane devises. Thirdly the members of an apostate Chu. are to be considered two wayes, 1. as they stand members of such a Chur. Secondly, as they are the seed & posterity of their forfathers which receaved the covenant for themselves & for their seed: & though in regard of the former estate, they have nether right to baptisme or the covenāt (for the holy things of God belongs not properly to false Chu. nor to the members therof considered in that estate) yet even to such members considered apart from such standing & as they are the seed of their forfathers, so are they capable of the covenant & Sacra. & the same is avayleable to them vppon their repentance: For in apostate Chur[c]hes God hath his people which are beloved for their Fathers sakes, Rom. 11. 28. & this apeareth in that he saith, come out of her my people, Apo. 18. 4. & to such it cannot be denyed, but that to them belongs the covenant, yea whyles they are in Spirituall Babylon, as it did to the Iewes that were in Babylon of Chaldea: bondage hinders not Gods grace.

But some may reply, that they whose Fathers were Idolaters & vnbelevers co[u]ld have no right to the covenant to be baptized through the Faith of their Fathers. I answer, the right that children have to Gods covenant depends not only vpon their immediate parents, but title therto descends vnto them, from their auncestors Exo. 20. if wee respect herein Gods mercy, even as mens inheritance

doe from their former Fathers: neither do the members of an Apostate Church cast of al profession of faith, for such beleve the Scriptures, & in Ch. &c. though with al they professe divers errors, & worship the true God in a false manner.

If question be made how it can be proved that the members of an Apostate Chu. had forfathers that beleved. I answeere, it cannot be denyed, seing that an Apostate Church ariseth not out of a company of infidels (for then could it not be called Apostate: seing that to apostate must be in regard of the truth) but is the ruines of a true Church, & therfor it must needs follow that their forfathers were belevers, & had receaved the covenant.

And thus have I breifly answered these two Anabaptistical positions with their reasons, as the Lor. hath inabled me for the present, wishing this labour might have bene taken in hand by such as could better performe it. & further I do intreate, that the truth (which I contend for), may not, through my weake defence, beare any reproche, but that which is felt worthy, let it returne vpon my head: & do also earnestly pray that he that hath thus written, & both he & they that so practise, may seriously consider of that which is done, & glorify God by their repentance. March. 14. 1608.

Rich. Clifton.

John Smyth.

In the next place you make answer to my last argument, which may bee framed into this forme.

As the false Church & ministry are rejected, & the contrary true Church & ministry assumed: So the false worship, & so by consequent the false baptisme must be renounced, & the true baptisme assumed.

Verum primum. Ergo secundum.

The summe of your answer is, that we must renounce indeed the false Church, ministry, & worship, & yet may retaine the baptisme receaved in the false Church, which (you say) is true in author, matter, forme, & end: Though corrupt in circumstance, as oyling, crossing,

breathing, &c. repenting of those coruptions, & not casting away the true substance with the corrupted circumstances devised by man, & annexed therto, &c.

Although al that is mentioned heer is already taken away in the former discourse yet it shal not be amisse to annexe some thing for further cleering of the point.

First, I deny the popish baptisme to be true in the 4. causes therof as you affirme: 1. The L. never instituted that infants should be baptized, 2. he never ordeyned that Pagans should be baptized, 3. he never instituted that the carnal seed of the faithfull should be baptized: Therfor seing infants that are not the seed of the faithful, but the seed of Babylonians, are baptized by Antich. the matter of baptisme is false, 1 the L. never appointed that the party should be baptized without his owne confession & consēt to the contract that the L. maketh in baptisme: & therfor the Apo. Peter saith that in baptisme ther is the question of a good conscience into God: & Paull saith that when the body is washed with pure water, the hart must be sprinckled from an evil conscience, 1. Pet. 3. 21. Heb. 10. 22. therfor infants are baptized which cannot Stipulate or contract themselves vnto the L. therfor the L. doth not contract with them, for Chr. the husband of the Church wil not contract in marriage with a bride or a spowse that is vnder age, Gal. 4. 1-4. 3. the L. did never appoint that baptisme should seale vp his new Testament to infants, or that infants should by his baptisme be admitted into the body of Antich. & into the Church, ministry, worship, & government of Antich. or that his baptisme should set a character indelible vpon parties baptized, or should give grace ex opere operato, al which or most of which are done in Antich. baptisme: but the end of Chr. baptisme is to manifest visibly that the partie confessing his faith & sinnes is sealed by the Spirit vnto the day of redemption, that he hath visibly put on Chr. that he is mortified, crucified, dead, & buried, risen againe, & ascended with Chr. Rom. 6. 1-6. & Col. 2. 12. Gal. 3. 27. Col. 3. 1-5. these are the true ends of baptisme instituted by Chr. Seing therfor the matter, forme, & end of baptisme in the false Church is from man even from Antich. therfor the L. is

not the author of this baptisme, but the baptisme is antic. wholly: & although he vseth the words, In nomine Patris, Filij, & Sp. Sancti amen: as the papists do in sprinckling holy water, in baptising their bels, & as conjurers do in their charmes, yet this cannot make true baptisme, but rather is a most notable profanatiō of the holy Scripture, even as it is profaned in ther Sermons & dayly worship performed by them. I affirme therfor againe & againe that the baptisme receaved in the false Church is none of the L. ordinance, but antichr. devise, essentially corrupted, in matter, forme, & end or vse: & therfor wholly to be rejected with the [an]oynting, breathing, & crossing, &c.

Heer you endeavour to prove that Israel was a false Church, bicause it Seperated from Iudah, & bicause they joyned together in a new Church & communion, vnder a false ministry & worship, & became a harlot: wherto I answer that so was Iudah a false Ch: when they worshipped Idols vnder every greē tree, & in the high places: & if you so vnderstand a false Church, viz: meetings, or companyes of men assembled together in a wrong place, & to a wrong worship, vnder a wrong Preisthood, I yeeld Israel so to be a false Church, but I deny that to be the true definition of a false Chu. for a false Church is contrary to a true Church: now a true Church is descerned in the true causes essential: & so a false Church is known by the want of those true causes essential: the true essential causes of the Chu. of the old Test. was the posterity of Abrah. or proselytes circumcised: the want of these things only made a false Chur: So long as the Israelites retained circumcision, they were the true carnal constituted Church of the old Test: & Israel & Iudah are called harlots, not for that they were a false Church, but for the worshipping of God in Idols, as before the calves at Dan & Bethel, or the Idols in Iudah, this is plaine enough in the History. So that I cōclude against you that Israel was no false Church in the constitutiō, but had a true matter & forme, viz: circūcised Israelites though vnder a false ministry, worship, & government, as I have already shewed in the former treatise.

Lastly, you bring vs in a double respect or considera-

tion of members of the Chur- of Antich. 1. as they are members of those false Chu: 2. as they are the children of [be]lieving progenitors who receaved the covenant for themselves & their posterity: in the first respect they are not vnder the covenāt or seale therof in the second respect they are vnder both, for the Fathers sake Rom. 11. 28. & so their repentance shal serve their turne when they come to the true Church without rebaptising.

I āswer divers things: first, I do not deny but that mē may be cōsidered two waies visibly as members of Antich. body, invisibly as aperteyning to the L. election, & that is the meaning of the Ap. Rom. 11. 28. but I deny that hence it foloweth, that when they come from their invisible being in Ch. to a visible being in the true visible Chu. they shal enter in any way but by the dore which is baptisme: For wheras you intimate that a man being invisibly elect & beloved of God, & invisibly having title to the covenant & holy things of God, may therevppon first visibly enter into the false Chu. by false baptisme, & then vppon his repentance come to the true Chu. & enter therinto not by baptisme, but that the dore of Antich. Chur. shal open him the way into Chr. Church long before he come into Chr. Church, wheras I say you intimate vnto vs so much, you do herby teach contrary to our Saviour Chr. who saith that we must goe in by the dore, & not climb vp by the window, & that wee must first bee taught & made Disc. & thē baptized into Chr. but you in the Kingdom of Antic. are first baptized falsely & then made Disciples flat contrary to Christs commaundem[ent].

Secondly I say that no man is vnder the covenant or vnder baptisme for the parēts sake: & that is not the meaning of the Ap. Ro. 11. 28. but his meaning is that the elect of the Israelites are beloved for the promise God made to Abrah. Isaac, & Iacob, in respect of Chr: not for that the children shalbe pertakers of that covenant, bicause of their parents faith, or bicause of Gods covenant made with the parents & ther carnal infants, but bicause the L. elected them & predestinated them in Chr. to life & salvation invisibly: & therfor I do confidently deny, & you are never able to prove that the carnal infants are

actually possessed of the everlasting covenant God made with Abrah. for their parents sakes: do you indeed think that God loveth any man for another mans sake? or do you think that God loveth not al men of his meer mercy: or for Chr. sake: neither is it the carnal line that is beloved of God for his mercy sake or for Chr. sake: but it is the Spiritual line of Abrah. the faithful onely & elect that are beloved for the Fathers, that is for the covenant made with Abrah. Isaac, & Iacob, our Fathers in the faith: & so it is true that God loveth men in the false Chu. of An. for Abrah. Isaac, & Iacob, that is for his merciful promise made to them: but what is this to prove that Antic. are beloved, & vnder the covenant, for their carnal line descending from a beleving auncestor? or if that were granted how doth it follow that the baptisme visibly receaved in the Antich. false Chu. is true baptisme sealing vp the covenant to them that the L. converteth in the false Chu. No: we have already proved that the baptisme is essentially false & none of Chr. & therfor it is the character or mark of the beast, openly retained in the forehead of al the subjects of Antic. who professing themselves to be of that baptisme do professe thēselves to be of that body for of that body they are of whose baptisme they are, & of that baptisme they are of whose body they are, 1. Cor. 12. 13. Eph. 4. 4. Gal. 3. 27. & we have also proved that the L. true baptisme doth not aperteyne to the carnal line, but only to them that are of Abrah. faith, that is actually beleving to justification, & shewing the faith of Abraham by the works of Abrah. Lastly, where you fetch the title to the Covenant & to baptisme, for infants in the false Chu. from some auncestor beleving 40. generations happily before acording to that Exo. 20 that the L. sheweth mercy to 1000. generations of them that love him: I answer 3. things, 1. you must prove that some off our predecessors had true actual faith & were members of [a] true Ch. & this you must prove for every member you receive in without baptisme therby to assure you that he had title to the covenāt & to baptisme by his carnal line: 2. you must by the same reason receive by baptisme into the true Chu. (if you can come by thē) al the infants of the Thessalonians,

the Ephesians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the Philippians, & the Chu. of Asia that did sometime beleve, 3. I deny that you expound the place Exo. 20. truly: For the L. directly doth require that they vpon whom hee sheweth mercy should feare him & keep his commaundem: & I do vtterly deny that ever the fore-Fathers of the English nation beleved, & you can never prove it. For that which you say that seing we are Apostates, therfor it followeth that somtyme we or our auncesters had the truth, I wonder at you for so saying: for we are departed frō the faith of the Scriptures, not from the faith of our auncestors, who never a one of them at any tyme beleved visibly in a true constituted Chu. Thus through Gods providence & blessing I am come to a happy end of answering your writing: wherin I praise the L. for his mercy I have receved such assurance of the truth as that you & al the earth shall never be able to wring it out of my hart & hands, & therfor I desire you Sir, & al the leaders of the Seperation to weigh seriously even betwixt the L. & their own harts vpon their beds this which is written, I doubt not but I may erre in particulars, & I have resolved to be vile befor men in confessing my erors, but for the maine points in controversy, & the cause I defend it is the most vndoubted & most evident truth that ever was revealed to me: & therfor as you love the L. & his truth, & the people that depend vpon you, seek it out & embrace it, & resist it not, but if we bee in error, shew it vnto vs, why? shall we perish through your default? wil not the L. require our blood at your hand? are we not your countrymen al of vs? in exile for the common truths, we hold out against Antich. Answer we beseech you in the L: nay we adjure you in the Lord: if we be in error it is ignorantly, & of a desire to see the truth & to feare the L: Thus hoping speedily either to heare an answer to this writing, or to see you yeeld to the truth which I vnfeynedly ask of the Lo: for you my countrymen, I end writing this 24. of March. 1608.

Iohn Smyth.



680 Passages betwixt Mr. Rich. Clifton & Iohn Smyth.

Rich. Clifton. If you reply, shew your strength, that we may make an end of these vncomfortable oppositions, for if I see not weight in your reasons, I wil bestow no more labour.

Ioh. Smyth. Sir: ther may be weight in my reasons, & you happily either cannot through prejudice or wil not through some sinister respect se the weight of them: I pray you be not charmed by evil counsel, but either shew me my error, or yeeld to the truth. I would be glad to be an instrument of shewing you this truth also: at least you by shewing vs our error shal discharg a good conscience: If you do not answer among you al: I proclayme you are subtilly blind, & lead the blind after you into the ditch.

FINIS.

[APPLICATION FOR UNION  
WITH THE  
WATERLANDER CHURCH IN AMSTERDAM]

Nomina Anglorum qui hunc errorem suum agnoscunt, ejusque penitentiam agunt, viz: quòd inceperint seipsos baptisare, contra ordinem a Christo constitutum: quique jam cupiunt hinc verae Christi ecclesiae vniri, eâ quâ fieri possit expeditione.

## Nomina virorum.

Hugh Bromhead.  
Jervase Nevill.  
John Smyth.  
Thomas Canadyne.  
Edward Hankin.  
John Hardy.  
Thomas Pygott.  
Francis Pygott.  
Robert Stavely.  
Alexander Fleming.  
Alexander Hodgkin.  
John Grindall.  
Salomon Thomson.  
Samuell Halton.  
Thomas Dolphin.

## feminarum.

Anne Bromhead.  
Jane Southworth.  
Mary Smyth.  
Joane Halton.  
Ales Arnefield.  
Isabell Thomson.  
Margaret Stavely.  
Mary Grindall.  
Mother Pygott.  
Ales Pygott.  
Margarett Pygott.  
Betteris Dickenson.  
Mary Dickenson.  
Ellyn Paynter.  
Ales Parsons.  
Joane Briggs.  
Jane Organ.

Cupimus vnanimiter votum hoc nostrum ecclesiae significari.

## [THE FIRST BAPTIST CONFESSION]

Corde credimus, et ore confitemur:

1. Unum esse Deum, optimum, maximum, gloriosissimum, creatorem et conservatorem omnium: qui est Pater, Filius, et Spiritus sanctus.

2. Deum creasse et redemisse genus humanum ad imaginem suam, omnesque homines (nemine reprobato) ad vitam predestinasse.

3. Deum, nullam peccandi necessitatem cuiquam imponere, sed hominem libere impulsu sathanae a deo deficere.

4. Regulam vitae a deo primitus in observatione legis positam; exinde ob infirmitatem carnis dei beneplacito, per christi redemptionem in justitiam fidei translata esse: quam ob causam, neminem deum juste incusare, verum potius ex intimis visceribus ipsius misericordiam revereri, admirari, et celebrare debere; eum possibile homini reddideret Deus per gratiam, quod prius homine lapso impossibile fuerat per naturam.

5. Nullum esse peccatum originis, verum omne peccatum esse actuale et voluntarium viz: dictum factum aut concupitum contra legem dei: ideoque infantes esse sine peccato.

6. Jesum Christum esse verum Deum et verum hominem: viz: filio dei assumente et sibi uniente hominis veram et puram naturam ex vera anima rationali, et vero corpore humano consistentem.

7. Jesum Christum, quod ad carnem attinet, per spiritum sanctum in utero virginis Mariae conceptum fuisse, postea—natum, circumcisum, baptisatum, tentatum fuisse, etiam ipsum esurivisse, sitivisse, comedisse, bibisse, crevisse, tum statura tum cognitione: defatigatum fuisse, dormivisse: denique crucifixum, mortuum, sepultum fuisse, resurrexisse, in coelum ascendisse: ipsique, utpote

soli Regi, Pontifici, et Prophetæ Ecclesiæ, omnem tum coelo tum in terra potestatem commissam esse.

8. Gratiam dei per Christi redemptionem impetratam omnibus sine discrimine paratam et oblatam fore, idque non fide sed bona fide: partim per creaturas quæ invisibilia dei declarant, partim per evangelij predicationem.

9. Homines ex dei gratia per Christi redemptionem posse (spiritu sancto per gratiam ipsos preveniente) resipiscere, credere, ad deum convertere, et vitam eternam adipisci: sicut e contrâ, posse ipsos spiritui sancto resistere, á deo deficere, et in eternum perire.

10. Justificationem hominis coram dei tribunali (qui est et justitiæ et misericordiæ thronus) subsistere, partim ex imputatione justitiæ Christi per fidem apprehensa partim ex justitia inherente in ipsis sanctis per operationem spiritus sancti quæ Regeneratio sive sanctificatio dicitur: si quidem justus est qui facit justitiam.

11. Fidem, bonis operibus vacuam, mortuam esse: veram autem et vivam fidem per bona opera dignosci.

12. Ecclesiam Christi esse coetum fidelium post fidei et peccatorum confessionem baptizatorum, potestate Christi prædicitum.

13. Ecclesiam Christi habere potestatem sibi delegatam, verbum anuntiandi, sacramenta administrandi, ministros constituendi et abdicendi, denique excommunicandi: ultimam autem provocationem esse ad fratres, sive corpus ecclesiæ.

14. Baptismum esse externum symbolum remissionis peccatorum mortificationis et vivificationis, ideoque ad infantes non pertinere.

15. Coenam Domini esse symbolum externum communionis Christi et fidelium ad invicem per fidem et charitatem.

16. Ministros ecclesiæ esse, tum Episcopos quibus facultas dispensandi, tum verbum tum sacramenta commissa est: tum Diaconos, viros et viduas, qui res pauperum et fratrum infirmorum curant.

17. Fratres post tertium gradum admonitionis in peccatis sibi cognitis perseverantes excludendos esse é communionem sanctorum per excommunicationem.

18. Excommunicatos quod ad civile commercium attinet non esse devitandos.

19. Mortuos (vivis momentó mutatis) resurrecturos ijsdem corporibus, non substantià, sed qualitatibus mutatis.

20. Post resurrectionem omnes sistendos fore ad Tribunal Christi Judicis, secundum opera judicandos: Pios post sententiam absolutionis, vita eterna cum Christo in coelis fruituros: Impios verò damnatos, in Gehenna cum diabolo et angelis ejus eternis supplicijs cruciandos.

John Smyth.

## [DEFENCE OF RIES' CONFESSION]

### Articulus 4.

Omnes in Adamo lapsi, restaurati sunt a deo, adeo ut é posteris Adae nemo, ob hanc restaurationem, in peccato aut reatu natus sit: utrumque fa[lsu]m pronuntiat censura: virum utrumque defendo: scripturae margini affixae sunt. Gen. 12. 3. et 22: 18 et 26: 4. Rom. 5: 18. Gen. 12 etc. Et benedicta erunt in te omnes familiae terrae. Rom. 5: 18. Nempe igitur sicut per unam offensam reatus venit in omnes homines ad condemnationem: ita per unam justificationem beneficium redundavit in omnes homines ad justificationem vitae.

Explicatio scripturarum ut veritatis defensio ex iisdem petita. Locus ille Geneseos 12 qui etiam 22 et 26 repetitur, est parallelaos primae illi promissioni Adae et uxori ejus in paradyso a deo factae de conterendo capite serpentis per semen illud benedictum: ergo quemadmodum Cayn particeps factus est Adae peccati, ita et beneficii christi: etenim hoc foedus factum est cum Adamo ipsiusque liberis omnibus; idque secundum vestram reformatam doctrinam qui foedus divinum cum fidei ejusque liberis ictum vultis: hoc ipsum foedus deus multis post annis renovat cum Abrahamo quod etiam sese extendit ad omnes familias terrae.

Quaero ergo quae sit haec benedictio quam omnes familiae terrae participant? non est procul dubio speciale illud fidelium privilegium qui e morte in vitam translati sunt: nam omnes familiae terrae id non participant, sed est generalis quaedam benedictio qua omnes posterii Adae ab ipsius peccato et peccati reatu liberantur, ea ipsa scilicet cujus ipse Caijn in utero materno conceptus

compos factus est; si enim Caijn hoc beneficium denegetur, tum foedus non est ictum cum fidei ejusque liberis: si concedatur Caijno quare non omni homini in hunc mundum venienti: quare non iis etiam qui Christum abnegant: Joh. 1, 2. Pet. 2. Si quisquam obijciat Caynum postea decessisse de ecclesia omnesque ipsius posteros hoc beneficio privasse: Respondeo: primo fides Adami plus virium habebit ad posteros Caini in foedere continendos quam infidelitas Caijni ad eosdem exterminandos Exod. 20: 5, 6. Secundo scriptura huic sententiae adversatur cum affirmet filium non moriturum ob peccatum parentum cum deus sit omnium animarum parens Ezech [1. Sirach] 18: 4, enim creatur a deo quam ipse corpori infundens puram, non polluit ipse cum non sit author peccati; labem non contrahit a corpore anima, cum corpus non sit peccati origo; non labitur anima a deo pura creata, nisi quis velit infantem nuper conceptum actuale peccatum perpetrare; necesse est ergo omnem animam omni peccato vacuum nasci. Praeterea quaero quomodo omnes familiae terrae benedictae erunt: omnes inquam familiae; Eludere soletis phrasim illam, omnes homines; scilicet dictum fore id non de singulis generum, sed de generibus singulorum, phrasis haec, omnes familiae, ad eundem modum non eluditur: voluit siquidem dominus per hasce phrases, omnes nationes; omnes familias, omnes homines, commenta hominum excludere, affirmando: quod omnis homo cujusque familiae, et unaquaeque familiae uniuscujusque gentis hanc benedictionem per Abrahamum participat.

Secundus ille locus ad Rom. 5. aperte significat ut reatum sic ut beneficium in omnes conferri: si τó omnes in protasi refertur ad singula individua, non video quomodo quispiam bona conscientia τó omnes in apodosi posset referre ad singula genera: praesertim cum propositum Apostolo sit gratiam Christi amplificare: voluit enim spiritus sanctus Christi beneficium, Adami inobedientiam dignitate et amplitudine superare: Si Christus quosdam homines solummodo redemit, non fregit caput serpentis, sed caudam: nam summa potestas adhuc manet quam nec voluit nec potuit Christus retundere: ideoque Christi gratia infirmior est peccato Adami cum

hoc omnes homines perdidit, illa perpaucos admodum ab interitu vindicavit.

Praeterea cum omnes homines in Adamo ad salutem condidit Deus, paucos vero e lapsu restituit. Exinde gratia creationis tum amplior, tum illustrior redditur, quam gratia redemptionis: deusque discessit a proprietate sua in opere redemptionis quam retinuit in opere creationis quod quam iniquum sit, viderint ipsi qui hujusmodi dogmata effutiunt: nos cum prophet[is] [c]antamus libri Dei misericordiam in omnia ipsius opera extendi, deumque neminem deserere nisi qui deum primo deseruit: ipsumque amare prosequi suos osoros mortemque oppetere pro ipsius inimicis. Psal. 145: 9, Rom. 5: 10, Ezech. 18: 31, 32.

#### Articulus 5.

Homo lapsus atque in malo positus, vires etiam habuit bono provenientes, illi ab ipso domino oblato, auscultare ipsumque sive assumere sive rejicere. Nam sicut ante lapsum, malo prevenienti auscultans, ipsumque assumens vires suas indicavit ad id assumendum: sic et post lapsum bono prevenienti auscultans idque assumens, vires suas declaravit ad id assumendum: Hac autem vires, videlicet, dei prevenientem gratiam sive assumere sive rejicere, per ipsius posteros ex gratia remanserunt: falsum hic annotat censura: quaererem ego num haec omnia falsa putat? Affirmantur hic quatuor: 1. hominem ante lapsum vires habuisse gratiam prevenientem recipere sive rejicere; 2. malum propositum assumere; 3. hominem lapsum vires habuisse bonum propositum assume[re]; 4. has vires remanere apud ipsius posteros. Credo censuram facile posse concedere, saltem verbis duo haec prima fere verissima: Etenim ut falsa, falsi titulo signat: Et quidem si verum sit quod illi acriter defendant, deum innocentem creaturam ab eterno rejecisse atque hanc reprobationem Adami voluntatem ad malum ponderare (quod ut fateantur necesse est) tunc sine dubio ante lapsum homo nullum sive ad bonum sive ad malum liberum arbitrium habuit, sed fatali quadam calamitate a bono ad malum abreptus est, nempe divini decreti necessitate externa impellente cui resistere Adamo



impossibile erat. Restant duo postrema discutienda, nimirum post lapsum Adamum ejusque posteros vires retinuisse ad bonum preveniens recipiendum: Itaque omissis graecis et latinis vocibus utpote superbis nimis, *ἀντεξούσιον* per liberum arbitrium, item distinctionibus scolasticorum de merito congrui et condigni, de necessitate consequentis et consequentia, quae simplicium ingenia fatigare potius quam instruere solent, rem ipsam nudis verbis et propinquo petitis simpliciter discutiamus.

Affirmamus ergo hominem post lapsum non esse sive diabolum, sive brutum, multo minus truncum aut stipitem; sed totam naturam humanam integram restare, ideoque naturales hasce vires intelligendi et volendi: hominemque posse quodvis objectum propositum sive bonum sive malum negligere, intelligere, velle nolle; viresque has naturales non esse extinctas, sed solummodo enervatas; quod ut facilius percipiatur quatuor jam proposita argumenta repetantur si[n]gillatim: Homo non est diabolus factus post lapsum: impuri illi spiritus pro seipsis nullam gratiam paratam intelligunt ideoque eam ut percipiant velintve impossibilis est: cum enim deus gratia sua eos non prevenit, iisque misericordiam non offert, non possunt illi quod non est sive cogitare sive desiderare: Haec est spirituum impiorum conditio: iam vero vos reformati maximam partem humani generis vel in hanc vel in ea[m] deteriorem conditionem praecipitem datis: Illi enim impij spiritus gratiam ipsis paratam non in[te]lligunt nec volunt, quia nulla est: hi vero homines juxta vestram doctrinam, ab eterno reprobj, gratiam et revelatam et in verbi ministerio summa cum efficacia oblatam et persuasam nec percipere nec velle possunt: apparet ergo ex vostro dogmate reproborum conditionem ipsis diabolis deteriorem esse: secundo brutorum est hanc conditionem posse ratione doceri vel suaderi, sive docentem et suadentem intelligere et sequi: vestra doctrina reformata id ipsum homini ascribit lapso non solum reprobis, sed et electis: tertio homines lapsos vos truncos et fustes facitis: nempe non posse hominem lapsum evangelium sive intelligere sive velle magis quam lapidem: potest deus ex lapidibus filios Abraha suscitare: id ipsum agit deus in conversione hominum juxta vestram

reformatam opinionem. Denique creatam qualitatem sive naturalem potentiam intelligendi et volendi a deo in creatione homini inditam post lapsum perditam strenue defenditis: lapsus ergo hominis ipsam creaturam in nihilum redegit: hoc autem dico respectu gratiae sive intelligendae sive expetendae: nos enervatam et diminutam dicimus naturalem illam potentiam et sive divino auxilio inanem et inefficacem: vos respectu gratiae penitus extinctam defenditis, quid hoc aliud est quam creaturam a deo conditam abolere: Hunc vero hominem lapsum adeo deformem, adeo mutilem vultis ut homines inter et quadrupedem, immo diabolus, fungus, lapidem, nihil interesse putes? Ut hominem non hominem efficias? Absit: Pergamus porro: Hujus articuli quarta clausula, quod censura exagitat, affirmat vires gratiam oblatam rejiciendi et assumendi per Adae posteris ex gratia re[man]sisse: dicit inquam, ex gratia remansisse: non quod alii obijciunt hoc esse vires humanas supra modum efferre; respondet articulus totum hoc deberi divinae benignitati quod possit homo gratiam previam sequi: non affirmat hoc esse gratiam, sed remansisse per gratiam: hoc est generale illud beneficium quod humanum genus per Christi redemptionem adeptum est: age, excutiantur scripturae testimonia margini ascripta: Genes. 4: 6, 7. sub te erit appetitus ejus et tu dominaberis ei: disertis verbis affirmat spiritus sanctus peccati appetitum subjici Cayno: et ejusdem dominium in ipsius potestate esse: respondere soletis hoc de Habele, non de peccato intelligi: ego dico hoc nulla ratione posse concedi: non nulla mentio facta est Habelis sive a Deo ipso ad Caynum, sive a Cayno coram Deo. Ergo affixum i non potest referri ad id quod in eadem sententia nequaquam precessit: sed concedatur vobis dictum fore de Dominio Primogeniti in fratres natu minores: quid tum postea hinc quod volo nequicquam minus efficitur: nempe ut primogenitus regit natu minores: sic ratio et voluntas illuminationem et suasum gratiae previae, cohibet appetitus peccatrices ipsiusque imperii habenas injicit: nam appetitus ad peccatum natu minores sunt.

Secundus Locus est Genes. 6: 2. 3. 12. Spiritus meus non perpetuo litigabit cum Adamo: hic locus apte indicat

spiritum dei cum spiritu hominis contendere et litigare quemadmodum pro tribunali consuetum est inter actorem et reum: est autem phrasis haec appositae satis ad rem ipsam explicandam: nam non vi et impulsu violento agit actor cum reo, sed ratione et argumentorum momentis quae Dei advocatus diluere et repellere potest: potestas rem ipsam definiendi penes iudicem est: sic spiritus dei agit cum homine qui peccati reus est, ratione non vi, suasu non impulsu violento cui reus possit sive resistere sive obsequi: rem ipsam definit iudex ille summus cuius imp[er]io omnia subiciuntur: hoc ipsum facile etiam apparet ex actis apostolorum Cap. 6: 2. 10 et cap. 7: 2. 51. hic affirmat Stephanus iudeos impios restitisse spiritui sancto: illic ait Lucas iudeos non potuisse resistere spiritui per quem locutus est Stephanus: id est etiamsi ipsorum conscientias veritas patefacta est, eidem tamen non auscultarunt: vincit spiritus litigando cum impiorum conscientias convincit; victus est spiritus sanctus, cum impij spiritus suasi non obtemperant. Iudicium tamen penes deum ipsum est, hominumque conscientias qui sunt *ἀποκατάκριτοι*. Denique nulla est major vis spiritus quam quae in prophetis, apostolis et Christo edita est, Christus enim spiritum supra modum accepit; prophetae autem, Apostoli et Christus omnem illam sp[iritus] sancti virtutem exercebant in eorum doctrina et miraculis quam habuerunt; hunc tamen spiritum extinguebant impij: videmus enim iudeos Prophetarum, Apostolorum et Christi spiritui semper restitisse: nam utpote perversi pueri sociis tibiis canentibus aut plangentibus non obtemperabant, Matt. 22: 3. Apostolos, prophetas, Christum populum congregare (satagantes) occidebant et noluerunt audire. Christus voluit, illi noluerunt: voluit autem Christus bona fide et ex animo, non simulate non fecte conlacrimat misericors, mirum in modum animi affectus exprimit Matt. 23: 37. Luc. 13: 34. neque est quod dicat quispiam voluit ut homo, noluit ut deus: respondet ipse Deus, Esaie 5: 4. quid faciendum vineae meae quod non fecerim in ea. Hic voluntas Christi et voluntas Dei in unum conspirant: facessant ergo huiusmodi nugamenta.

Locus tertius est Deut. 11: 26. et 30: 19. huc referantur

et reliqui: sic Psal. 81: 13. 14. Esaij 1: 19. 20. et 42: 18-21. Jerem. 8: 7 et 25: 4. Joan. 5: 34. 40. Haec omnia testimonia subministrant nobis hujusmodi argumenta: vel penes homines est previam gratiam amplecti sive aversari, vel vita et mors, benedicti et maledicti non est homini proposita: verum aperte ait dominus Deut. 11: 26 et 30: 15. proposui vobis vitam et mortem, bonum et malum, id est benedictionem et maledictionem: ergo penes homines est gratiam previam sive amplecti, sive respuere: si enim non potuit amplecti previam gratiam, vita, bonum, benedictio non erat ipsi proposita: si non potuit non respuere previam gratiam, mors, malum, maledictio ipsi non erat proposita: cum ergo utrumque proponitur, utrumque potuit, id est amplecti et aversari. Deinde: quibus deus ex animo optat bonum, benedictionem et vitam, et de quibus graviter conquestus est dominus quibusque horrenda minatur ipsius gratiam recusantibus penes eos est gratiam oblatam vel recusare vel recipere: siquidem deus non sine causa non fecte, non simulate, non frustra, non irrisorie optat, conqueritur comminatur: quae quidem fecisset, si homo est quasi diabolus, brutus, truncus, fungus, lapis. At manifestum est ex psalmo, ex Esaia, ex Hierimia deum vehementer optare bonum Israelitarum, graviter conqueri, et horrendum in modum comminari rebellibus et perversis peccatoribus. Causa ergo penes ipsos est qui potuerunt gratiam previam amplecti, [n]on penes Deum qui necessitatem mali agendi imposuisset: si hoc fecisset deus, potuissent respondere Israelitae: quid optat, quid conquestus est, qui comminatur deus: necessum est nos sic agere, reprobatio dei eterna nos in peccata precipitat, nos ipsis diabolis deteriores facti sumus, bruta lapides sumus, non possumus velle nolle, intelligere percipere oblatam gratiam: immo gratia nobis non erat oblata, noluit deus nos salvos, coena nobis non erat parata, non eramus nos ad nuptias filij invitati, decepit nos deus, dixit se velle nos salvos fore, verum non erat illi in animo, ab eterno odit nos: deus nos per ipsius predestinationem ciconiae, hirundini, palumbi, grui postposuit, non ergo potest deus de nobis conqueri, sed irridet nos miseros homunciones. Quero jam quid responsuri sunt, prophetae, Apostoli, Christus, ipse deus?

Respondet Apostolus: tu quis es qui responsas deo? Lutum figulo? Scilicet jubet propheta judeos judicare caussam suam inter ipsum et vineam: Esaj. 5: 3. et nolit hic Apostolus nos id ipsum agere? minime gentium. Non igitur recurrit Apostolus ad predestinationem vestram reformatam, quam non agnovit, sed partim retundit petulantiam carnis, et indignitatem responsantis, partim divinae voluntatis equitatem indicat, cum obstinatos et pervicaces reprobat, quos appellat vasa ad iram disposita: morigeros autem et in veritatem sequens eligit utpote misericordiae vasa in honorem parata: Rom. 9. Non reprobatur creaturam innocentem, sed in peccatis pervicacem: neque eligit quemlibet, sed iustum et in justitia perseverantem in finem: de hac dei electione et reprobatione nemo conqueri potest juste, de vestra illa reformata sententia conqueri possunt judei quos propheta iudices instituit inter deum et vineam. Esaj. 5: 3. Huic reclamatur ipsa conscientia: sed de predestinatione postea: iam revertamur ad propositum.

Reliqua scripturae testimonia in superioribus proposita et exposita sunt.

#### Articulus septimus.

Ad hunc articulum quatuor annotantur: 1. affirmat censura hominum spontaneam electionem tenebrarum esse causam proximam damnationis: Dextre admodum juxta reformatam illam doctrinam: illi enim primam causam sive originem damnationis designant dei voluntatem et reprobationem creaturae adhuc purae atque in innocentia constitutae: ideoque annotatio secunda censurae arguit eum imperitum qui affirmet deum neminem predestinasse, disposuisse, sive creasse ut damnaretur: deinde etiam annotatio tertia censurae incusat articulum quod neget Dei electionem cum afferat deum disposuisse sive creasse omnes homines in salutarem finem: Hic ergo tria discutienda sunt: 1. quae sit origo damnationis. 2. an deus predestinavit, ordinavit sive creavit hominem ad damnationem. 3. an sic et quid sit dei electio;

Quod ad primum attinet, non est dubium quin homo sit causa sui interitus: verum an sit prima causa an proxima queritur: Deum esse causam cujusque creaturae

certum est eamque primariam: damnationis ergo causa primaria est in quantum poena, sed in quantum damnatio est culpa, nimirum impenitentiae, perveracia in malo, rebellio contra deum ejus nec author nec fautor est deus: verum aiunt nostri hi praedestinatores deus voluit peccatum quia permisit: Negatur: permittere non est velle apud homines. Toleramus plurima quae nolumus: sic David toleravit homicidium Joabi: hoccine verum est inter homines, nonne verum est multo magis in Deo, ad cujus imaginem homo conditus est? Hoc nobis manifestum erit in Sabbathi typo: postquam deus creasset omnia opera sua dicitur die septimo desijsse, et quiescisse: hoc est non sive voluisse sive fecisse peccatum: quo exemplo docet nos deus debere nos itidem ab operibus nostris, id est peccatis, feriari: Nova haec praedestinatio Manicheorum deum malum introduxit, qui velit mala: si enim deus origo sit sive prima causa mali culpa, malus est deus qui vult mala: est autem origo et radix mali, si homines fatali necessitate in peccatum trudit: si est causa causae et causa caussati; Si hominis voluntatem in malum propendere facit per ipsius inevitabile et efficax decretum, ipsum malum agit efficaciter: quod ut impium et blasphemum horret animus cogitare. Cum ergo in damnatione duo sunt praeter malum damni viz: culpa et poena, culpa id est origo poenae est ab homine et Sathana: poena autem consequitur culpam quam creat justus iudex: ergo prima haec annotatio inepta satis est si velit deum primam causam damnationis quod attinet ad culpam: si vero respectu poenae vult deum esse primam causam ne id quidem omni ex parte verum est, nam peccata hominum impellunt creatorem qui justus est, poenam instigare, quam ipse solus creat.

Quod attinet secundum: solutio pendet partim a superioribus, partim ab iis quae sequuntur: Creaturam condere, predestinare, ordinare ad interitum longissime abest a natura divina: Deus natura pater est, iudex autem et vindex (ut ita dicam) ex accidenti sive ex consequenti: Adam est filius dei Luc. 3. creavit ergo Adamum ad salutem omnesque cum eo ipsius posteros: deus cum sit animarum creator et pater, non creat eos ad interitum: si non creat non ordinat nec predestinat

ad interitum: nisi quis velit deo opera et proposita contradictoria ascribere: quid quod nemo omnium noctalium est qui sibi proponit filios gignere ad patibulum: paternitas creaturarum oritur ex paternitate dei ejusque quasi scintilla quaedam est; si homines vero amant liberos suos ipsisque optima quaeque ex animo optant et curant, qui possumus deum fingere patrem crudelissimum, qui ideo cupit filios ut possit eos odisse, perdere, in eternum flagellare: Nova haec predestinatio naturam divinam ignorat quae deum fingit patrem truculentum et homicidam: Homicidium prohibuit Deus: quare? quia nolit quemquam sine caussa mori: hi fingunt deum crudelissimum homicidam qui creaturas innumeras etiam innocentissimas eternis cruciatibus destinavit: nonne hoc est ipsius legem transgredi: Lex dei imago est divinae naturae: lex inquam sive naturalis sive moralis: lex naturae docet parentes amare liberos suos quod videmus in brutis animalibus: Decalogus jubet nos amare proximos ut nos ipsos: Deus ergo vel amat suas creaturas vel legi suae contrariatur: apage ergo Manicheorum illum deum truculentum tyrannum crudelissimum qui innumeras creaturas creavit et predestinavit ad ruinam. Noster deus est plenus misericordiae: paratissimus ad condonandum: tardus ad iram: deus ille Manicheorum totus est iratus, immisericors, preceps ad vindictam, immo innumeras creaturas innocentes reprobatur ab eterno nullo ipsorum precedente merito: Manicheorum deus precipitat homines in peccatum quia est iudex: noster misericors deus iudicat homines quia ipsi se precipitant in peccata ipsiusque misericordiam despiciunt: ille deserit suos prius quam sui deserunt ipsum: noster deserit neminem nisi qui ipsum primum deseruit. ille primo iudex est, nusquam pater reproborum: noster primo pater est, post iudex: ille primo contra innocentem sententiam mortis pronuntiat, deinde reum deridet ejusque causam ludicro inquirat: noster primo (sonti) ex animo cupit benefacere, serio rem tractat: tandem in peccatis perseverantem tardus punit. Ille deus est reformatorem, hic noster deus est.

Tertium jam sequitur: an sit et quid sit electio: esse nemo dubitat neque articulus hic electionem dei negat: vestram reformatam electionem eternam reprobationi

vestrae oppositam impugnat et respuit ut aequum est: electio est in Christo: qui in Christo est et perseverat ille electus est, etiam ante mundi jacta fundamenta; hanc enim regulam electionis ab eterno proposuit deus et prescivit omnes credentes et perseverantes: Reprobatio extra Christum est qui in peccatis perseverant usque in finem reprobi sunt, etiam ante mundi fundamenta, nam constituit deus hanc reprobationis regulam ab eterno, et precognovit omnes eos qui in infidelitate et impenitentia in finem perseverare vellent. Haec dei prescientia eterna nullam necessitatem infert, verum quemadmodum in rebus civilibus scientia dei non impedit liberam actionem et voluntatem: sic nec in rebus spiritualibus: ex aequo utraque prescivit deus ab eterno, neutri necessitatem intulit, sed liberam agendi et volendi potestatem reliquit. Inscite ergo ne dicam imperite articulo huic ascrivit censura divinae electionis abnegationem.

Restat jam ultimum ex iis quae censura animadvertit in hoc articulo scilicet quod articulus numquam intellexit doctrinam de predestinatione; verum id quidem est si reformatam vestram predestinationem velitis quam neque scripturae agnoscit: eam non intelligit id est non approbat verum tamen intelligit id est percipit quid sit; nempe quod error sit et naturae divinae (absona), satis superque agnoscit cum sacra scriptura articulus: Deinde quod articulus restringit universale illud beneficium quo Christus dicitur omnes redemisse, ad paucos fideles vel universalem electionem ad particularem electionem, agit id quidem non sine causa quamvis alias fortasse censurae visum est: si proprie loqui velimus universale illud beneficium unicuique communicatum quo possunt gratiam oblatam recipere, non potest dici nec dicitur (opinor) electio in sacris libris: illi proprie electi sunt qui vocationi divinae obsecundant: propriissime vero illi sunt electi qui in finem perseverant; non loquor de electione ad munera ecclesiastica, sed de electione ad salutem: Hic ergo non peccat articulus quod restringit generale.

#### Articulus octavus.

Articulus hic taxatur tripliciter: primo quod videatur aliquibus e nostris contradicere: quero ego a censura num



sui omnes cum ipso consentiant: si non: commune est hoc vitium, ideoque nobis non imputandum: non debet in nobis reprehendere id quod ipsi vitio verti possit. Secundo ait censura hoc veritati non satisfacere quod articulus affirmat Christum esse verum deum et verum hominem, verum spiritum et verum carnem: quid ita? rationem non affert, suspicor tamen nempe quod carnis Christi materia non designatur: quid? num necesse est in fidei confessione breviuscula (qualis hoc est) etiam minutissima quaeque proponere? verum fortasse censura vult articulum hunc esse magni pretii et fundamentum fidei: Hanc vero; et quare non expressit hoc ipsum spiritus sanctus in sacris libris: credimus quaecumque loquitur sacra scriptura; phrasin ullam materiam carnis Christi indicantem non adhuc percipimus, sequelas et consequentias vestras audimus, verba diserta non videmus: mallet ergo in dubio relinquere quam de lana caprina contendere: cupio ego carnem Christi aliam cognoscere, illam scil[icet] quam exprimit apostolus Eph. 5: 30 membra sumus corporis ejus, ex carne ejus et ex ossibus ejus: hanc Christi carnem manducare debemus ad vitam, non illam externam visibilem carnem cujus scientiam parum valere Apostolus testatur 2 Cor. 5: 16.

Tertio censura nobis exprobrat phrasin anabaptisticam: Christus est visibiliter, invisibiliter, interne externe, verus filius viventis dei: phrasis haec declarat Christum totum esse verum filium dei non duos filios; neque quicquam esse in Christo quod a Deo non est genitum: nam affirmamus deum patrem totum Christum genuisse, mariam negamus Christum genuisse: conceptum et natum ex muliere fatemur, genitum negamus: pater siquidem eum genuit: quicquid ergo in Christo est ex patre est, nisi quid habeas ad hoc.

#### Articulus decimus.

Affirmat censura articulum hunc imperite eliminare magistratum ex ecclesia Christi: ego autem affirmo Christum esse regem spiritualem ipsiusque ecclesiam esse regnum spirituale omnesque ecclesiae ministros esse ministros spirituales, arma esse spiritualia, leges spirituales, poenas spirituales, praemia spiritualia, milites spirituales,

bellum spirituale: ideoque non video quomodo externa illa et carnalis politia ecclesiam Christi administrare possit: secundo quero a vobis quis futurus sit magistratus, quale regimen, eritne monarchia, an aristocratia, an politia: preterea magistratus hi, an fiant electione, jure hereditario, an victoria: deinde quibus legibus utantur, politia Mosaica an alia quavis deinceps quos non puniet ille magistratus, num qui poenitentiam agunt, an impenitentes, hereticos an maleficos: denique cum Christus jussit nos inimicos nostros deligere, miror quomodo magistratus Christianus possit vindictam exercere contra ipsius hostes? Haec omnia vellem mihi ex novo testamento exponi: Postremo cum ecclesia Christi temporibus apostolorum erat perfectissima, omnibusque perfidiis munita ad ejus perfectionem et complementum, mirum est Christum noluisse magistratum in ecclesiam introducere qui gladio, vi et vindicta subditos in ecclesiam cogeret si intelligeret munus hoc ad ipsius ecclesiam attinere, quin potius e contrario voluit ipse per persecutiones, exilium, paupertatem, ignominiam, mortem suum regnum spirituale instituere: perfectissima illa primitiva ecclesia non agnovit magistratus in ipsius gremio, ea tamen omnibus subsidiis ad ipsius tutelam necessariis fulta est: ergo aut magistratus officium non est ecclesiae idoneum, aut primitiva ecclesia non erat satis instructa ad ipsius tutelam et defensionem: aut hisce nostris temporibus feliciora secula visura est ecclesia Christi.

### Articulus 13.

Dicit hic censura articulum hunc pugnare cum suis, qua autem in re non intelligo, ejus rei ergo plenioram explicationem expecto.

### Articulus 19.

Swenckfeldianum est illud (inquit censura) quod Christi opera in carne facta nos majora quaedam et spiritualia docuit: est etiam scripturae et spiritus sancti unde hoc et alia fortasse verissima hausit Swenckfeldius: enim vero quid conceptio, nativitas, circumcisio, baptisimus, tentatio, predicatio, miracula, mors, sepultura, resurrectio, ascensio Christi, numquid haec propter se

ipsa, aut propter aliud quiddam potius contigerunt: Christo contigerunt haec omnia ut possit in gloriam suam ingredi nobisque spiritum sanctum a Patre mittere: Quemadmodum enim omnes figurae et ceremonia veteris testamenti Christi personam ejusque accidentia adumbrarunt: sic ipsa Christi persona, actiones et perpassiones in humilitate gesta, umbra quaedam fuerunt suiipsius jam gloria exaltati ad dextram dei pa[tris]: Hic incipit, ipsius regnum, sacerdotium, prophetia. Non quod illa priora nihil ad regnum, sacerdotium, prophetiam pertinent, sed quod respectu horum minora sunt et minoris momenti: debuit siquidem Ch[ristum] priora illa omnia perpeti aliter non potuit in gloriam suam ingredi: siquidem per hanc viam afflictionum et humiliationis, Princeps nostrae salutis consecratur: Hebr. 2: 10. Et in omnibus tentatus est ad similitudinem: Hebr. 4: 13, ut nobis exemplum preberet nobisque auxiliaretur. Ideoque scriptura de iis quae Christi sunt dupliciter loquitur, quo[d] ad umbram et quod ad veritatem: exempli gratia: Christi caro est naturalis ut ita dicam: Heb. 5: 7 et spiritualis: Eph. 5: 30. Christi corpus est etiam vel naturale (absit invidia verbo) Mat. 27: 58 vel spirituale Eph. 5: 30. Ossa etiam naturalia Joh. 19: 36 et spiritualia Eph. 5: 30. Christi afflictiones vel naturales sunt Joh. 19: 37 vel spirituales Act. 9: 4. Christi nativitas duplex: naturalis Mat. 1: 18. spiritualis Apoc. 12: 5. ejus conceptio duplex: naturalis Luk. 1: 31 et spiritualis, Gal. 4: 19. Christi miracula duplicia: externa Joh. 9: 6, 7. et interna, Joh. 9: 39. Atque hoc interna miracula (ut ita dicam) jam agit Christus per spiritum et acturus est usque ad consummationem seculi: haec interna majora sunt quam illa externa, Joh. 14: 12. Illa externa omnia et naturalia quae Christus perfecit et sustinuit, erant quasi preludia ad haec interna et spiritualia: Haec adeo manifesta sunt ut non opus sit pleniore explicatione aut probatione, solummodo hoc animadversione dignum est, externa haec Christi minima esse respectu eorum quae interna sunt: quamvis ergo externa illa victima corporis Christi in cruce facta infinita efficacia est, atque in eternum efficax ad peccatorum remissionem, tamen minoris est momenti, quam victima illa interna

qua cordis concupiscentiae et peccata crucifiguntur quotidie, sepeliuntur et extinguuntur: nam illa prima externa victima hujus posterioris et internae figura quaedam et umbra fuit, suam in se tamen continens vim et veritatem etsi posteriori minorem: nam Christi munera eorumque opera sive effectus in gloria, multo illustriora et nobiliora sunt quam quae in humilitate transegit: regnum suum nactus est Christus, sacerdotium et prophetiam post glorificationem, quamvis externa quaedam rudimenta eorundem et fundamenta fecit in humilitatione: Haec si meminerit et intellexerit censura facilius futura erit responsio ad reliqua quae postea objicit Swenckfeldiana ut ipsi visum est loqui.

#### Articulus 21.

Duo hic animadvertit Censura: primam quod confudit articulus justificationem et sanctificationem: immo diceret sanctificationem potius hic ab articulo fieri partem justificationis, quod ex superioribus Swenckfeldianis facile apparet ipsissimam fore veritatem: deinde censura taxat clausulam hanc ut falsam quod articulus afferat justificationem ex fonte regenerationis fluere: haec ut facilius percipiantur a censura, paulo pleniore explicatione indigent. Dicimus ergo novam creaturam esse fontem justificationis, ejusque radicem, omnesque partes justificationis, viz: peccati mortificationem, novam oboedientiam et peccatorum remissionem novae creaturae effectus esse sive accidentia: haec nova creatura est nostra ut ita dicam filiatio, per novam creaturam facti sumus filii dei; hanc novam creaturam generat in nobis pater coelestis per immortale semen verbi sui: per novam creaturam admittimur in regnum dei; nova creatura est baptismus ille Christi per quem in corpus Christi baptizati sumus ut simus caro de carne ejus et os de ossibus ejus: quemadmodum Christus factus est filius dei cum pater ejus eum genuit, sic et nos facti sumus filii dei cum Christus in nobis genitus est: peccata nobis remittit pater quia sumus filii; non sumus filii ob remissionem peccatorum: mortificamus peccata quod habeamus spiritum Christi: fructus novae creaturae producimus quod novam creaturam habemus: Christus postquam genitus, natus

est et adolevit, mortuus est, sepultus et resurrexit; sic cum Christus in nobis firmatus est per novam creaturam, nos cum ipso morimur, sepelimur et reviviscimus. Et quemadmodum per ipsius mortem peccatorum remissionem pro nobis assecutus est ipse, sic et nos ad ipsius exemplum per peccatorum mortificationem, sepulturam et resurrectionem nostram spiritualem, remissionem peccatorum pro nobis ab illo partam nanciscimur: adeo ut mortificatio peccati, vitae novitas et peccat[orum] remissio fructus potius quam arboris partes censendae sunt: nova haec creatura est quasi anima Christiani hominis, vitae novitas et peccatorum mortificatio sunt ejusdem spiritualis animae actiones et effecta; remissio peccatorum est quasi accidens inseparabile, vel proprium πάθος. Audiamus scripturae testimonia: Gal. 3: 11. justus ex fide vivit: vs. 26. nam estis vos omnes filij dei per fidem in Christo Jesu. Eph. 3: 17. ut Christus inhabitet in cordibus vestris per fidem.

Hic apostolus attribuit fidei vitam nostram spiritualem: filiationem nostram; Christi presentiam sive inhabitationem in nobis: fides est interna quaedam virtus per charitatem efficax ipsa quasi novae creaturae essentia, caro, corpus, anima: nova creatura non est quidquam extra nos sed in nobis, non justitia nobis imputata, sed justitia in nobis insita, vel potius dispositio quaedam spiritualis ad justitiam quam usu et assidua exercitatione assequimur, quam remissio peccatorum tanquam pedissequa consequitur: Hic ego quererem a Censura num ille putet peccata remitti iis qui adhuc novam creaturam non habent: Credo illum negaturum: quid ergo? num simul habentur peccatorum remissio et nova creatura? immo vero inquit: quero preterea, si sunt tempore simul quod fateor, tamen natura alterum altero prius est, utrum prius est inquam? credo illum responsurum remissionem peccatorum esse causam novae creaturae: ergo remittit peccata deus iis qui non sunt filij: et deus fit actu pater post remissa peccata: haec quam absurda sunt ipsa viderit censura, congruit tamen haec reformata doctrina cum illorum, de eterna stoica necessitate, dogmate nam cum illi affirmant deum absoluto quodam decreto predestinasse quorundam salutem, ipsos in remis-

sionem peccatorum et in novam creaturam deinceps precipitat, ut voluit noluit, necessum sit ipsos hanc remissionem participare, et novam creaturam induere, nam specialis ille dei amor ab eternitate quo alios pre ceteris complexus est, facit deum illorum patrem priusquam illi facti sunt ipsius filij, quemadmodum ex adverso per decretum illud reprobationis creaturae infantis factus est deus iudex et vindex innocentum qui nihil adhuc mali perpetraverint sive commeriti sunt. Sed de his supra.

### Articulus 22.

Hic etiam censura duo annotat: 1. spiritum sanctum esse efficientem causam regenerationis, verbum esse medium: cum articulus affirmat sp[iritum] sanctum esse medium: 2. Nihil creatum esse medium regenerationis censura affirmat Swenckfeldianum: examinentur utraque atque ad incudem roborentur (quod aiunt). Quemadmodum in Christi generatione sive conceptione in utero materno pater filium genuit per spiritum sanctum, sic etiam in nostra regeneratione qua simus filij dei, pater nos gignit filios suos per spiritum sanctum: verbum autem est spirituale illud semen quod effundit coelestis pater in uterum quasi cordium nostrorum, spiritus sanctus est vis plasmatica ut ita dicam in semine qua semen hoc cordibus nostris ἐμφύσιω id est insitum et implantatum fingit et format in novam creaturam: adeo ut si propriae loqui velimus, Deus pater est genitor, ipse semen hoc immortale effundit in corda nostra: cor honestum est uterus fecundus sive terra fertilis quae semen hoc amplectitur et fovet: semen hoc est verbum dei quod proprie est materia ex qua nova creatura fingitur: semen hoc non est sterile sed fecundum, non mortuum sed vivum, siquidem deus vivens effudit: vita sive fecunditas seminis est spiritus sanctus qui efficaciter vim suam exerit in semine ad Christum in corde fideli configurandum: Nova creatura est ille dei filius qui in nobis genitus est: non opus est scripturae testimonia hic iterum referre quae partim in articulo referuntur, partim cuivis obvia sunt: jam queritur num verbum sit medium; num spiritus sit efficiens: num medium sit creatum quiddam. Respondeat nobis bona conscientia Censura haec: Enim-

vero, deus pater est efficiens: Jacob. 1: 18, Joh. 1: 13. verbum est semen ex quo tanquam ex materia nova creatura effingitur: 1 Pet. 1: 23. Spiritus sanctus est verum et genuinum medium quo nova creatura producitur et perficitur ex semine paterno: Joh. 3: 1, 5, 1 Cor. 12: 13. Si spiritus sanctus esset efficiens novae creaturae, esset pater: nam pater et filius sunt correlativa et ad seinvicem referuntur: hoc quam absurdum sit censura viderit. Praeterea quod incusat censura articulum Swenckfeldianisem cum afferat medium nostrae regenerationis esse nihil creatum, oritur hoc ex eadem inscita atque ex re male intellecta. Quamvis enim regeneratio dicitur nova creatura, non tamen inde sequitur quod nova haec creatura creatur: nam nova haec creatura gignitur quemadmodum sacri libri plane et plene attestantur: neque in novae creaturae productione sive generatione adhibet pater aliquid instrumentum sive medium quod creatum est, pater enim, verbum et spiritus sanctus totum hoc opus perficiunt: non hic excluditur cor honestum et verbi ministerium, quae media externa sunt: eaque necessaria; siquidem articulus loquitur de opere interno et de interna perficiendi ratione: Hinc fit quod in novae creaturae formatione tria haec concurrunt, pater, verbum et spiritus sanctus; ideoque in coelo, id est in regno coelorum quod consistit ex novis creaturis, tria haec testimonium perhibent, ut Johannes dicit: cap. 5. Hoc credo censuram non facile negaturam.

### Articulus 23.

Exagitat hic censura Rom. 5: 5. perinde ac si male intellectum sit ab articulo: videamus quem pro se sensum ferat: amor dei in sacris libris significat vel active vel passive. Passive significat amorem illum quo nos deus diligit, active significat amorem illum quo nos deum diligemus: articulus interpretatur hunc locum de amore activo, censura fortasse vult amorem passivum: audiamus apostoli verba, Spes non pudefacit, ob amorem dei in cordibus nostris effusum per spiritum sanctum qui nobis datus est: passivus amor dei unicuique obvius est, nam amat deus ipsius inimicos, ideoque Christus docuit nos inimicos nostros diligere, loquitur autem apostolus hoc

in loco de amore qui spem concomitatur, de amore qui spiritum sanctum concomitatur, de amore qui effunditur in corda nostra; de amore qui est spiritus sancti donum: huic hujusmodi argumenta colligi possunt.

Primo: Comes spei est amor activus: quia amat deus eos qui sine spe sunt, ideoque amor passivus non est comes spei.

Amor Rom. 5. est comes spei.

Ergo Amor Rom. 5. est amor activus.

Secundo: Comes spiritus est amor activus: quia amor passivus est ubi non est spiritus, nam deus amat inimicos qui spiritum non habent.

Amor Rom. 5. est comes spiritus.

Ergo. Amor Rom. 5. est amor activus.

Tertio: Amor effusus in corda fidelium est amor activus: quia amor passivus non effunditur, nec cor est ejus subjectum:

Amor Rom. 5. est amor effusus in corda fidelium.

Ergo Amor Rom. 5. est amor activus.

Quarto: Amor qui est spiritus sancti donum est amor activus: per se patet.

Amor Rom. 5. est spiritus sancti donum.

Ergo Amor Rom. 5. est amor activus.

Praeterea ipse contextus hoc satis indicat, non ab initio versus secundi ad principium versus sexti interponit Apostolus quasi parenthesi inclusa quadam, versu sexto redit ad propositum et probat pacem nostram per Christi redemptionem partam esse, et deinceps versu octavo amorem dei passivum sive illum quo nos diligit amplificat: Hic dei amor quo nos diligimur et haec Christi redemptio quae nobis impartitur, fide apprehenduntur a nobis, unde pax apud deum et recessus ad deum, cum fiducia ac gaudio, etiam inter afflictiones, unde patientiam discimus, magis magisque experti dei benignitatem et auxilium in rebus anxiiis, ideoque spem de futuro concipimus quae nos numquam decipit sive pudefacit quia amor dei verus fructus regenerationis et novae creaturae per spiritum sanctum cordibus nostris effusus nos certiores reddit deum nobis semper affuturum et auxiliaturum: jam vos reformati phantasma quoddam confingitis; viz: spiritus quoddam testimonium de amore dei passivo, quo



vos scilicet certiores facti estis, tanquam divina, extraordinaria et immediata inspiratione, quae potius imaginaria est idea et inanis speculatio quam solidum testimonium spiritus, quod exinde solum oritur quod percipimus nos vere et ex animo deum diligere: de hoc amore loquitur hoc in loco Apostolus: quomodo certior factus es quod te deus diligit? quia tu diligis deum: quamvis enim amor dei ad te prior est quam amor tuus ad deum, tamen amor tuus in deum facilius et prius percipitur in corde tuo quam amor dei erga te: a posterioribus ratiocinamur, non a prioribus: vos autem a prioribus vel ab immediatis inspirationibus sive potius phantasmatis.

#### Articulus 29.

Ad hunc articulum Censura unum taxat: quod suspectum reddere conatur vetus testamentum (graeca enim cum non scribantur non leguntur:) itane vero? quid ita? num vos honorem veteris testamenti diminuitis, cum totam legem ceremoniam et paene judicalem sublatam vultis e populo christiano: ea lege qua vos multum, nos plurimum immo totum vetus testamentum e medio tollimus cum Christus idem cruci suae affixit et abolevit: libros vero veteris testamenti et legimus ut decet homines Christianos, eosque exponimus ad normam fidei in novo testamento ab Apostolis Christi traditam, verum tamen quemadmodum vos, sacerdotium, templum, altare, velum, arcam, propitiatorium, discrim[in]a dierum, ciborum, vestium, aliaque id genus sustulistis, ideoque etiam ipsas scripturas et praecepta de hisce rebus quod ad literam attinet completas et amotas vultis, sic et nos de regno reliquisque ad regnum illud externum pertinentibus facimus, sic de circumcissione, de masculo et femina, de primogenitura, et quaecumque ejusdem fami[li]ae in vetere testamento inveniuntur: Litera enim jam obiit, umbra preteriit, corpus et veritas est Christus: vos dicitis, Sacerdotes Levitici abierunt, veri spirituales sacerdotes eorum vice substituuntur: templum illud externum et lapides illi terreni evanuerunt, cum jam adsit spirituale templum ex vivis lapidibus constructum, cujus lapis angularis est Christus, fundamentum reliquum

doctrina apostolorum et prophetarum de Christo: Eadem omnino ratione infans nuper natus masculus cum circumcissione carnali ex novo testamento eijcitur ipsiusque vicem supplet ille verus masculus in cujus corde Christus configuratur qui est ipsa veritas sive sit in masculo sive in femina quorum nullum est discrimen in Jesu Christo: Gal. 3: 28, Gal. 4: 19, Apoc. 12: 5. sic et regnum illud temporarium externum ejusque appendices omnes quod Christum ejusque regnum spirituale figurabant: eadem enim ratione qua vos infantes baptizatis, et magistratus auctoritatem in ecclesia Christi retinetis, possumus nos sacerdotium, altare et victimas ovium et boum reducere, qua vos ratione haec eijcitis eadem et nos reliqua, hoc autem velim vos animadvertere, si magistratum in ecclesia constituitis necesse est vos invenire aliquem e tribu juda et e familia Davidis, qui sedeat in solio Davidis patris ejus secundum dei ordinationem quod cum vobis sit impossibile, valeat ergo externum illud regnum, Christus solus est rex noster, per cujus adventum familiae et domus Davidis genealogia cessavit.

### Articulus 31.

Hic suggeritur a Censura falsa baptismi definitio: rationem nullam audio: ex iis quo supra dicta sunt abunde liquet, praeterea etiam ex forma baptismi a Christo prescripta: Mat. 28: 19. infantum baptismum funditus eradicari: Cum enim baptismus Christi sit in nomine patris, filij et spiritus sancti, post factos discipulos: cum sit proprie nova creatura: cum nova creatura genita sit a patre, ex verbo vitae, per spiritum sanctum, cujus infantes non sunt compotes: cum infantes omnes ut prius dictum et probatum est, sive peccatis aut peccati culpa nati sunt innocentes: quid opus est baptis- mate, utpote signo, cum deest (neque enim adesse opus est), signatum nempe nova creatura, régeneratio: neque est quod inculcetis eandem semper cantilenam de foedere et foederatis, de sanctitate infantum, de circumcissione masculorum, cum certum sit confederationem et sancti- tatem infantum non esse novi testamenti, sed universalis Christi gratia et redemptionis quae ex equo unicuique mortalium communicatur, cumque certum sit circum-

cisionem cum ipso masculino octiduo, per Christi crucem, utpote umbras et figuras, e novi testamenti communione excludi quae est novae creaturae solius communio et foedus. ex ipso articulo sic concludo contra infantum baptismum: Qui doctrinam Evangelij nec audiunt, nec ei credunt, nec poenitentiam agunt, eos non iussit Christus baptizari.

Infantes superiora illa nec agunt nec agere possunt, nec debent.

Ergo Christus non iussit infantes baptizari.

#### Articulus 34.

Hic rursus nobis objicit censura Swenckfeldianum quiddam: quod etiam sacris scripturis adversari ait: cum enim articulus affirmet Christum glorificatum esse vivificum animarum nostrarum panem, cibum et potum dicit hoc contradicere verbis Christi qui ait: hoc est corpus meum: Age rem ipsam penitus introspeciamus: primo huc repetantur ea quae prius dicta sunt de carne Christi naturali et spirituali: Caro Christi naturalis est ea quae in utero virginis concepta, quae postea cruce pendens exanimata est et transfixa a militibus. Caro autem Christi spiritualis est ea quam fideles quotidie comedunt, quae est alius generis de qua Christus dicit Joh. 6: 54, nisi comederitis carnem filij hominis et biberitis sanguinem ejus non habetis vitam in vobis ipsis: et vs. 58: Caro mea vere cibus est et sanguis meus vere potus est: et per hanc comestionem facti sumus caro de carne ejus et os de ossibus ejus. Eph. 5: 30. atque ipsius fratres fimus cum scilicet eandem carnem et sanguinem spiritualem participamus: Heb. 2: 11, 14. quae autem et qualis sit hoc caro spiritualis partim percipitur et Christi ipsius verbis. Mat. 12: 50 is est frater Christi qui facit voluntatem patris sui coelestis: qui enim hoc cum Christo commune habet ut dei mandata observet, is frater est Christi, caro igitur spiritualis Christi est vel oboedientia vera vel aliquid simile: plenius vero percipitur hoc ex verbis Johannis 3: 34. deus dedit filio suo spiritum non secundum mensuram et Joh. 1: 16. ex ipsius plenitudine nos recepimus omnes: hinc filius dei appellatur Messias sive Christus, id est unctus, hoc unguentum sive

oleum est spiritus, quo etiam uncti sunt fideles post Christi ascensum: Hic spiritus est caro spiritualis Christi, non ipse spiritus sanctus, sed spiritus sancti dona celestia quae in corda fidelium effunduntur; haec caro Christi cibus et potus est spiritualis animarum nostrarum, alia illa naturalis caro nihil prodest, Joh. 6: 63. Spiritus sive spiritualis caro vivificat: non quod illa caro naturalis nihil omnino prodest, sed nihil respective agit siquidem illa caro, erat enim victima pro peccatis nostris in humilitate neque pro nostris solum, sed pro peccatis totius mundi: haec erat generalis gratia et beneficium commune: specialis gratia, et beneficium, ecclesia sive corporis Christi peculiare est caro haec spiritualis, quae veram vitam prebet eam comedentibus. Jam quod attinet ad verba scripturae hoc est corpus meum, duplex est ipsius sive compositus sensus: Panis significat utramque utriusque corporis Christi carnem; Panis est figura corporis naturalis: corpus naturale est figura corporis spiritualis: naturalis ipsius caro confossa est et hasta transfixa, spiritualis ipsius caro unicuique distribuitur secundum mensuram donationis Christi, nam ab ipsius plenitudine accepimus omnes, gratiam pro gratia: fracta est ipsius caro naturalis in victimam et hostiam dece[r]ptam deo pro peccatis nostris, distributa est ipsius caro spiritualis pro vita et vivificatione nostra: nam omnes nos comedimus et bibimus in eundem spiritum: Ne autem censura hoc a nobis fingi opinetur, audiamus ipsius domini verba disertissima Mat. 26: 29 non bibam ab hoc tempore, ex hoc fructu vitis usque ad illum diem quum ipsum bibam vobiscum novum in regno patris mei. Quid hoc novum est? nonne manu nos ducit ad novam coenam, quam Christus glorificatus cum discipulis celebrabat, de qua Apostolus sub Christi persona loquitur. Apoc. 3: 20. cenabo cum eo et ipse mecum? hoc cibo et potu spirituali nova creatura quotidie nutritur, crescit, seque extendit in longum, latum, altum, profundum et adolescit in perfectum virum, ad mensuram plenae staturae Christi: hoc non fit per Christi justitiam imputatam quae secundum vestram reformatam doctrinam nullum admittit incrementum, nam justitia imputata non suscipit magis et minus, necessum est ergo hoc fieri in vera illa justitia

quam per novae creaturae augmentum acquirimus: Integra ergo coena perficitur fractione et comestura: fractio figurat corporis naturalis victimam in peccatorum remissione quam omnes vident etiam impij: ejus vero ad oculos ponit novae creaturae cibationem et nutritionem per carnem spiritualem quae vero cibus est, et quae in novae creaturae essentiam transmutatur, ut ex ea fiant fideles Christi fratres germani, per ejusdem spiritualis carnis *κοινωνίαν*, et ejusdem spiritualis sanguinis consanguinitatem, sunt enim duo illi, id est Christus et ecclesia in carnem unam per magnum hoc sacramentum spiritualis hujus coniugis. Eph. 5: 31. 32. 30. Huic satis superque constat, doctrinam hanc hujus articuli esse verissimam et verae consolationis plenissimam, ut ne dicam doctrinam vestram de corpore Christi naturali, ejusque virtute in coena dominica, jejunam, frigidam et insipidam esse, et carnali transubstanti[at]oni papisticae quam proximam.

#### Articulus 36.

In articulo Mennonis iudicium nobis obiicitur, perinde ac si nos juramus in verba cujusvis magistri: verum fortasse censura nostram hic repugnantiam et contradictionem annotat: quid num vos reformati in omnibus vestris dogmatibus unanimes estis? nonne apud vos, quot capita tot sensus? Licet nobis a Mennone discedere, cum Menno discedit a veritate: rationem nostram proferimus quare conjuges sive debita conjugalia vitanda prohibemus ex Matt. 19: 9, ubi aperte ait dominus uxorem non debere dimitti nisi ob adulterium: ergo excommunicatio non dirimit conjugium: error hic de vitandis conjugibus et debitis conjugalibus orta est ex scripturae sinistra interpretatione: sit tibi ut ethnicus et publicanus, id est ut judei non comedebant cibum communem cum ethnicis, sic noli tu comedere coenam domini cum impenitentibus: sic et locus ille 1 Cor. 5 intelligi debet cum hujusmodi ne comedito, nempe coenam domini.

#### Articulus 37.

Hic proverbium nobis exprobrat Censura, Pelliceam vestem lavat, non madefacit, inquit, quid ita? magis-

tratum reveretur, verum in ecclesiam non admittit: credo facile? Sic Paulus et Petrus volunt f[r]atres magistratibus subjici qui ethnici erant: Nos magistratus qui jam Christum profitentur equali dignamur honore cum regibus et senioribus populi Israelitici sub vetere testamento eosque posse eque deo placere credimus atque magistratus ecclesiae judaicae: verum officium magistratus sive usum gladii civilis non agnovit sive Christus sive Apostoli, sive prima illa et pura ecclesia: quid nos? restat ut eorum vestigiis insistamus ne sanctiora et saniora sapimus.

### Articulus 39.

Denique in hoc articulo prejudicium falsum nobis impingit censura; quale quaeso? quam non permittimus fratres et sorores nostras extra ecclesiam dei cum impiis, infidelibus et carnalibus connubio jungi: verba sunt Apostoli pene. I Cor. 7: 39. Uxor post mortem viri libera est ad cui velit nubendum, tantum in domino: ideo sub vetere testamento prohibuit dominus ne judei cum extraneis gentibus conjugio copularentur: Deut. 7: 3. siquidem peregrinae hae nuptiae plerumque piis illecebrae sunt ad impietatem: neque hic falso prejudicamus omnes extra nostras ecclesias esse impios, infideles carnales homines. Minime gentium: Possimus nos salva conscientia quemadmodum nuper de magistratu dictum est, omnes eos qui Christum profitentur et honesti vivunt, eodem statu et conditione habere cum ecclesia judaica: Atque de his hactenus.

Finis.

## ARGUMENTA CONTRA BAPTISMUM INFANTUM

1. Ad quos non pertinet ecclesiae doctrina, ad eos non pertine[n]t ecclesiae sacramenta: ideoque non baptismus.

Ad infantes non pertinet ecclesiae doctrina.

Ergo, ad infantes non pertine[n]t ecclesiae Sacramenta ideoque non baptismus.

Major propositio hoc nititur fundamento quod scilicet omne sacramentum in se doctrinam complectitur, signa enim et symbola sunt quae seipsa et actione explicant ea, qua verbis et oratione enarrantur ab episcopis ecclesiae[.] Sacramenta sunt visibilis verbum: nam enim duo sunt sensus disciplinae, auris et oculus; uterque instruitur a domino; hic sacramentis, illa doctrina ecclesiae; neque sacramenta quicquam aliud edocent, quam quod prius per ecclesiae doctrinam proponebatur. Cum ergo deus duos hosce sensus homini dederit, oculum scilicet ad videndum et aurem ad audiendum: ideo etiam et duplicem ecclesiam instruit, per verbum et per sacramenta: Prov. 20, 12. vide. Exod. 13, 8. 14. 15. 16.

Minor propositio non eget explicatione: praeterea Christus ipse: Mat. 13, 9. et Apoc. 2, 7. aperte monet eos, qui habent aures ad audiendum, ut doctrinam ipsius audiant: inde manifestum est Dominum distinguere velle in[ter] hos infantes et adultos qui rationis usum adepti sunt: sic et Nehem. 8. vers. 2. 3. Ezra dicitur librum legis legisse audientibus et intelligentibus[.] Surdo narrat fabulam, qui infantibus doctrinam ecclesiae proponit. Sic et caecum consulit de coloribus qui infantes aqua baptismatis abluunt. Cum ergo intellectus humanus realiter instituitur per visum, gustum, olfactum, tactum in sacramentis ecclesiae, 1 Joh. 1, 1

quemadmodum verbaliter edocetur ex auditu in verbi ministerio, cumque infantes nihilomagi instruuntur visu, olfactu, gustu, tractu per medium sacramentorum, quam auditu per ministerium verbi: exinde manifestum est, cum utrumque infantibus non competit, ergo neutrum ad eos pertinere.

## 2. argumentum.

Qui non possunt doceri, ij non debent baptisari.

Infantes non possunt doceri.

Ergo infantes non debent baptisari.

Major colligitur ex Mathei cap. 28. vers. 19. *μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες*: ubi Christus praecipit ut prius doceantur, deinde baptisantur: Si prius docendi sunt, quam baptisandi, tum ij qui non possunt doceri, non debent baptisari: Ideoque praxis Christi Johan. 4. 1. huic praecepto consona erat: dicitur enim discipulos fecisse et baptisasse: verum adversarij primos infantes baptisant, deinde eos docent; hoc autem est christi praeceptum violare atque irritum facere: Non enim ea solum agenda sunt quae praecipit dominus, sed eundem etiam ordinem observare debemus quam dominus instituit: Exuite veterem hominem (inquit Apostolus) et induite novum: Si quis prius vellet novum hominem induere quam veterem exuisset nonne frustra operam impenderet? eadem ratio: ne operam abutuntur qui infantes aqua baptismatis tingunt, prius quam eos disciplina ecclesiae instituerunt; eum Christus apertissime praecipit; Docere ut fiant discipuli, et baptisate:

Minor absque omni controversia est: nam etsi quidam asserunt infantes a spiritu sancto doceri, eque atque spiritu sancto impleri; tamen hoc nihil ad rem, cum christus non loquitur de spiritus interno ministerio et eruditione, sed de externa ecclesiastici ministerij institutione et doctrina. Jubet enim dominus apostolos suos, gentes docere et baptisare: hoc ergo duo sunt Apostolorum opera, non spiritus sancti: Deinde impleri spiritu sancto non significat, quenquam a spiritu sancto, in infantia, doctrina resipiscentiae aut fidei imbui, sed potius spiritus ductu et praeventione habilem fieri ad destinatum munus in posterum ducendum, eodem pene modo, quo infans



rationalis est[:] vide. Judicum. cap. 13. vers 25. et Lucae 1. 15. 80. Unde concludere possumus, cum Christus mandavit discipulos baptizare, infantes autem non possunt doceri aut discere ut fiant discipuli, ideo ad eos baptismum non pertinere.

### 3. argumentum.

Qui non agunt poenitentiam non sunt baptisandi.

Infantes non agunt poenitentiam.

Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Propositio major confirmatur ex ipsa baptismi institutione, nam Joannes baptista dicitur baptismum poenitentiae predicasse: Luc. 3. 3. et Petrus ait Act. 2. 38. Resipiscite, et baptizetur unusquisque. Unde liquide constat Resipiscentiam esse baptismi conditionem: sic enim conc[i]l[i]atio inter signum et signatum prae se fert: nam resipiscentia in animo est id ipsum quod Aqua[e] ablutio in corpore: baptismus abluit sordes a corpore, sic et poenitentia vera abluit peccatum: Infantibus autem deest signatum qua est poenitentia, ineptum est igitur signum illis impertire nempe baptismum aquae.

Minor propositio non eget multa explicatione, cum manifestum sit infantes adhuc usum rationis non esse adeptos. Resipiscentia autem, sive sit *μετάνοια*; sive *μεταμέλεια*; est perfu[n]ctus et absolutus rationis usus: *μετάνοια* enim est actus mentis; propositum scilicet animi de vita corrigenda: *μεταμέλεια* autem est cordis sollicitudo et anxietas de vitae anteactae ratione: uterque autem hic rationis actus confirmatus deprehenditur in solis actu ratiocinantibus, non impotentia rationalibus, in adultis non in infantibus. Etenim animi propositum a malo in bonum commutare; conscientiae stimulos per-sentiscere; dolore et tristitia affer[r]i ob admissa peccata; vota et promissa de vita emendanda; Assidua diligentia, et impiger conatus in eundem finem; haec omnia inquam quae vel partes vel adjuncta sunt verae poenitentiae longe absunt ab infantibus, ergo et ipsa poenitentia. nihil autem moror quod quidam affirmant infantes potentia vel inclinatione haec omnia habere quod ipsis sufficeret; nam ea ratione etiam coenam participarent infantes quia potentia possunt seipsos examinare: verum

ad ecclesiae privilegia participanda non potentia sed actus requiritur, poenitentiae et fidei: ideo Joannes ait poenitentiam agite: μετανοείτε. Mat. 3.

#### 4 argumentum.

Qui non credunt, non sunt baptisandi.

Infantes non credunt: Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Major constat ex verbis Philippi ad Eunuchum Act. 8. 37. Si credis ex toto corde poteris baptisari. et christi Marc. 16. 16. qui crediderit et baptisatus fuerit, salvabitur. Siquidem sacrae literae duo haec simul conjungunt, fidem et baptismum, baptismus est signum fidei per quam remissionem peccatorum et eorundem purgationem in sanguine Christi adipiscimur: fides est res signata in baptismo quae cor purgat a peccatis ut aqua corporis sordes abluit: Act. 15. 9. Si quis forte obijciat haec scripturae testimonia ad adultos solos pertinere, non autem ad infantes: sed eandem esse infantum rationem sub novo testamento atque sub veteri: cum baptismus circumcisioni successit: respondeo: neque baptismum aquae circumcisionis vires supplere sub novo testamento, sed mortificationem peccati: (nam figura non respondit figurae sed veritati) neque eandem esse infantum rationem sub utroque testamento cum illic masculi tantum circumcidebantur, hic mas et foemina baptisandi sunt: cumque masculus octiduus circumcidebatur non sui ipsius causa quod ipsi opus esset vel externa vel interna circumcissione, sed solum astantium ergo, qui hoc symbolo externo instituebantur; quod circumcissio ipsis in memoriam reserabat foedus ictum cum ipsis eorumque in foedere officium, cordis scilicet circumcissionem: verum nec foedus nec conditio foederis nempe circumcissio cordis ad infantes pertinebat, qui peccatis vacui in statu innocentiae adhuc constituti, permanserunt. Masculum autem assumpsit dominus non foeminam, ut primogenitum, non reliquos fratres mysterij caussa. Ut christum venturum prefigureret, omnesque in Christo regenitos, sive mares sint, sive foeminae. Colos. 1. 15. Gal. 3. 28.

Minor etiam per se satis manifesta est, atque ex praemissis argumentis confirmari potest, etenim cum

infantes, nec capaces sunt doctrinae ecclesiae quae ad eos non pertinet, neque ullos rationis actus edunt credere procul dubio nequeunt, cum fides ex auditu verbi divini creatur Rom. 10. 14. futile est illud quod objiciunt adversarij, semen fidei inesse infantibus nam primo semen fidei est verbum dei, quod non est in infantibus: deinde si semen fidei interpretentur inclinationem ad fidem, nego specialem aliquam in infantibus fidelium esse inclinationem ad fidem supra infantes aliorum, omnes enim infantes sub eadem conditione nati sunt creati scilicet ad imaginem dei, peccato vacui, rationales. Gen. 1. 27. et Gen. 3. 2. et 9. 2. Psalm 8. 4-8.

#### 5 argumentum.

Qui peccato vacui in innocentia sua permanent, non sunt baptisandi.

Infantes peccato vacui in innocentia sua permanent.

Ergo Infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Ratio majoris propositio[nis] haec est, quod baptismus symbolum est remissionis peccatorum et mortificationis; nam quemadmodum ablutio aquae sordes corporis expurgat, sic animae peccatum purgatur remissum et mortificatum. Cum igitur infantes non egent aut peccatorum remissione, aut mortificatione, in innocentiae statu consistentes, baptismus infantibus non competit qui eorundem beneficiorum symbolum est.

Minor propositio aliquantulum in dubium vocatur, cujus veritas inde constat, quod omne peccatum voluntarium est. Jacob. 1. 15. Infantes autem neque mentis neque voluntatis actus ullos persentiunt, neque a peccato tentantur Sathanae motu et instigatione, neque ullos concupiscentiae motus persentiunt, quibus assentiantur: Si quis autem velit hinc concludere nos tenere Redemptionem christi ad infantes sese non extend[er]e: respondemus minimi gentium: nam Redemptionis christi tria sunt beneficia, unum ut peccata remittantur et mortificentur: alterum ut peccatis adeptis, pristinus innocentiae status restituatur: tertium ut vera justitia id est nova creatura locum subeat: Christus ergo servat populum suum a peccatis suis dupliciter, primo tollit peccata ubi sunt, secundo impedit peccata ne sint. Sic

credibile est bonos angelos christi redemptionem participare. Colos. 1. 16–20. et bruta animalia etiam liberationem expetant et participant per christum. Rom. 8. 19–22. Et christus dicitur redemisse eos qui ipsum abnegant. 2 Petrus 2. 1. Si bruta liberantur per Christum, si angeli boni confirmantur per christum, si impij redimuntur per Christum, si Maria virgo (ut affirmant papistae) exultat in Christo servatore suo, quod ipsam conservasset ne peccaret, quidni etiam ut nos affirmemus infantes aliquod beneficium per Christi redemptionem nancisci, etsi non assecuntur remissionem peccatorum quae non habeant, cum sint innoxij. Si ergo quispiam affirmaret posteritatem Adae per peccatum originale commaculatam esse, respondeo fieri non potest ut Christi redemptio angustior esset quam Adae transgressio: Ideoque cum Christus agnus occisus sit ab initio mundi, mors Christi prevenit peccatum originale ne transiret per traducem ad posteros Adae.

#### 6. argumentum.

Aut infantes debent coenam dominicam comedere, aut non debent baptisari.

At infantes non debent coenam domini comedere.

Ergo infantes non debent baptisari.

Disjunctio necessaria est, quia qui digne potest unum sacramentum participare, potest et alterum: cum eadem sit utriusque natura et conditio: eadem enim beneficia in utroque sacramento proponuntur: eadem conditio ad utriusque sacramenti communicationem requiritur: Coena domini remissionem peccatorum praefigurat in fractione panis et vini effusione, quae symbola sunt mortis et sacrificij Christi: aquae ablutio in baptismate id ipsum ante oculos ponit, fides et poenitentia requiruntur ad Eucharistiam participandam: Eadem etiam desiderantur ad baptismum ut prius probavimus: Argumentis 3 et 4. vide Act. 2. 38. et Act. 8. 37. ubi Petrus exigit resipiscentia[m] a judeis ante baptismum, et Philippus fidem ab Eunuchis: Deinde si velimus veteris testamenti figuras inspicere, unusquisque circumcisis comedebat pascha et panem [azijmum] dies septem: atque omnis masculus in festo paschatis comparebat coram Domino:

Deut. 16. 16. Luc. 2. 41. 42. 43. Si ergo ut adversarij volunt infantes baptisandi sunt, quia sub vetere testamento circumcidebantur masculi octidui, eadem ratione et coenam domini comedent, quia pascha comedebant infantes: Exod. 12. 47. Luc. 2. 42. Cum ergo eadem gratia proponatur in utroque sacramento, videlicet remissio et ablutio peccatorum per sacrificium et sanguinem Christi, cumque una eademque conditio requiritur ab ijs qui utrumque sacramentum participant, fides scilicet et poenitentia, necessum est ut infantes aut utrumque sacramentum aut neutrum communicent. Assumptum facile concedunt adversarij: affirmant enim ad coenae participationem ab apostolo desiderari probationem sui ipsius: et recte nam Christus coenam solis apostolis suis distribuebat viris scilicet aetate provectis, et discipuli congregati erant ad frangendum panem. Act. 20. 7. inter discipulos autem sunt foeminae Act. 9. 36. Soli ergo discipuli admittendi sunt ad coenam domini, infantes autem non sunt discipuli Christi, quod non possunt doceri ut fiant discipuli: Verum sciendum est hoc argumentum tantas in se vires habere ad veritatem corroborandam ut quidam in dubium vocant an coena domini etiam infantibus praebenda sit cum fateantur utriusque sacramenti eandem esse rationem et coenam respondere Paschati, ut baptismum circumcisioni.

#### 7 argumentum.

Quorum corda non aspera sunt a mala conscientia, eorum corpora non sunt abluenda aqua pura baptismatis.

Corda infantum non sunt aspera a mala conscientia.

Ergo infantum corpora non sunt abluenda aqua pura baptismatis.

Majoris consequentia habetur ad Heb. cap. 10 vs. 22. 23. ubi tum signum tum signatum ab Apostolo copulantur et sibi invicem adjunguntur[:] signum est ablutio corporis elemento aquae: Signatum est aspersione, id est purgatio cordis a conscientia mala per sanguinem Christi: ubi serio animadvertenda est collatio ex propositis figurae et veritatis, sive sacramenti et rei sacramenti: nisi adsit malae conscientiae aspersione, non dolet adesse purae aquae ablutio: nam haec se invicem ponunt et auferunt:

Quemadmodum enim umbra sequitur corpus, sic ablutio aquae, conscientiae aspersionem. baptismus sine conscientiae aspersione per sanguinem Christi facta, est quiddam monstris simile, nempe umbra sine corpore: firmissima est ergo majoris consequentia nisi velimus umbram a corpore divellere, eaque seperare quae dominus institutione divina copulavit.

Assumptionis veritas pendet partim ex quinti argumenti ratione quia infantes in innocentiae statu permanent, ideoque nullos conscientiae stimulos habent qui illos pungant aut vigeant, quibus liberentur: partim quia conscientia mala originem suam habet a peccatis actualibus contra scientiam et cognitudinem admissi[s]: nam conscientia est contra scientiam, vel cum scientia: sic graece dicitur *συνείδησις*: idest scientia cum accusatione vel excusatione. nam in conscientia est *συντήρησις* sive memoria eorum quae bene vel male fecimus: In infantibus nulla est memoria: nulla accusatio ob male facta vel ob bene facta excusatio: nulla scientia, nam nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuit in sensu: neque aures habent ad audiendum neque oculus ad videndum qui proprii sunt sensus disciplinae. Ergo neque bonam neque malam conscientiam habent: nullam omni[n]o habent conscientiam: quia conscientia oritur ex scientia: sunt rationales creaturae, id est potentiam habent satis amandi, intelligendi, recordandi, sciendi, verum horum omnium nihil habent actu[:] verum actus, rationes, intellectus, memoriae, scientia boni et mali requiruntur ad conscientiam sive bonam sive malam producendam. Et quemadmodum Adam, antequam comederet de arbore scientiae boni et mali erat nudus neque tamen pudore suffusus: Sic omnes infantes ad ipsius exemplar comparati sunt, nullos persentiunt conscientiae motus, dum scientiam boni et mali assequuntur.

### 8 Argumentum.

Qui non habent remissionem peccatorum, non sunt baptisandi.

Infantes non habent remissionem peccatorum.

Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Ratio consequentiae majoris propositionis petitur ex

institutione baptismi nam dicitur *baptisma poenitentiae in remissionem peccatorum Luc. 3. 3.* nam per baptismum aquae remissio peccatorum ante oculos ponitur: ubi ergo non est signatum, frustra et temere adhibetur signum: neque credibile est voluisse Dominum Christum, qui in se omnes thesauros scientiae et sapientiae habet, tam jejune et frigide rem tractare scilicet signum divinum abrasae tabulae appendere: haec siquidem differentia est inter christum filium et Mosen servum, quod Lex per Mosen lata umbram futurorum bonorum habuit: ideoque sacramenta veteris testamenti non presentia sed futura bona prefigurarent. Christus autem filius in carne exhibitus ecclesiae sub novo testamento sacramenta reliquit ejusmodi, quae partem saltem futurorum bonorum presupponunt, alias nullum esset discrimen inter sacramenta veteris et novi testamenti: Potuit infans sub vetere testamento tum circumcidi, tum etiam pascha manducare quia haec sacramenta erant futurorum bonorum. Heb. 10. 1. Verum sub novo testamento illicitum est infantibus vel baptisari vel coenam comedere quia sub novo testamento bona ipsa adesse debent vel saltem pars aliqua bonorum quae sub veteri prefigurabantur: debet ergo adesse peccatorum remissio, aliter baptismus non potest merito vindicari. Quod infantes non habent remissionem peccatorum siquidem constat, tum ex prioribus argumentis, tum ex re ipsa, omnes enim uno ore fatentur infantes peccata actualia nulla perpetrasse: baptismus autem non significat alterius peccati imputati remissionem, cum non aliorum sordes, sed propriae a corporibus baptisatorum abluuntur, nec infantes ulla peccati labe contaminantur cum Christi gratia universalis peccati traducem et scaturiginem praeoccupavit: cumque remissio peccatorum fide sola apprehenditur, quae ex audito evangelio suum habet ortum et originem, mediante spiritus sancti operatione in intellectu et corde hominum adutorum, infantes autem neque fidem habent neque aures habent ad audiendam evangelij promulgationem, neque intelligunt ea quae a spiritu sancto suggeruntur, ergo manifestum est infantes remissionem peccatorum non habere. denique si fateremur infantes peccatum originale habere (quod negamus) ejusque remissionem ad ipsum, non

ex inde sequitur debere baptisari, quod baptismus est signum remissionis peccatorum non peccati unius ejusque involuntarij. vide Rom. 5. 26. Luc. 3. 3.

### 9. argumentum.

Qui non possunt viam domini praeparare, non debent baptisari.

Infantes non possunt viam domini praep[ar]are.

Ergo infantes non debent baptisari.

Consequentiae ratio pendet ex prima baptismatis institutione, nam Johannis Baptistae officium erat viam domini rectam facere: quod perfecit ille partim doctrina, partim sacramento baptismatis. Mat. 3. 3. Esaiae. 40. 3. Johannis doctrina erat poenitentia ad remissionem peccatorum: via domini praeparatur implendo valles, depri-mendo montes, rectificando curva, aspera complanando: ut ergo Johannis baptisma administrari posset, praedictae conditiones desiderabantur, baptismus enim erat doctrinae praecedentis sacramentum sive emblema ut mysterium sacrum. Ergo Johannes non baptisabat vel impenitentes ut phariseos et Sadducaeos. Matt. 3. 8. Luc. 7. 30. vel non poenitentes infantes quibus poenitentia non erat opus, neque baptismus poenitentiae: nam qui ab eo baptisaba[n]tur confessi sunt peccata sua quod infantes non potuerunt facere. Mat. 3. 6. et Luc. 3. 10. 12. 14. Sed homines poenitentiam agentes qui viam domini parabant in cordibus suis, per veram contritionem—humiliationem, et conversionem. Luc. 1. 17. qui externi signi significationem remque ipsam internam habebunt[:] quod hic obijciunt adversarij nullius ponderis est, nempe non loqui hoc in loco Evangelistam de infantibus sed de adultis, neque opus esse ut baptismatis eorum mentionem faceret, cum notum satis erat judeis baptismum in locum circumcisionis succedere: nam primo id falsum est quod affirmant baptismum externum circumcisioni manufactae respondere ut supra probatum est. deinde quare in actis apostolorum nulla sit mentio baptismatis infantum inter Ethnicos, quibus circumcisionis lex incognita erat: si respondeant gentes legem illam a Judeis didicisse affirmo ego hoc esse conjecturam non rectissimam veritatem: denique magna est Evangelistarum et Apostolorum incuria, si baptisarint



infantes tum judeorum tum Ethnicorum, quod hujus facti ne semel meminerint: cum id maxime debuit fieri in tanti sacramenti institutione: non debuit fieri inquit adversarij: debuit inquam, nam non successit baptismus circumcisioni; si enim hoc verum esset, quare abstulit dominus circumcisionem praeputij ut induceret baptismum aquae, umbra non respondet umbrae sed corpus: Christus est Pascha: et Christus est circumcisio nostra, sic ait Petrus baptisma non externum sed internum est ἀντίτυπον. 1 Pet. 3. 21. id est A. vicem supplet typi. Assumptio patet ex reipsa, nam infantes non agunt poenitentiam, non confitentur peccata, non implent valles, non deprimunt montes, non rectificant curva, non complanant aspera, non convertunt corda, ergo non parant viam domini neque rectas faciunt semitas ejus: ideoque non perficiunt doctrinam baptismi.

#### 10. argumentum.

Si sacramenta novi testamenti multo praestantiora sunt sacramentis veteris testamenti: tum infantes non sunt baptisandi:

At sacramenta novi testamenti multo praestantiora sunt sacramentis veteris testamenti.

Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Ratio consequentiae haec est, quod externum signum nempe baptismus aquae non antecellit circumcisionem manibus factam, immo baptismus aquae erat sub veteri testamento. Heb. 9. 10. Ideoque excellentia et dignitas sacramentorum testamenti novi non consistit in externo signo, sed in persona sacramentum participante: Ergo si infantes in novo testamento baptisandi sunt uti in veteri testamento circumcidebantur, nulla est praestantia sacramenti, quod ad personam attinet, in novo testamento: et sic sacramenta utriusque testamenti paria et dignitate aequalia futura sunt: quod Christi officia non parum derogat, cum Christus novi testamenti Legislator, et ipse filius in domo patris sui sit: Heb. 3. 6.

Assumptionis veritas praecipue convertitur, quae tamen facile confirmari possit si rationem habeamus, personae Christi; conditionis ecclesiae; atque plenitudinis temporis: Quod ad christi personam attinet jubet

pater coelitus ipsum audire. Mat. 17. 5. ejusque officium erat neque inferius, nec solum Mosis officio par: sed multo perfectius et magis veritati congruum: Per Mosen lex data est: veritas per Christum accidit; Ergo quicquid instituit Christus multo nobilior et praestantior erat Mosaicis ceremonijs: deinde quod attinet ad ecclesiae statum et conditionem, vetus ecclesia judaica infanti assimilatur, vel in cunis vagienti, vel cum matrice saltem balbutienti Gal. 4. 3. ecclesia autem novi testamenti viro provectae etatis comparatur, qui incunabula dereliquit, quique sapientiam loquitur cum perfectis. 1. Cor. 13. 14. I Cor. 2. 6. ideoque sacramenta novi testamenti comparata sunt ad statum et conditionem ecclesiae quae consistit ex viris quasi perfectis. Denique si temporis plenitudinem respiciamus sacramenta novi testamenti, plenam et completam (ut ita dico) instructionem et doctrinam in se contineant necessum est, quae non competit infantibus, qui nullius doctrinae capaces sunt: Omnia ergo externa ecclesiae externae mysteria, quia sub Christo administrantur in carne exhibitio, corpus quoddam et substantiam sibi substratum habent, verum fidem, poenitentiam, conversionem, neque sunt nuda signa, umbrae merae, aut figurae superficialia, quales erant veteris testamenti ceremoniae.

### II argumentum.

Si solus Christus, utpote Doctor coelestis audiendus est, in ecclesia novi testamenti tum infantes non sunt baptisandi.

At solus Christus utpote D. coelestis audiendus est in ecclesia novi testamenti.

Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Consequentiam satis probat silentium spiritus sancti in scriptis apostolicis novi testamenti, nullibi enim monet sp. sanctus baptismum infantum, ne in ipsius prima institutione inter judeos, vel postea inter gentes: neque sufficit quod afferunt adversarij, posse baptismum infantum facile intelligi ex circumcissione marium in veteri testamento: nam tum Christus solus non esset audiendus sed et Moses: Si ergo debemus Christum solum audire, in omnibus novi testamenti negotijs et

institutionibus, tum vel Christus debet nos docere baptismum infantum, vel si non docuit non debent baptizari, nam a Mose non debet infantum baptismus mutatus accipi[.] Verum adversarij nostri graviter hic hallucinantur cum volunt Christum baptismum instituere, Mosen vero personam infantis non totam illam et integram, sed masculam solam, femellam autem introducunt per quasdam (nescio quas) consequentias a libertate et latitudine evangelij ductas: utcumque se res habet, fateantur necessum est Christum non tam dilucide, non tam perfecte externam novi testamenti ecclesiam suis privilegijs instruxisse, atque Moses veteris ecclesiae ceremonias instituerat: cum opus nobis est Mosis infante masculo, et consequentia (nescio qua) pro femella in baptismatis institutione, alias Christi, doctrina non est absoluta.

Minor propositio confirmatur partim elogio patris e caelo facto. Mat. 17. 5. hic est filius meus dilectus ipsum audite, partim Mosis testimonio. Deut. 18. 15. et Act. 3. 22. ipsum audietis in omnibus. Si enim Moses audiendus esset in una parte unius ceremoniae, quid ne in reliquis omnibus tum ceremonijs tum ceremoniarum partibus et si Christus solus audiendus sit; non est confugiendum ad Mosen; non possunt Moses et Christus permisceri, quin Christus imperfectus habendus est sine Mose: minime vero iniquiunt adversarij, quia plurima petenda sunt ex veteri testamento, quae tamen Christus per Mosen stabilivit: at verò inquam quod attinet ad ceremonias in novi testamenti ecclesiam receptas nihil a Mose petendum est quod Christus ipse non stabilivit: nam Christus per crucem suam Mosaicam omnes ceremonias et figuras abolevit, exceptis ijs quos ipse pro coelesti sua sapientia expressis verbis et praeceptis in ecclesia novi testamenti et praeceptis retinuit: cum ergo infans masculus octiduius est, ceremonia non potest retineri in usu baptismi nisi velimus totam legem mosaicam introducere in ecclesiam novi testamenti cum ipse Christus neque praecepto, neque exemplo vspiam nobis mandavit ejusmodi infantem ad baptismum sacrum admittere: quem ipse in veteri testamento vtpote umbram et figuram constituerat. Gal. 3. 28.

## 12 argumentum.

Nudae umbrae non debent baptisari.

Infantes sunt nudae umbrae.

Ergo infantes non debent baptisari.

Major propositio pendet ex proportione ecclesiae veteris testamenti ad ecclesiam novi testamenti: tota enim mosaica paedagogia erat umbra et figura futurorum bonorum, sic ait Apostolus. ad Heb. 10. vs. 1. ecclesia ipsa, membra ecclesiae, sacerdotes, Levitae, masculi, foeminae, primogeniti, reliqui fratres, animalia pura et impura, judeus, graecus, templum, terra sancta, civitas sancta, cibus et potus, vestes, denique quid non? totusque populus Israeliticus per has ceremonias instituebatur tam quod per rudimenta, sive elementa mundi *στοιχῆα κτίσεως* Gal. 4. 3. ad corpus ipsum sive veritatem Christi, hae umbrae nudae et simplices non admittuntur in communionem novi testamenti, ejusque mijsteriorum participationem; Etenim Joannes baptista ab ipsis judeis, immo a phariseis legis doctoribus poenitentiam exigebat priusquam eos ad baptismum suum admisit: potuissent Pharisei Joanni objecisse hunc in modum. sumus nos filij Abrahae, populus dei cumque deus foedus suum pepigerat, circumcisi octavo die, docti in lege dei, inexpressibiles et inculpati quod attinet ad legis justitiam, non ergo debes nos abigere a baptisate tuo, unquam baptisma tuum sanctius quiddam est quam omnia veteris testamenti privilegia? licitum ne nobis est illa participare, tuque nobis baptisma tuum sub conditione poenitentiae proponis. Respondet Joannes: omnia illa praedicta privilegia nullius sunt momenti ad novi testamenti ecclesiam et sacramenta participanda: opus vobis est cordis contritione et conversione, vera poenitentia et fide in presentem Messiam Jesum qui me fortior et robustior est, cujus ego precursor sum ut viam ejus parem. Nox abiit, dies adest, umbrae veteris testamenti evanuerunt, veritas in earum locum successit, ignorantiam priorem illam connivendo dissimulavit dominus: jam admonet omnes ubique homines ut resipiscant, non solum gentes et Ethnicos verum et vos judeos etiam, nam altius quiddam vobis jam proponit, magis quiddam ergo a

vobis exigit ut in regnum coelorum admittamini: jam adest regnum coelorum, respiscite itaque et credite evangelio, et baptisabimini. Quod infantes sunt nudae umbrae, apparet ex consideratione maris et foeminae, mas circumcidebatur, foemina non: qua re? quia mas Christum masculum denotabat, Apoc. 12. 5. et in Christo omnes regenitos Apoc. 2. 26. 27. foemina significat contrarium id est non regenitos: quod intelligitur partim per proportionem sexus, partim ex verbis Apostoli. ad Gal. 3. vs. 28 non enim circumcidebantur masculi quod per circumcisionem in foedus admittebantur, sed quod nudae erant umbrae et figurae. Sic primogenitus: etc:

### 13 argumentum.

Aut omnes infantes baptisandi sunt; aut nulli:

Sed omnes infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Ergo nulli infantes debent baptisari.

Disjunctio necessaria est: sunt enim hoc contraria sine medio; omnes enim omnium mortalium infantes eadem sorte et conditione nati sunt, tum quod ad peccatum, peccati poenam et gratiam Christi universalem attinet: neque jam ulla est differentia inter judeum et graecum, sed materia jam diruta est per Christi mortem, et uterque populus deo reconciliatus est. Eph. 2. 13-18. Si ergo quispiam somnare vellet foedus particulare, Apostoli verba aperte huic errori refragantur et coelitus demissum linteum quadrupedibus, feris, reptilibus, volatilibus refertum Act. 10. 15. 11. docet gentes jam puros esse et sub foedere atque judeos: ideoque etiam et eorum liberos: neque objectio illa trita ullas in se vires habet quae volunt adversarij gentes deficientes vel absistentes ab evangelij gratia, ex foedere exclusos esse; minime quidem; gratia enim foederis divini non irrita est per infidelitatem hominum, Rom. 3. 3. 4. et quamvis decem tribus Israelis apostatae erant, et defecerant a gratia dei, tamen foedus cum Abrahamo ictum firmum et inviolatum permansit ex parte dei, et adhuc sub divino foedere continebatur. Rom. 9. 1-15 et 11. vers 1. 2. 28. Cum ergo omnes infantes tum gentium tum judeorum sunt sub foedere divino comprehensi una cum parentibus: ergo aut omnes aut nulli sunt baptisandi

volunt enim adversarij infantes confoederatos esse baptisandos. Verum ipsi adversarij affirmant omnes infantes non debere baptisari quod pro lucro nostro assumimus: concessionem enim adversariorum licet nobis ad lucrum nostrum apponere: verum tamen fundamentum concessionis illorum omni[n]o improbamus, fingunt enim semen infidelium pollutum et contaminatum, a domino rejectum ob parentum infidelitatem: quasi vero dominus a gratia sua aliquem excluderet ob alterius peccata? minime gentium: testatur enim dominus apertissime animam quae peccat morituram, non filium moriturum ob peccata parentum. Ezech. 18. accidit aliquando ut poena temporaria castigantur infantes una cum parentibus, sic et bruta animalia: sed ut quispiam poenas aeternas lucet ob alterius peccata, contradicit tum divinae justitiae, tum misericordiae dei et Christi qui inimicos suos amore prosequitur, multo magis nescentes infantes: immo tanta est divinae misericordiae immensitas ut poenam temporariam differat ob infantum et brutorum causam, quemadmodum videre est Jonae 4. 11. Etsi ergo concessionem adversariorum amplectimur, omnes scilicet infantes non debere baptisari, tamen fundamentum hujus assertionis rejicimus: et dicimus deum neminem, nedum innocentes odio habere.

#### 14. argumentum.

Si Johannis baptistae ministerium praestantius est, omnium prophetarum ministerio, tum infantes non debent baptisari.

At ministerium Joannis praestantius est reliquorum prophetarum ministerio.

Ergo infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Consequentia majoris patet ex collatione ministerij Mosis et Joannis baptistae: Moses erat maximus propheta sub veteri testamento: Deut. 34. vs. 10. Moses instituit in ecclesia veteris testamenti circumcisionem. Joan. 7. 19–23. ut circumcideretur masculus octiduum: Si Johannes baptista qui primus spiritus ductu baptismum introduxit, infantum baptismum instituit, ejus officium et ministerium Mosis ministerio solummodo par, non superius aut praestantius esset: nam Moses etiam instituebat circumcisionem adultorum proselytarum, quemadmodum

Joannes baptismum adultorum: ergo quod attinet ad personas nullum est discrimen: deinde quod attinet ad signum videtur circumcisionem baptismum longe antecellere respectu significationis: in circumcisione enim, sanguis effundebatur, cum magno dolore infantis circumcisi pars carnis abscissa mortificabatur, impressa erat genitali cicatrix, sive sigillum; quae omnia profunda pietatis mysteria exprimunt: viz: suum et sanguinem et vitam peccati debere effundi: cor contritum et dolore secundum deum fractum et humiliatum: carnis mortificationem: spiritus sigillum sive arrham post carnem mortificatam, quod est nova creatura. Ergo circumcisio plenissime et apertissime explicat totam novi testamenti doctrinam. baptismus autem Joannis haec eadem mysteria non tam dilucide et distincte exprimit, praeterea baptismus erat sub veteri testamento. Dignitas ergo et excellentia ministerij Joannis non est in signo, nec in personis sacramento signatis: debet ergo alibi exquiri; nempe in conditione baptismi: Conditio Joannis baptismi erat poenitentia et fides in Messiam presentem: per quem via domini parabatur: vel ergo hae conditionis debent adesse in baptisate aquae, vel ministerium Joannis nihilo dignius est ministerio Mosis.

Quod ministerium Johannis dignius et praestantius est ministerio reliquorum prophetarum, et Mosis ipsius, apparet ex verbis Christi: Mat. 11. 9-13. quodque Joannes Christum digito ostendebat, non solum digito corporis, sed doctrina quae Christum Christique officium vivis coloribus exprimebat: Siquidem haec sunt dignissima de Christi officio elogia: Ecce agnus dei qui tollit peccata mundi: Hic est sponsus qui habet sponsam, fortior me est et baptisat spiritu sancto et igni. Purgabit aream, colliget triticum in granarium, paleam comburet igni inextinguibili: talia non docuit Moses.

#### 15 argumentum.

Si ministerium Johannis sit principium evangelij Christi, et tamen minus ministerio Christi: tum infantes non sunt baptisandi.

At ministerium Johannis est principium evangelij Jesu Christi, et tamen minus ministerio Christi.

Ergo Infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Connexio propositionis certissimam veritatem in se continet, etsi non cuivis obviam: nam principium Evangelij est a baptismo Johannis: tum enim incipit Christus nuntium illud salutare, et laetitia plenam cordibus poenitentiam et fidelium promulgare et patefacere: infantibus evangelij principium non revelatur neque ad infantes pertinet, nam illi non opus habent nuntio hoc salutari cum adhuc integri et liberi a peccato in innocentia permanent, soli autem peccatores qui conscientiae stimulis ob peccata admissa urgentur, hac Evangelij consolatione egent; ideoque ministerium Johannis infantes non attingit: deinde cum ministerium Joannis minus sit ministerio Christi; et tamen ad ejus ministerium praeparatio et praevia quasi dispositio per poenitentiam scilicet et fidem opus sit: inde manifesto apparet, quod Johannis baptisma neque infantes attingit, quibus nulla opus est praeparatione, ut ad Christum adducantur cum numquam a Christo recesserint per peccata actualia; neque regenitos, qui Christi baptisma, id est novam creaturam, vel spiritus effusionem in corda sua assecuti sunt; sed quod sit mediae cujusdam naturae, quodque filium prodigum respicit, et ovem errantem ab ovili, nempe homines peccatis actualibus pollutos et contaminatos: ergo Joannes praeparat viam Christo: quod nobis significat viam adhuc non esse praeparatam, sed esse inaequalem et asperam: collibus et vallibus praesumptionis et desperationis, aliorumque peccatorum, quibus Christi adventus impeditur, refertam.

Assumptio manifesta est ex duobus scripturae testimonijs Marc. 1. 2-3. Et Mat. 3. 11. Marcus ait, Principium Evangelij Christi est a baptismo Joannis: et Matthaeus ait, qui venit post me validior me est; ergo Joannis ministerium est infirmius ministerio Christi, et tamen Evangelium Jesu a ministerio Joannis initium suum habet; ideoque Apostolus ad Heb. 6. vs. 1. 2. appellat baptismum, poenitentiam et fidem, sermonem principij Christi sive fundamenti: *λόγον τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ θεμέλιον.* totum ergo ministerium Joannis tribus hisce circumscribitur, ab Apostolo Paulo Act. 19 vs. 4: verum haec tria minora sunt Christi ministerio, quae proprie regeneratio, nova creatura, sive spiritus baptisma est.



## 16 argumentum.

Si Christus servat populum suum a peccatis suis; tum infantes non sunt baptisandi.

At Christus servat populum suum a peccatis suis.

Ergo Infantes non sunt baptisandi.

Ratio consequentiae haec est, quod cum baptismus sit symbolum purgationis peccatorum per sanguinem Christi, baptismus non competit ijs qui peccatorum expurgatione non egent id est infantibus: Infantes non habent peccata quae possunt expurgari, in innocentia sua adhuc permanent, cursus enim atque fluxus peccati originalis intercipitur per Christi mortem, qui agnus occisus est ab initio mundi, adeo vt peccatum non sit extraducere: nam mors Christi aequae ampla et efficax est ad peccatum originale intercipiendum atque Adae transgressio ad idem introducendum. quid ergo? Christus non servat infantes a peccatis suis, sed impedit et prohibet ab infantibus peccatum unum alterius: (loquitur per suppositionem) infantes ergo non debe[n]t in corpore suo baptismum aquae suscipere, cum aquae baptismus ijs solis dispensum debet, qui sanguine Christi opus habent ad peccata sua propria abluenda: non enim Christus servat nos a peccatis aliorum, vel a peccato uno solo eoque alterius non nostro, sed liberat nos a peccatis, proprijs, nostris: Sic ait Apostolus: ad Rom. 5. Reatus est ex una offensa ad condemnationem, donum gratuitum est ex multis offensis ad justificationem: ex multis offensis dicit: non ex una offensa. Praeterea Mat. 1. 21. servabit populum suum a peccatis suis, non dicit aliorum, vel alterius nempe Adae: ideoque Apostolus apertissime testatur ad Heb. 2. vs. 15. Liberavit Christus, quotquot metu mortis per omnem vitam obnoxij erant servituti: quod de adultis solis intelligitur.

Assumptio sunt ipsissima verba Angeli ad Mariam. Mat. 1. 21. Nominabitur Jesus, quia servat populum suum a peccatis suis, id est non solum remittit peccata sua per ipsius sanguinem effusum in remissionem peccatorum sed penitus eximit et extrahit peccata ut amplius non sint: sic enim Christus eijcit daemonia, ut praeterea non vexent obsessum: sic penitus tollit lepram ut corpus purum sit, ex omni contagione vacuum, scilicet perfecte

sanum. Sic enim testatur Evangelista Matheus cap. 8. vs. 17. ipse infirmitates nostras accepit, et morbos portavit, nam curatio quam perfecit Christus in corporibus aegrorum, figurabat sanationem quam ipse complet in animis peccatorum: Peccata enim animi morbi sunt.

### 17. argumentum.

Cujus nullum extat vel exemplum vel praeceptum, id non debet fieri.

Baptismatis infantum nullum extat vel exemplum vel praeceptum.

Ergo infantes non debent baptismate donari.

Propositionis ratio pendet ex verbis Apostoli ad Corinthios cap. 4. primae epistolae, vs. 6. nolite sapere supra quod scriptum est; etsi enim traditiones non scriptas nobis obtendere velint pontificij, inter quas baptisma infantum atque alios quosdam articulos fidei, quos affirmant ad salutem esse necessarios, reputant: tamen eadem severitate a nobis rejiciuntur, ficti scripturae sacrae auctoritate atque perfectione, qua illas nobis obtendunt importunitate. neque nobis quicquam obest Joannis elogium de rebus gestis Christi non scriptis. Joan. 21. 25. ea enim quae scripta sunt possunt virum dei perfectum reddere ad omne opus bonum accurate instructum. 2 Timoth. 3. 16. 17.

Minor propositio in dubium vocatur: exempla quae proferuntur solummodo probabilia sunt, ex adversariorum confessione: verum non faciunt fidem probabilia seu vel similia: quod attinet ad praecepta, fatentur etiam adversarij nulla extare praecepta totidem verbis expressa verumtamen ad consequentias nescio quas obscuras et incertas confugiunt: sed nos respondemus debere sacramenta novi testamenti a Christo qui filius est et fidelissimus in tota domo dei tam dilucide explicari, quod attinet ad omnes circumstantias, atque a Mose factum est de sacramentis veteris testamenti: neque posse nos confugere ad circumcisionem ut inde lucem afferamus baptismati. quis enim exponeret testamentum novum per vetus? quis scripta apostolica per prophetica explicaret? quis baptismatis rationem per circumcisionis circum-

stantias describeret? quis Christum per Mosen interpretaretur? Joannes baptista major et dilucidior est omnibus prophetis, minimus in regno coelorum major est Johanne: et tamen adversarij nos remittunt ad circumcisionem pro legitimo usu baptismatis: hoccine quid aliud est quam taedam soli preferre? Si ipsis concedamus dicentes, esto baptisentur ergo masculi octidui non foeminae: tum iterum recurrunt ad libertatem novi testamenti pro foeminarum baptisate: Sic circulatores hi undique corradunt, quod ipsis visum est proposito suo convenire. Verum sciendum est, cum Christus in novo testamento revelavit nobis occulta mijsteria veteris testamenti, ideo etiam et sacramenta novi testamenti multo plenius et dilucidius exponunt, quam ut vel consequentia vel circumcisionis analogia et proportione nobis opus sit ad verum et genuinum usum baptismatis assequendum. hoc enim fidelitati Christi maxime derogaret Mosenque Christo praeferret, qui singulas circumcisionis circumstantias etiam minutissimas enucleate exposuit. De his hactenus[.]

Tam veteris ecclesiae et Antiquorum patrum  
Elogia quaedam addamus.

Antiqui patres, ut Origines, Ciprianus, et Augustinus, infantum baptismum traditionem ecclesiae nuncupant.

Augustinus. de Genesi ad literam Lib. 10. cap: 23.

Consuetudo tamen matris ecclesiae in baptisandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est; neque ullo modo superflua deputanda; nec omnia credenda nisi apostolica esset traditio.

Idem Aug. Epistolâ ad Hieronymum. 28<sup>a</sup>.

Nemo sentiat contra fundatissimam ecclesiae morem. loquitur autem Aug. ibi de infantum baptisate[.]

Idem Aug. de baptismo contra  
Donatistas lib. 4. cap. 23.

Quod traditum tenet universitas ecclesiae cum parvuli infantes baptisantur, qui nondum possunt corde credere et ore confiteri.

Hinc Romana ecclesia et omnes pontificij uno ore fatentur baptismum infantum esse traditionem Apostolicam non scriptam.

18 argum<sup>t</sup>. Inde concludimus hoc modo.

Traditiones ecclesiae non scriptae reijciendae sunt.  
1 Cor. 4. 6.

Baptismus infantum est traditio ecclesiae non scripta.  
Ergo baptismus infantum reijciendus est.

Secundo in loco certum est Christianos plurimis in locis liberos suos non baptisasse infantes, sed baptismum illorum distulisse usque ad aetatem perfectam: Sic Monica non baptisabat Augustinum: neque Ambrosius et Marcellina baptisabant Ambrosium filium suum sed ipsi postea baptisabantur: Ambrosius Mediolani cum electus est Episcopus: et Augustinus ab Ambrosio in festo Paschatis natus annos triginta: qui quidem mos vulgatus erat in locis quibusdam: uti satis manifestus est ex Historia illa quam refert Eusebius. Ecclesiast: Historia lib. 10. cap. 15. de Athanasio parvulo, alios parvulos ludicro baptisante, qui quaestiones et responsiones Catechumenis propositas in baptismo tenebant, quique procul dubio infantes in ecclesia nati erant:

19. argument. Unde sic colligo.

Si plurimi Christiani antiquitus infantes suos non baptisabant; tum infantum baptismus communi consensu non receptus erat.

At Plurimi Christiani infantes suos non baptisabant.

Ergo infantum baptismus communi consensu non erat receptus.

Huc pertinet testimonium Tertulliani  
lib. de baptismo. Cap. 18.

Itaque pro cujusque personae conditione ac dispositione etiam aetate cunctatio baptismi utilior est, praecipue tamen circa parvulos: quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri. qui et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt et proventu malae indolis falli. Ait quidem dominus nolite illos prohibere ad me venire; veniant ergo dum adolescent, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur, fiant Christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agitur in secularibus, ut cui substantia terrena non

creditur, divina credatur? norint petere salutem ut petenti dedisse videaris. hoc Tertullianus: ubi plura argumenta adducuntur contra infantum baptismum.

1. Non sunt adulti, non possunt doceri, non possunt discere, non norunt Christum. ergo ne baptisentur infantes.

2. Innocens est aetas infantum: ergo non opus est baptisate. quia baptismus est symbolum remissionis peccatorum.

3. Non credimus infantibus terrena: Ergo non debemus infantibus credere divina, qualis est baptismus.

4. Debemus dare petentibus.

Infantes non possunt petere baptismum.

Ergo non debemus baptismum infantibus dare.

Post tempora Tertulliani, invalescente errore illo de anima quod scilicet ex traduce sit, ideoque quod peccato originali contaminata sit; quodque baptismus externus aquae ex opere operato abluit peccatum: undique paulatim admissus est error de infantibus baptisandis.

Sic inquit Augustinus. de genesi ad literam.

Lib. 10. cap. 23.


Eorum sententia, qui animas ex parentibus creati putant, de baptismo parvulorum, praeponderat.

Nam satis constat ex Tertulliano: lib. de baptismo sub finem, quod mos antiquus erat tempore Paschatis et Pent[e]costis baptisare solum, nisi in casu necessitatis: casus ille erat periculum mortis, tum autem omni die et hora baptisare licitum erat, quia putabant non posse infantem salvum fieri aut purgari a peccatis alia quam per baptismum.

Sublatis ergo erroribus hisce: tollitur infantum baptismus. Fatentur ergo. Ludovicus Vives: in lib. 1. Augustini de civitate dei. cap. 27. et Erasmus Roterodamus in cap. 5. Epist. ad Rom. temporibus Apostolorum infantes non fuisse baptisatos.

Concludimus ergo infantes non debere  
aqua baptismatis abluui.

Propositions and conclusions,  
concerning true Christian religion,  
conteyning a confesion of faith of certai-  
ne English people, liuinge at  
Amsterdam

1. ee beleve that ther is a God. Heb. 11. 6.  
against all Epicures and Atheists, which  
either say in ther harts, or vtter with  
ther mouths that ther is no God. Psal.  
14. 1: Esay 22. 13.
2. That this god is one in number  
1 Cor. 8. 4, 6 against the Pagans or anie other that hold  
a pluralitie of gods.
3. That god is incomprehensible and ineffable, in  
regard of his substance or essence: that is, gods essence  
can neither be comprehended in the minde, nor vttered  
by the words of men or angells. Exod. 3. 13-15. 33.  
18-23.
4. That the creatures and holy scriptures, do not  
intēd to teach vs what god is in substance or essence,  
but what he is in effect and property ro. 1. 19-22.  
Exod. 33. 23.
5. That these terms, father, sonne, and holy Spirit,  
do not teach gods substance, but only the hinder parts  
of god: that which may be known of god. Rom. 2.  
Exod. 33.
6. That god may be known by his titles, properties,  
effects, imprinted and expressed in the creatures, and  
scriptures. Joh. 17. 3.
7. That to vnderstand and conceive of god in the  
minde is not the sauing knowledge of god, but to be  
like to god in his effects and properties: to be made  
conformable to his diuine and heauenly attributes,  
That is the true sauing knowledge of god. 2 Cor. 3. 18.  
Matt. 5. 48. 2 Peter 1. 4. whervnto we ought to give  
all diligence.

8. That this god manifested in father, sonne, and holy ghost: Mat. 3. 16. 17. is most mercifull, most mighty, most holy, most just, most wise, most true, most glorious, eternal and infinite. Exo. 34. 6. 7: Psal. 90. 2. Psal. 102. 27.

9. That god before the foundatiō of the world did foresee, and determine the issue and event of all his works. Acts 15. 18. and that actually in time he worketh all things by his providēce, according to the good pleasure of his will Eph. 1. 11. and therfor we abhorre the opinion of them, that avouch, that all things happen by fortune or chance. Acts 4. 27. 28. Matt. 10. 29. 30.

10. That god is not the Author or worker of sinne Psal. 5. 4. James 1. 13. but that god only did foresee and determine what euil the free will of men and angels would doe: but he gave no influence, instinct, motion or inclination to the least sinne.

11. That god in the begininge created the world viz: the heavēs, and the earth and all things that are therin Gen. 1. Acts 17. 24. So that the things that are seene, were not of things which did appeare. Heb. 11. 3.

12. That god created man to blessedness according to his image, in an estate of innocency, free without corruption of sinne Gen. 1. 27: 2. 17. 25: he created them male and female, (to witt) one man and one woman. Gen. 1. 27: He framed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the breath, of lyfe, so the man was a liunge soule Gen. 2. 7: 1 Cor. 15. 45. But the woman he made of a ribe, Taken out of the syde of the man, Gen. 2. 21. 22. That god blessed them, and commaunded thē to increase, and multiplie, and to fill the earth, and to rule over itt and all creatures therin Gen. 1. 28 et 9. 1. 2: Psal. 8. 6.

13. That therfor marriage is an estate honourable amongst all men, and the bedd vndefiled: viz: betwixt one man and one woman Hebre. 13. 4: 1 Cor. 7. 2. but whoremongers and adulterers God will iudge.

14. That god created man with freedome of will, so that he had habitie to chuse the good, and eschew the evil, or to chuse the evil, and refuse the good, and that

this freedome of will was a naturall faculty or power, created by god in the soule of man. Gen. 2. 16. 17 and 3. 16. 17. and 27. Ecclesia. 7. 29.

15. That Adam sinnenge was not moued or inclined therto by god, or by anie decree of god: but that he fell from his innocencie, and died the death alone, by the temptation of sathan, his freewill assenting therunto freely. Gen. 3. 6.

16. That the same day that Adam sinned, he died the death Gen. 2. 17, for the reward of sinne is death. Rom. 6. 23, and this is that which the Apostle saith, dead in trespasses and sinnes Eph. 2. 1, which is losse of innocencie, of the peace of consciēce and comfortable presence of God. Gen. 3. 7-11.

17. That Adam being fallen did not loose anie naturall power or facultie which god created in his soul. For the worke of the devill, which is siñe, cannot abolish gods works or creatures: and therfor being fallen he still retained freedome of will. Gen. 3. 23. 24.

18. That original sin is an idle terme, and that ther is no such thing as men intend by the word Ezeck. 18. 20, bicause god threatned death onlie to Adam. Gen. 2. 17 not to his posterite and bicause god created the soule Heb. 12. 9.

19. That if original sinne might haue passed from Adam to his posteritie, Christs death, which was effectually before Caine and Abells birth he being the lambe slaine from the begininge of the world, stopped the issue and passage therof. Apocalips. 13. 8.

20. That infants are conceiued and borne in innocencie without sinne, and that so dyinge are undoubtedly sauēd, and that this is to be vnderstoode of all infāts vnder heauē Gen. 5. 2. 1. 27 compared with 1 Cor. 15. 49, for wher ther is no law ther is no transgressiō, sinne is not imputed while ther is no law, Rom. 4. 15. and 5. 13. But the law was not given to infants, but to them that coulde vnderstand. Rom. 5. 13: Matt. 13. 9: Nehemia 8. 3.

21. That all actuall sinners beare the image of the first Adam, in his innocencie, fall: and restitution, in the offer of grace. 1 Cor. 15. 49 and so passe under these three conditions, or threefold estate.



22. That Adam being fallen god did not hate him, but loved him still, and sought his good Gen 3. 8 to 15, neither doth he hate anie man that falleth with Adam: but that he loueth mankinde, and from his loue sent his onely begotten sonne into the world, to save that which was lost, and to seeke the sheepe that went astraye. John 3. 16.

23. That god never forsaketh the creatuere till ther be no remedie, neither doth he cast away his innocent creature from all eternity: but casteth away men irrecouerable in sinne Esa. 5. 4: Ezek. 18. 23. 32 [and] 33. 11: Luke 13. 6. 9.

24. That as ther is in all the creatures a naturall inclination to ther yonge ones, to doe them good, so ther is in the lord toward mā: for everie sparke of goodnes in the creature is infinitely good in god. Rom. 1. 20: Psal. 19. 4: Rom. 10. 18.

25. That as no man begetteth his childe to the gallowes, nor no potter maketh a pott to breake it: so god doth not create or predestinate anie man to destruction Ezeck. 33. 11: Gen. 1. 27: 1 Cor. 15. 49: Gen. 5. 3.

26. That god before the foundatiō of the world, hath determined the way of life and saluation to consist in Christ, and that he hath foreseen who would follow it Ephe. 1. 5: 2 Timoth. 1. 9, and on the contrary hath determined the way of perdition to consist in infidelitie, and in impenitēcie, and that he hath forseene who would follow after it Jude 4 verse.

27. That as god created all men according to his image, so hath he redeemed all that fall by actuall sinne, to the same end: and that God in his redēption hath not swerved from his mercie, which he manifested in his creation John 1. 3-16: 2 Cor. 5. 19: 1 Timoth 2. 5. 6: Ezeck. 33. 11.

28. That Jesus Christ came into the world to saue sinners, and that god in his loue to his enemies did send him John 3. 16: that Christ died for his enemies Rom. 5. 10: that he bought them that denie him 2 Peter 2. 1, therby teaching vs to loue our enemies Matt. 5. 44. 45.

29. That Christ Jesus after his baptism by a voyce out of heauen from the father, and by the anoyntinge of

the holy ghost, which appeared vppon his head in the forme of a doue, is appointed the prophet of the church, whom all men must heare Matt. 3: Heb. 3. 1. 2: and that both by his doctrine and life, which he ledd heere in the earth, by all his doings and sufferings, he hath declared and published, as the only prophet and lawgiuer of his church, the way of peace and life, the glad tidings of the gossell. Acts 3. 23. 24.

30. That Christ Jesus is the brightnes of the glorie and the engrauen forme of the fathers substance, supporting all things by his mighty power [Heb.] 1. 3: and that he is become the mediatour of the new Testament (to wit) the kinge, Priest, and Prophet of the Church, and that the faithfull through him, are thus made spiritual kings, Priests, and Prophets Apoc. 1. 6: 1 John 2. 20: Apoc. 19. 10.

31. That Jesus Christ is he which in the beginning did lay the foundation of the heauens and earth which shall perish Hebr. 1. 10: Psalm 102. 26: that he is alpha and omega, the begininge and the end, the first and the last. He is the wisdom of god, which was begotten from everlasting before all creatures Michai 5. 2: Prov. 8. 24: Luck 11. 49: he was in the form of god, and thought it no robberie to be equall with god: yet he took to him the shape of a seruant, the word became flesh John 1. 14, wonderfully by the power of god in the wombe of the virgin Marie: he was of the seed of David according to the flesh Phil. 2. 7: Hebre 10: Rom. 1. 3: and that he made himselfe of no reputation, humbled himself, and became obedient vnto the death of the crosse, redeeming vs from our vaine conversation, not with siluer or golde, but with the pretious blood of himself, as of a lambe without spot and vndefiled 1 Pet. 1. 18. 19.

32. That although the sacrifice of Christ[s] body and blood offered vp vnto god his father vppon the crosse, be a sacrifice of a sweet smelling sauor, and that god in him is well pleased, yet it doth not reconcile god vnto vs, which did neuer hate us, nor was our enemie, but reconcileth vs vnto god 2 Cor. 5. 19, and slayeth the enmitie and hatred, which is in us against god Ephes. 1. 14. 17: Rom. 1. 30.

33. That Christ was deliuered to death for our sinnes Rom. 4. 25, and that by his death we have the remission of our sinnes Eph. 2. 7, for he cancelled the handwriting of ordinances, the hatred, the law of commandements in ordinances Eph. 2. 15: Colos. 2. 14 which was against vs Deut. 31. 26: he spoyled principalities and powers, made a shew of them openly, and triumphed over them on the crosse Colloss. 2. 15: by death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the deuill Heb. 2. 14.

34. That the enemies of our saluation, which Christ vanquished on his crosse, are the gates of hell, the power of darknes, sathan: sinne: death: the greaue, the curse or condemnation: wicked men, and persecutors Eph. 6. 12: 1 Cor. 15. 26. 54. 57: Matt. 16. 18: Apoca. 20. 10. 14. 15, which enemies we must overcome no otherwise then Christ hath done John 21. 22: 1 Pet. 2. 21: Reue. 14. 4.

35. That the efficacie of Christ[s] death is only deriued to them, which do mortifie ther sinnes, which are grafted with him to the similitude of his death Rom. 6. 3-6, which are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the sinfull body of the flesh, through the circumcision which Christ worketh Coloss. 2. 11. who is the minister of the circumcition for the truth of god, to cōfirme the promises made to the fathers. Rom. 15. 8 compared with Deut. 30. 6.

36. That ther are three which bear witness in the earth, the spirit, water and blood, and these three are one in testimony, witnessing that Christ truely died 1 John 5. 8 for he gaue up the ghost, John 19. 30: and out of his side pearced with a speare came water and blood verse 34, 35, the couer of the hart being pearced, where ther is water contained.

37. That euerie mortified person hath this witness in himself 1 Joh. 5. 10, for the spirit blood and water of sinne is gone, that is the life of sinne with the nourishment and cherishment therof 1 Pet. 4. 1: Rom. 6. 7: 1 John 3. 6.

38. That Christ Jesus being truely dead was also buried John 19. 39. 42, and that he lay in the graue the

whole saboth of the Jewes: but in the graue he saw no corruption Psa. 16. 10: Act 2. 31.

39. That all mortified persons are also buried with Christ, by the baptisme, which is in to his death Rom. 6. 4: Colloss. 2. 12: keeping ther saboth with Christ in the graue (that is) resting from ther own workes as god did from his Heb. 4. 10, waiting ther in hope for a resurrection Psal. 16. 9.

40. That Christ Jesus early in the morning, the first day of the weeke, rose again after his death and burial Mat. 28. 6 for our Justification Rom 4. 25, being mightilye declared to be the sonne of god, by the spirit of sanctification, in the resurrection from the dead Rom. 1. 4.

41. That these that are grafted with Christ to the similitude of his death and buriall shall also be to the similitude of his resurrection Rom. 6. 4. 5: for he doth quicken or give life vnto them, together with himself Colloss. 2. 13: Eph. 2. 5. 6: for that is their salvation, and it is by grace Eph. 2. 5: 1 John 5. 11. 12. 13: Titus 3. 5. 6. 7.

42. That this quickening or reuiueing of Christ, this laour of regeneration, this reneweing of the holy ghost, is our iustification and salvation Titus 3. 6. 7. This is that pure riuer of water of life cleare as crystal, which procedeth out of the throne of god, and of the lambe. reuel. 22. 1: which also floweth out of the belly of him that beleueeth in Christ John 7. 38: this is those pretious promises wherby we are made partakers of the diuine nature, by flying the corruptions that are in the world through lust 2 Pet. 1. 4: this is the fruite of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of god: this is the white stone wherin there is a name written, which no man knoweth, saue he that receiueth yt. This is the morning starre, this is the new name, the name of god, the name of the citie of god: the new Jerusalem which descēdeth from god out of heauen: this is the hidden Manna, that white clothinge, eye salue, and gold: and that heauenly supper which Christ promiseth to them that overcome reuel 2. 7. 17. 18. et 3. 5. 12. 18. 20.

43. That ther are three which beare recorde in heauen, the father, the word, and the holy spirit: and

that these three are one in testimonie, witnessing the resurrection of Christ. The father saith Thou art my sonne this day haue I begotten the Acts 13. 33-35. The sonne testifieth of his owne resurrection, being fourtie daies, with his disciples Acts 1. 3. The holy ghost testifieth the same, whom Christ sent to his disciples vppon the day of pentecost Acts 2.

44. That euerie person that is regenerate and risen again with Christ hath these three aforesaide witnesses in himself 1 John 5. 10: for Christ doth dwell in his hart by faith Eph. 3. 17: and the father dwelleth with the sonne Joh 14. 23: and the holy ghost likewise 1 Cor 3. 16: and that the grace of our lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowshippe of the holy ghost is with them 2 Cor 13. 13.

45. That Christ haueinge fourty dayes after his resurrection conuersed with his disciples Acts 1. 3, ascended locally into the heauens [Acts] 1. 9, which must conteyne him unto the time that all things be restored Acts 3. 21.

That they which are risen with Christ, ascend vp spiritually with Him, seeking those things which are aboue, wher Christ sitteth at the right hande of God, and that they sett their affections on heauenly things, and not on earthly things Col 3. 1-5.

46. That Christ now being receiued into heauen, sitteth at the right hād of God Mar. 16. 9, hauing ledd captiuitie captiue, and giuen gifts unto men Eph. 4. 8: that god hath now highly exalted him, and giuen him a name aboue euerie name that at the name of Jesus euerie knee should bow, of things in heaven in earth and vnder the earth Phil. 2. 9. 10, that he hath obtained all power both in heaven and in earth Matt. 28. 18, and hath made all things subiect under his feet and hath appointed him ouer all things to be the head to the church, that is his body, the fulnes of him that filleth all in all things Eph. 1. 12-23.

47. That the regenerate do sitt together with Christ Jesus in heauenly places Eph. 2. 6, that they sitt with him in his throne as he sitteth with the father in his throne Reu. 3. 21, that they haue power ouer nations,

and rule them with a rodd of Iron, and as a potters vessell they are broaken in pieces Reu. 2. 26. 27: and that sitting on twelue thrones, they do iudge the twelve tribes of Israel Matt. 19. 28, which spiritually is to put all ther enemies in subiection vnder ther feet: so that the euil one doth not touch them 1 Johan 5. 18, nor the gates of hell preuaile against them Math. 16. 28, and that they are become pillars in the house of god, and go no more out Reuel. 3. 12.

48. That Christ Jesus being exalted at the right hand of god the father, farre aboue all principalities and powers, might, and domination, and euerie name that is named, not only in this world, but in the world to come Eph. 1. 21, hath receiued of his father the promise of the holy ghost, which he also shed fourth upon his disciples, on the day of pentecost Acts 2. 33.

49. That Christ Jesus, in his resurrection, ascētion and exaltation, is more and rather lord and Christ, sauour, anoynted, and kinge then in his humiliation sufferings and death Act 2. 36: Phil 2. 7. 11, for the end is more excellent than the meanes, and his sufferings were the way by the which he entered into his glorie Luc. 24. 16, and so by consequent the efficacie of his resurrection in the new creature, is more noble and excellent, then the efficacie of his death in the mortification and remission of sinnes.

50. That the knowledge of Christ according to the flesh is of small profit 2 Cor. 15. 16. 17, and the knowledge of Christs genealogie, and Historie, is no other but that which the Devill hath as well if not better than anie man liuinge: but the knowledge of Christ according to the spirit is effectual to saluation which is spiritually to be grafted to the similitude of Christs birth, life, miracles, doings, sufferings, death burial, resurrection ascētion, and exaltation Rom. 6. 3. 6.

51. That Christ Jesus according to the flesh and history in his doings and suffering, is a great misterie, and diuine sacrament of himself, and of his ministerie, in the spirit, and of those spirituall things, which he worketh in those which are to be heires of saluation Rom. 6. 3. 6: Eph. 2. 5. 6. and that spiritually he performeth all

those miracles in the regenerate, which he wrought in his flesh: he healeth ther leprosy, bloody issue, blindnes, dumbnes, deafnes, lamenes, palsie fever, he casteth out the devils, and vnclean spirits, he raiseth the dead, rebuketh the windes, and the sea: and it is calm: he feedeth thousands with the barley loaves and fishes Math. 8. 16. 17. compared with Esay. 53. 4. John 6. 26. 27.

52. That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the father and the sonne John 14. 26. and 16. 7: that he is the eternal spirit wherby Christ offered himself without spot to God Hebr. 9. 14: that he is that other comforter, which Christ asketh, obtaineth, and sendeth from the father. Johan 14. 16 which dwelleth in the regenerate 1 Cor. 3. 16. which leadeth them into all truth John 16. 13. he is that anointing which teacheth them all things, and that they haue no need that anie man teach them, but as the same anointing teacheth 1 Jo. 2. 20, 27.

53. That although ther be diuerse gifts of the spirit yet ther is but one spirit, which distributeth to euery one as he will 2 Cor. 12. 4. 11: Eph. 4. 4 that the outward giftes of the spirit which the holy ghost powreth forth upon the day of pentecost upon the disciples, in tongues and prophecy, and giftes, and healing, and miracles, which is called the baptism of the holy ghost and fire Acts 1. 5. were onlie a figure of and an hand leading to better things, even the most proper gifts of the spirit of sanctification, which is the new creature: which is the one baptism Eph. 4. 4. compared with Acts 2. 33. 38 and with Lucke 10. 17, 20.

54. That John Baptist and Christ are two persons, their ministeries are two ministeries seuerall, and ther Baptismes are two baptismes, distinct the one from the other. John 1. 20: Actor 13. 25: Actor 1. 4, 5: Matt. 3. 11

55. That John taught the baptism of repentance for the remission of sinnes, baptizing with water to amendment of life Math. 3. 11 thus preparing a way for Christ, and his baptism Luck 3. 3, 6 by bringing men to repentance and faith in the Messias whom he pointed out with the finger, (saying) behold the Lambe of God that taketh away the sinnes of the world Jo. 1. 31, 29: Act. 19. 4.

56. That Christ is stronger and hath a more excellent office, and ministerie than John Matt. 3. 11: that he baptizeth with the holy ghost and fire: that he cometh ād walketh in the way which John hath prepared: and that the new creature followeth repentance Lucke 3. 6.

57. That repentance and faith in the Messias, are the conditions to be performed on our behalfe, for the obtaining of the promises Acts 2. 38: John 1. 12: that the circumcision of the hart mortification and the promise of the spirit, that is, the new creature, are the promises which are made to the aforesaid conditions Deut. 30. 6: Actor 2. 38: Gal. 3. 14: 2 Pet. 1. 4, 5 which promises are all yea and Amē in Christ Jesus 2 Cor. 1. 20 and that in the regenerate Galat. 3. 16.

58. That repentance and faith, are wrought in the harts of men, by the preaching of the word, outwardlie in the scriptures, and creatures, the grace of God preventing vs by the motions and instinct of the spirit, which a man hath power to receive or reiect Matt. 23. 37: Acts 7. 51: Acts 6. 10: Rom. 10. 14, 18: that our iustification before God consisteth not in the performance of the conditions which God requireth of vs, but in the pertaking of the promises, the possessing of Christ, Remission of sinnes, and the new creature.

59. That god the father, of his owne Good will doth begett vs, by the word of truth Jame 1. 18 which is an immortall seed 1 Pet. 1. 23. not the doctrine of repentance and faith which may be lost Luke 8. 13: and that god the father, in our regeneration, neither needeth nor vseth the helpe of any creature, but that the father, the word and the holy ghost, immediatly worketh that worke in the soule, wher the free will of men cann doe nothing Johan 1. 13.

60. That such as haue not attained the new creature, have need of the scriptures, creatures and ordinances of the church, to instruct them, to comfort them, to stir them vpp the better to performe the condicion of repentance to the remission of sinnes. 2 Pet. 1. 19: 1 Cor. 11. 26: Eph. 4. 12-23.

61. That the new creature which is begotten of God, needeth not the outward scriptures creatures or



ordinances of the church, to support or help them 2 Cor. 13. 10, 12: 1 Joh. 2. 27: 1 Cor. 1. 15, 16: Apoklips 21. 23 seeing that he hath three witnesses in himselfe, the father, the word, and the holie ghost: which are better then, all scriptures, or creatures whatsoever.

62. That as Christ who was aboute the law notwithstanding was made vnder the law, for our cause: so the regenerate in love to others cā ād will doe no other, thē vse the outward things of the church: for the gaininge and supporting of others[:] and so the outward church and ordinances, are always necessary for all sorts of persons whatsoever Matt. 3. 15: 28. 19, 20: 1 Cor. 8. 9.

63. That the new creature although he be aboute the law and scriptures, yet he can doe nothing against the law or scriptures, but rather all his doings shall serue to the confirminge and establishing of the law. Rom. 3. 31. Therfor he can neither lye, nor steale, nor committ adulterie, nor kill, nor hate anie man, or do anie other fleshly action. and therfor all fleshly libertinisme, is contrarie to regeneration, detestable, and damnable. Rom. 6. 15. 16. 18. 2 Pet. 2. 18. 19. 1 John 5. 18. John 8. 34.

64. That the outward church visible, consistes of penitent persons onely, and of such as beleeuing in Christ, bring forth fruites worthie amendment of lyfe. 1 Tim. 6. 3. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 1. 5. Act. 19. 4.

65. That the visible church is a mysticall figure outwardlie, of the true, spirituall invisible church: which consisteth of the spirits of iust and perfect men onlie, that is of the regenerate. Reu. 1. 20. compared with 2 P. 2. 23. 27. [sic]

66. That repentance is the change of the minde from evill, to that which is Good Matt. 3. 2. a sorrow for sinne committed, with a humble hart for the same: and a resolution to amend, for the time to come: with an vnfained indeavour therin 2 Cor. 7. 8. 11: Esay 1. 16. 17: Jer. 31. 18. 19.

67. That when we haue done all that we can we are vnprofitable seruants, and all our righteousnes is as a stayned clothe Luce 17. 20. and that we can onely suppress and loppe of the brāches of sinnes, but the

root of sinne we cannot pluck vp out of our hartes.  
Jer. 4. 4. compared with Deut. 30. 6. 8.

68. That faith is a knowledge in the mind of the doctrine of the law, and gospell, conteyned in the prophetical, and apostolical scriptures of the old and new testament: accompanyeing repētance with an assurance that god through Christ, will performe vnto vs his promises of remission of sinnes, and mortification, vppon the condition of our vnfained repentance, and amendment of life. Rom. 10. 13. 14. 15: Act 30. 33 [sic] and Act 2. 38. 39: Heb. 11. 1: Mark 1. 15.

69. That all penitent and faithfull Christians are brethrē in the communion of the outward church, wherso euer they liue, by what name soeuer they are knowen, which in truth and zeale, follow repentance and faith, though compassed with neuer so manie ignorances and infirmities: and we salute them all with a holie kisse, being hartilie grieved that wee which follow after one faith, and one spirit, one lord, and one God, one bodie, and one baptisme, should be rent into so manie sects, and schismes: and that only for matters of lesse moment.

70. That the outward baptisme of water, is to be administred onely vppon such penitent and faithfull persons as are (aforesaid) and not vppon innocent Infants, or wicked persons. Matt. 3. 2. 3 compared with Matt. 28. 19. 20 and Joh. 4. 1.

71. That in Baptisme to the penitent person, and beleueer, ther is presented, and figured, the spirituall baptisme of Christ, (that is) the baptisme of the holy ghost, and fire: the baptisme into the death and resurrection of Christ: euen the promise of the spirit, which he shall assuredly be made partaker of, if he continue to the end. Gal. 3. 14. Mat. 3. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Rom. 6. 3-6. Coloss. 2. 10.

72. That in the outward supper which onely baptised persons must pertake, ther is presented and figured before the eyes, of the penitent ād faithfull, that spirituall supper, which Christ maketh of his flesh and blood: which is crucified and shed for the remission of sinnes (as the bread is broken and the wine powred forth) and which is eaten and drunken (as is the bread and wine

bodily) onely by those which are flesh, of his flesh, and bone of his bone: in the communion of the same spirit. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Reu. 3. 20. compared with 1 Cor. 11. 23. 26. Joh. 6. 53. 58.

73. That the outward baptisme, and supper doe not confer, and convey grace and regeneration to the participants, or communicants: but as the word preached they serue only to support and stirr vp the repentance, and faith of the communicants till Christ come, till the day dawne, and the day-stare arise in ther harts. 1 Cor. 11. 26. 2 Pet. 1. 19. 1 Cor. 1. 5-8.

74. That the sacraments haue the same vse that the word hath: that they are a visible word, and that they teach to the eye of them that vnderstand as the word teacheth the eares of them that have eares to heare. Pro. 20. 12 and therefore as the word appertaineth not to Infants, no more do the sacraments.

75. That the preaching of the word, and ministerie of the sacraments, representeth the ministry of Christ in the spirit: who teacheth baptiseth, and feedeth the regenerate, by the holie spirit inwardlie and invisiblie.

76. That Christ hath sett in his outward church two sorts of ministers: viz. some who are called pastors, teachers or elders, who administer in the word and sacraments: and others who are called Deacons, men and women: whose ministerie is, to serue tables and wash the saints feet. Actor 6. 2-4. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 2. 3. 8. 11. and Chap. 5.

77. That the seperating of the impenitent, from the outward comunion of the church, is a figure of the eternal reiection, and reprobation of them that persist impenitent in sinne. Reue. 21. 27. and 22. 14. 15. Math. 16. 18 and 18. 18: John 20. 23 compared with Reu. 3. 12.

78. That none are to be seperated from the outward communion of the Church but such as forsake repentance, which deny the power of Godlines 2 Tim. 3. 5 and namely that sufficient admonition goe before, according to the rule Math. 18. 15. 18. and that none are to be reiected for ignorance or errors, or infirmities: so long as they retayne repentance and faith in Christ. Rom. 14. and 1 Thessa. 5. 14. Rom. 16. 17. 18. but they are to be

instructed with meeknes: and the strong are to beare the infirmities of the weake: and That we are to support one another through loue.

79. That a man may speak a word against the sonne, and be pardoned, (that is) a man may err in the knowledge of Christs Historie: and in matters of the outward church, and be forgiuen: doing it in an ignorant Zeale: but he that speaketh a word against the holie gost (that is) that after illumination forsaketh repentance and faith in Christ, persecuting them, trampling vnder foot the blood of the couenant: returning with the dogg to the vomitt: that such shall neuer be pardoned, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. Math. 12. 31. 32. compared with Hebre 6. 4. and Chap. 10. 26. 29. 2 Pet. 2. 20. 22.

80. That persons seperated from the comunion of the church, are to be accounted as heathens and publicans Math. 18. and that they are so far to be shunned, as they may pollute: notwithstanding being readie to instruct them, and to relieue them in ther wants: seeking by all lawfull meanes to winne them: considering that excommunication is onely for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saued in the day of the lord. 1 Cor. 5. 5. 11. Math. 11. 19. Lucke 15. 1. 2.

81. That ther is no succession in the outward church, but that all the succession is from heauen, and that the new creature onely, hath the thing signified, ad substance: wherof the outward church and ordinances, are shadowes. Colo. 2. 16. 17. and therfor he alone hath power, and knoweth aright, how to administer in the outward church, for the benefitt of others John 6. 45. yet God is not the God of confusion, but of order: and therefore we are in the outward church, to draw as neare the first institution as may be, in all things 1 Cor. 14. 33. therefore it is not lawfull for euery brother to administer the word and sacraments Ephes. 4. 11. 12. compared with 1 Cor. 12. 4. 5. 6. 28. 29.

82. That Christ hath sett in his outward church the vocation of maister and seruant, parents and children, husband and wyfe. Eph. 5. 22. 25. Chap. 6. 1. 4. 5. 9. and hath commaunded euerie soule to be subject to the

higher powers. Rom. 13. 1. not because of wrath onlie but for conscience sake. verse 5. that we are to give them ther dutie: as tribute, and custome, honour, and feare, not speaking euil of them that are in authoritie Jude verse 8 but praying and giuing thankes for them, 1 Tim. 2. 1. 2. for that is acceptable in the sight of God euen our sauour.

83. That the office of the magistrate, is a disposition or permissiue ordināce of God, for the Good of mankinde: that one man like the brute beasts deuoure not another Rom. 13. and that iustice and ciuilitie may be preserued amonge men: and that a magistrate may so please God in his calling, in doing that which is righteous and just, in the eyes of the lord, that he may bring an outward blessing, vppon himselfe his posteritie and subiects. 2. kin. Chapter. 10. vers. 30. 31.

84. That the magistrate is not by vertue of his office to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, to force and compell men to this or that form of religion, or doctrine: but to leaue Christian religion free, to every mans conscience, and to handle onely ciuil transgressions Rom. 13. iniuries and wronges of men against man, in murther, Adulterie, theft etc. for Christ onelie is the king, and lawgiuer of the church and conscience Jas 4. 12.

85. That if the magistrate will follow Christ, and be His disciple, he must deny himself, take vp his crosse, and follow Christ: he must loue his enemies and not kill them, he must pray for them, and not punishe them, he must feed them and giue thē drinke, not imprison them: banish them: dismember them: and spoyle their Goods: he must suffer persecution and affliction with Christ, and be slaundered, reviled, blasphemed, scourged, buffeted, spit vpon, imprisoned and killed with Christ: and that by the authoritie of magistrates, which things he cannot possible doe, and reteyne the reuendge of the sword.

86. That the Disciples of Christ the members of the outward church, are to Judge all ther causes of difference, among themselves: and they are not to goe to law, before the magistrates 1 Cor. 6. 1. 7. and that all ther

differences must be ended by (yea) and (nay) without an oath. Math. 5. 33-37. Jam. 5. 12.

87. That the Disciples of Christ, the members of the outward church, may not marrye, anie of the prophane, or wicked, Godles people of the world, but that euerie one is to marry in the lord. 1 Cor. 7. 39 euerie man one onely wyfe, and euerie woman one onely husband 1 Cor. 7. 2.

88. That parents are bound, to bring vp ther children in instruction, and information of the lord Eph. 6. 4. ād that they are to provide for their familie: otherwise they denie the faith, and are worse then Infidels 1 Tim. 5. 8.

89. That notwithstanding if the lord shall giue a man anie speciall callinge, as Simon, and Andrew: James, and John: then they must leaue all, father shipp, netts wyfe, children, yea, and life also to follow Christ. Luke 14. 26. Math Chap. 4. 18-20.

90. That in the necessities of the church, and poore brethren, all things are to be common Acto 4. 32 yea and that one church is to administer to another in time of need. Galat. 2. 10. Actor 11. 30. 2 Cor. 8 and .9. Chap.

91. That all the bodies of all men that are dead, shall by the power of Christ be raised vp, out of his owne proper seed, as corne out of the seed rotting in the earth. 1 Cor. 15.

92. That these which liue in the last day shall not die, but shall be changed in a moment: in the twinckling of an eye, at the last trumpett 1 Cor. 15. 52 for the trumpe shall blow, ād the dead shall be raised vp incorruptible, and we shall be changed, not in substance but in qualities: for the bodies shall rise in honour, in power, in incorruption, and spirituall: being sowen in dishonour, in weaknes, in corruption, and naturall. 1 Corinth. 15. 42. 44.

93. That the bodies being raised vp, shall be ioined to the soules, wherto formerlie they were vnited: which till that time were preserued in the handes of the lord Reue. 6. 9. Job. 19. 25. 27.

94. That it is appointed to all men that they shall

once dye, and then cometh the iudgmentt Heb. 9. 27 and that the change of them that liue on the earth at the last day, shall be as it were a death vnto them 1 Cor. 15. 52. 1 Thessa. 4. 15-17.

95. That there shall be a generall and vniuersall day of Judgment, when euerie one shall receiue according to the things that are done in the flesh, whether they be Good or evill. 2 Cor. 5. 10. Act. 17. 31.

96. That of that day, and hower knoweth no man: no not the Angells in heauen, neither the sonne himself, but the father onely Mar. 13. 32.

97. That Christ Jesus that man, shall be iudge in that day Actor 17. 31 that he shall come in the cloudes with glorie: and all his holie angels with him Matt. 25. with a showte and with the voyce of the Archangell, and with the trompe of God. 1 Thessa. 4. 16 ād He shall sit vppon the throne of his glorie: and all nations shall be gathered before Him: and he shall seperate them one from another, as a sheephard seperateth the sheep from the goates, setting the sheep on his right hand and the goates on the left. Mat. 25.

98. That the king shall say to the sheep the regenerate, which are on His right hand: come yee blessed of my father, inherit the kingdome prepared for you before the foundation of the world: and it shall be performed accordinglie Math. 25.

99. That the king shall say to them on his left hand, the goates, the wicked ones, depart from me, yee cursed into euerlasting fire, prepared for the Devill and his angells. and it shall be accomplished accordinglie Mat. 25.

100. That after the Judgement ended and accomplished, and the lastemie that is death being put under the feet of Christ, then the sonne Himself shall deliuer vp the kingdome into the handes of the father,

and shall be subiect vnto him,  
that subdued all things unto him,  
that God may be all in all. 1 Cor. 15. 24-28.

FINIS


[ornament]

The Last Booke of Iohn Smith  
Called the Retractation of His Errours,  
and the Confirmation of the Truth

*If any man be in Christ, let him be a new creature 2 Cor. 5. 17.*

*For they that are Christes, haue crucified the flesh with the affections.  
and the lustes. Gal. 5. 24*





Am not of the number of those men, which assume unto them selues such plenarie knowledge and assurance of ther wayes, and of the perfection and sufficiencie therof, as that they peremptorily censure all men except those of their owne vnderstanding, and require that all men vppon pain of damnation, become subiect, and captiuatē, in their Judgement and walkinge to ther line and leuell: of which sort are those of our English nation, who publish in print ther proclamation against all churches, except those of their owne societie and fellowship: I mean the double seperation maister Hainsworth, and maister Helwys. although the one more neare the truth, then the other: neither is my purpose in this my writinge, to accuse and condemne, other men, but to censure and reforme my selfe: If I should walke with either of the double seperation, I must from the persuasion of mine owne alone, perfect reformation reprove all other, and reiect them as short of that marke wherto I were come: and I must shutt my eares from hearinge anie instruction which others may affoord mee: for this is the Quintessence of the seperation, to assume vnto themselues a prerogatiue to teach all men, and to be taught of no man. now I haue in all my writings hithertoe, received instruction of others, and professed my readines to be taught by others, and therfor haue I so oftenn tymes beene accused of inconstancie: well, let them thinke of mee as they please, I professe I haue changed, and shall be readie still to change, for the better: and if it be ther glorie to be peremptorie and immutable, in their articles of Religion, they may enioye that glorie without my envie, though not without the grief of my hart for them:

The Articles of Relligion which are the ground of my salvation, are these, wherin I differ frō no Good Christian: That Jesus Christ the sonne of God, and the sonne of Marie, is the Anointed king, Priest, and Prophett of the church, the onlie mediator of the new Testament, and

that through true repentance and faith in him who alone is our saviour, wee receiue remission of sinnes, and the holie ghost in this lyfe, ād there-with all the redemption of our bodies, and everlastinge life in the resurrection of the bodie: and whosoever walketh accordinge to this rule, I must needs acknowledge him my brother: yea, although he differ from me in diuers other particulars:

And howsoever in the daies of my blinde Zeale, and preposterous Imitation of Christ, I was somewhat lavish in censuring and Judgeing others: ād namely, in the waie of seperation called Brownisme, yet since haueing been instructed in the way of the lord more perfectly, and finding my error therin, I protest against that my former course of censuringe other persons, and especially for all those hard phrases, wherwith I have in any of my writings, inveighed against either England or the seperation. for England although I cannot with anie Good conscience, acknowledge the wicked ones mingled with the Zealous professors in one congregation, to be the true outward, visible church which Christ and his Apostles, at the first instituted: which consisted onely of penitent persons and beleeuers: yet therefore to say that the Zealous professors them selues are Antichristians, is a Censure such as I cannot iustifie before the lord who is my Judge in my conscience. And therefore I vtterly revoke and renounce it.

Againe howsoever I doubt not but itt is an error of the forward professors of the English, churches, to be mingled with the open wicked, in the supper of the lord, as they daylie are, seeing therin they doe transgresse the first institution, of Christ, who ate his supper onely with the eleuen, (for Judas departed so soone as he had receaved the soppe of the Passe over:) yet I Cannot therfor conclude the saide forward professors, vnder the same Judgement, or fellowship of synne, with the wicked ones with whome they pertake the supper: Yea rather. I do also renounce that evil and perverse Judgement which I have pronounced in my writings, in this particular acknowledginge my error therin:

further I must needs avouch that the Bishoppes of the land, greevously synne against God: and the forward

Professors in rulinge them so rigorously, urginge ther subscription Canons, and Ceremonies vppon mens consciences, vppon payne of excommunication deposition, silence, imprisonmēt, banishment, and the like penalties: and that therin they sitte as Antichrist, in the temple of God, which is the conscience. Yet therfor to say that all the professors of the lāde, whether preachers or others that remaine vnder their Jurisdiction, do submitt vnto the beast and receiue his marke, that I dare not avouch and Justifie as I haue done, for I doubt not but manie touch none of their vncleane things: but onely submitt to Christ so farr as they are inlightened: and if a synne of ignorance make a man an Anti-christian, then I demaunde wher shall wee finde a Christian: In these three perticulars especially haue I transgressed against the professors of the English nation:

Generally all those bitinge and bitter words, phrases, and speeches, vsed against the professors of the land, I vtterly retract and revoke, as not being of the spirit of Christ but of the Disciples, who would have called for fire and brimstone from heaven, which Christ rebuketh. Particularly that booke against maister Bernard. wherin Maister Marbury, Maister White, and others are mentioned, and cruelly taxed [*Paralleles*, 335, 545]: I retract not for that it is wholly false, but for that it is wholly censorious and criticall: and for that therin the contention for outward matters, which are of inferiour note, hath broken the rules of loue and charitie, which is the superiour law:

now for the Separation I cannot, nor dare not in my conscience before the Judge of the whole world: Justifie my writings and dealings against them: for the truthe of the matter I doubt not, but it is on my side: but the manner of writing is that alone wherin I haue failed: for I should haue with the spirit of meeknes instructed them, that are contrarie minded, but my wordes haue bene stout, and mingled with gall: and therfor hath the lord repayed me home full measure into my bosome for according to that measure wherwith I measured, hath yt bene measured againe vnto mee: by maister Clifton, especially by maister Hainsworth and maister Bernard[.]

The lord lay none of our synnes, to the chardge of anie of vs all, but he of His mercy passe by thē: for my part the lord hath taught me therby, for hereafter shall I sett a watch before my mouth, that I synne not againe in that kinde and degree.

for maister Hainsworth book I acknowledge that I erred in the place of the candelsticke and Altar: but that of the Altar, is not maister fenners error with me but mine rather with him. for other things namely the chiefe matter in controuersy I hold as I did: yea which is more I say that although it be lawfull to pray preach, and sing out of a booke, for all penitent persons, yet a man regenerate is aboue all bookes and scriptures what soever, seing he hath the spirit of God within him, which teacheth him the true meaninge of the scriptures, without the which spirit the scriptures are but a dead letter, which is perverted and misconstrued, as we see at this day, to contrary ends and sences: and that to bind a regenerate man to a booke in prayinge, preachinge or singinge, is to sett the holy ghost to schoole, in the one aswell as in the other. for the other question of elders with maister Hainsworth, and of Baptisme with maister Clifton, and the two testaments, I hold as I did, and therin I am persuaded I haue the truthe:

If anie man say why then do you not answere the bookes written in opposition, my Answere is, my desire is to end controversies among Christians rather then to make and mainteyne them, especially in matters of the outward Church ād Ceremonies: and it is the grief of my hart that I haue so long cumbred my self, and spent my time therin: and I professe That difference in Judgement for matter of circumstance, as are all things of the outward church, shall not cause me to refuse the brotherhood of anie penitent and faithfull Christian whatsoever. And now from this day forward do I putt an end to all controversies and questions, about the outward church and ceremonies with all men: and resolute to spēd my time, in the mayne matters wherin consisteth salvation. without repentance, faith, Remission of synne, and the new creature ther is no salvation. but ther is saluation without the truthe of all the outward Ceremonies of the

outward church. if anie man say[:] you answer not, because you cannot, I say to him[:] that I am accounted one that cannot answere, is not my fame, but to spend my time in a full Answere of those things of the outward Church which I am bound to imploy better, (necessity calling vppon me) would be my synne: and so I had rather be accounted vnable to Answere then to be found in synne against my conscience. Againe if I should answere, it would breed further strife among Christians. further we haue no meanes to publish our writings. but my first aswere satisfieth my conscience, and so I rest haueing peace at home in this point.

but now to come to maister Helwys his seperation, against which I haue done nothing in writing hitherto, notwithstanding I am now bound in conscience to publish an Apologie of certaine imputations cast vppon me by him in his writings[.] as first the synne against the holy ghost, bicause I haue denied some truth which once I acknowledged, and wher with I was inlightened. then this can there be no more grievous imputation cast vppon anie man, then this can there be no higher degree of censuring: what shall I say here for my Apologie, shall I say that my hart yet apperteyneth to the lord, that I daylie seeke mercie and aske forgiuenes, that I labour to reforme my self wherin I see my errour, that I continuallie search after the truth ad indeavour my self to keep a Good conscience in all things, but this, happily, will not satisfy maister Helwis, well, let vs examine the poynts wherin I Haue forsaken the truth:

Succession is the matter wherin I hold as I haue written to maister Bernard, that succession is abolished by the Church of Rome, and that ther is no true ministry deriued from the Apostels through the Church of Rome to England, but that the succession is interrupted and broken of: Secondly I hold as I did hould then, succession being broken of and interrupted, it may by two or three gathered together in the name of Christ, be renewed and assumed againe: and hearin ther is no differēce betwixt maister Helwis and me. Thirdly maister Hel. saith that although ther be churches alreadie established, ministers ordained, and sacraments administred orderly, yet men

are not bound to Joyne to those former churches established, but may being as yet vn baptized baptize themselues (as we did) and proceed to build churches of themselues, disorderly (as I take it)[.] Herin I differ from maister Helwis, and therfor he saith I Haue sinned against the holy ghost bicause I once acknowledged the truth (as Mr Helwis calleth yt:)

here I answer .3. things 1. I did never acknowledge it. 2. It is not the truth. 3. though I had acknowledged it, and it were a truth, yet in denying it I have not synned against the holie ghost.

first I did never acknowledge yt, that it was lawfull for priuate persons to baptize, when there were true churches and ministers, from whēce wee might haue our bapisme without synne, as ther are 40. witnesses that can testifie: onlie this is It which I held, that seeing ther was no church to whome wee could Joyne with a Good conscience to haue bapisme from them, therfor wee might baptize our selues: that this is so the lord knoweth, my conscience witnesseth, and maister Helwis himself will not deny it.

secondly it is not the truth that two or three priuate persons may baptize, whē ther is a true church and ministers established whence bapisme may orderlie be had: for if Christ himself did fetch his bapisme from John, and the gentills from the Jewes baptised, and if God be the God of order and not of confusion, then surely wee must obserue this order now, or els disorder is order, and God alloweth disorder: for if Mr. Helwis positiō be true, that everie two or three, that see the truth of baptism may begin to baptise, ad need not Joyne to former true churches, wher they may haue ther baptism orderly from ordained ministers: thē the order of the primitiue church, was order for them and those times onely, and this disorder will establish baptism of priuate persons, Yea of women from henceforth to the worldes end, as Mr. Helwis his ground doth evidently afford to him that will scāne it.

Thirdly though I had acknowledged that assertion of Mr. Hel. and it were the truth, and I now forsake it, it doth not ther vpon follow, that a man sinneth against

the holie ghost: for I demaund may not a man forsake a truth vppon a tēptation, and obteyne remission vppon repentance, did not Peter so in denying Christ, did not David so ād continued impenitēt, till the childe was borne after adulterie, with Bethshabe. A man therefore that vppon a temptatiō forsaketh a knouwen truth, may repent and receiue mercys, further may not a mā (as he supposeth) vppon force of argument, yeeld from the knowne truth to error for consciēce sake, haue all those sinned against the holy ghost that haue seperated from England, and are returned againes. Certainly Mr. Hel: herin erreth not a litle, and breaketh the bonde of charitie aboue all mē that I ever read or heard in vttering so sharp a Censure vppon so weake a ground: Besides the synne against the holy ghost is not in outward Ceremonies, but in matter of substance, which is the knowledge of the truth. Heb. 6. 10. namely a forsaking of repentance and faith in Christ, and falling to prophanenes and Paganisme: for I hold no part of savinge righteousnes to consist in outward ceremonies: for they are onely as a Crutch for the lame, and weak to walke withall till they be cured.

concerning succession briefly thus much: I deny all successiō except in the truth: and I hold wee are not to violate the order of the primitiue church, except Necessitie vrge a dispensation: and therefore it is not lawfull for euery one that seeth the truth to baptise, for then ther might be as manie churches as couples in the world and none haue anie thinge to doe with other: which breaketh the bonde of loue and Brotherhood in churches, but in these outward matters I dare not anie more contend with anie man but desire that we may follow the truth of Repentance, faith and regeneration, ād lay aside dis-sention, for mint comine and annis seed.

Another imputation of Mr. Hel. is concerninge the flesh of Christ: wherto I say: that he that knoweth not, that the first and second flesh of an Infant in the mothers wombe are to be distinguished, knoweth not yet the groundes of Nature and naturall resaon. I affirmed concerning Christ that his second flesh, that is his nourishment he had from his mother, and that the scriptures

are plain for yt: but concerninge the first matter of Christ[s] flesh whence it was I said thus much: That although I yeeld it to be a truth in nature that he had it of his mother Mary, yet I dare not make itt such an Article of faith as that if anie man will not consent vnto it I should therefore refuse brotherhood with him, ād that the Scriptures do not lead vs (as farr as I conceiue) to the searchinge of that point, whereof Christ[s] naturall flesh was made: but that we should searche into Christs spirituall flesh, to be made flesh of that his flesh and bone of his bone in the comunion and fellowship of the same spirit. That this was my speech ād the somme of my assertion concerning this point I call the lord ād all that hard, as witnesses: wherby appeareth Mr. Helwis his partiality in reporting this particular.

Concerning a secret imputation, which Mr. Helwis by way of intimation suggesteth as though I had receiued much helpe of maintenāce from his company or from that company of english people that came over together out of the north parts with me, I affirme thus much: that I never received of them all put together the value of fortie shillings to my knowledge since I came out of England: and of Mr. Helwis not the value of a penny: but it is well knowne to M<sup>r</sup>. Helwis, and to all the companie, that I hauē spent as much in helping the poore as M<sup>r</sup>. Hel. hath done, and it is not knowne that M<sup>r</sup>. Hel. hath spent one penny but I haue spent another in anie common burthen for the relieving of the poor. All that euer Mr. Hel. can say, is that when I was sick in England at Bashforth I was troublesome and chargeable to him: wherein I confesse his kindnes, but I would haue given him satisfaction, and he refused it, and in my sicknes ther was as much brought in as I spent.

Another imputation is of some moment, that I should affirme Christ in the flesh to be a figure of himself in the spirit: and that men are not to striue about the naturall flesh of Christ, as about his spiritual flesh: and that the contention concerning the naturall flesh of Christ, is like the contention of the soldier for Christs Coate. True, this I did affirm, and this I defend as the most excellēt and comfortable truth in the scriptures: for who knoweth



not that to knowe and be made conformable to the similitude of Christs death, buriall and resurrection in the mortification of synne and the new creature, to be made flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, spiritually in the fellowship of one holy aoynting, which is Christs spiritual flesh, who knoweth not I say that this, is better then the knowledge of Christs naturall flesh. That Christs naturall flesh is a figure of Christs spirituall flesh is playne by Ro. 6 where the Apostle saith that we must be grafted to the similitude of his death buriall and resurrection, if his death, buriall, and resurrection, be a similitude or figure so is his body, that died was buried and rose againe, the like saith the Apostle. Hebre. 4. 15. that Christ was tēpted in all things in a figure or similitude: but this point is also playne enough, that all Christ[s] miracles and doings in the flesh, with his sufferings, are figures of those heavenly things, which he in the spirit worketh in the regenerate, he cleanseth ther leprosie, casteth out the Deuill, dryeth upp the bloodie issue, rideth to Jerusalem on an Asse, stilleth the windes and sea: feedeth the multitude: for Jesus Christ is yesterday and to-day, and the same also for ever. if this be a truth, then the contention about Christ[s] naturall flesh, is in comparison like to the souldiers contention for his coate. It is the spirit that quickeneth the flesh profiteth nothing saith Christ: and so I rest satisfied in this particular.

concerning the.

[ornament]

## APPENDIX

Extracts from the Marriage Registers of Amsterdam, 1598–1617, made by Prof. J. G. de Hoop Scheffer and published 1881.

Translation of such as relate to the Gainsborough district, including two prior to the great emigration. Marks by illiterate people reproduced \*. A few notes are added, drawn partly from A Memoriaal voor Reijnier Wijbrands, in the Mennonite Library.

1601. April 28. Jelvis Zetwell\* of Nottinghamshire, trunk maker, 28 years, and Lijsbet Williams\* of Essex.
1603. November 15. Thomas Willasone of Beverkorte [West Markham], bombazine worker, 32 years, and Jenneke Cras\* of Essex, widow of Joris Marissen.
1608. July 5. Henry Cullandt of Nottinghamshire, bombazine worker, 20 years,—producing certificate by Richard Clyfton, preacher at Sutton [cum Lound], that his banns had been published there—and Margarete Grymsdiche\* of Sutton, 30 years. [In November 1613 he married at Leijden Dorothy Pettinger from Moortel, perhaps Morton near Gainsborough.]
- August 23. John Murton of Queynsborch, furrier, 25 years, and Jane Hodgkin of Worchepe, 23 years.
- August 30. Francis Pigott\* of Axen [Axholme], bricklayer's labourer, 32 years, and Margriet Struts\* of Basford, 30 years.
- October 4. Jacobus Hurste of Re克福ort, bombazine worker, 26 years, and Geertrud Bennister\* of Re克福ord, 23 years.
- December 6. Cuthbert Hutton of Daelton, tinsmith, 27 years, and Prudence Blass of Berford, 21 years.
- December 10. Jan Willems\* of Redtford, bombazine worker, 24 years, and Marserye Dall\* of [Sutton cum] Laundt, 32 years.
1609. April 11. William Jepson\* of Worship in Nottinghamshire, house carpenter, 26 years, and Rosemund Horsfeld\*, also of Worship, 23 years. [He lived in Leijden 1611–1635.]
1610. October 23. Matthew Auckland of Brechtwyl, glover, 24 years, and Elisabet Pygadt\* of Axen, 19 years. [He married again August 1, 1615.]
1611. February 12. Edward Armfield of Epeestown [Epworth or Edwinstowe?], damask worker, 26 years, and Margery Orghan\* of Kasselwey [Kersall?], 33 years.

1612. April 4. Eduard Amlin of Saltsbury, bombazine worker, 25 years, and Lijsbeth Smyth\* of Cambridge, 21 years. [John Smyth apparently married near Cambridge in 1598.]
- July 14. Salomon Thomson of Lauwe, bombazine worker, 21 years, and Dorothea Struth\* of Axem, 34 years. Witness his father Antoni Thoms and her nephew Francis Pygott. [Their daughter married in 1636. Anthoni Thomasson an old man and Lijsbet his wife joined the church 21 December 1614.]
- September 22. Thomas Salzbery\* of London, trunk maker, widower of Aelken Andries, and Elisabet Scharp of Nottinghamshire, 25 years. Their witnesses are Francis, Joseph and Richard Bennett.
1612. November 10. Barthey Silman\* of Alewick, Northumber, bombazine worker, 26 years, and Elsebet Glind\* of Gilbe in Leicestershire, 26 years. [Gilby is close to Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire.]
1613. June 29. William Masit of Passit, bombazine worker, widower of Lijsbet Willens, and Dorothea Thomas\* of Thorburg [Thoresby], 19 years. Her witness is her father Thomas Perkins.
- July 6. Timothy Moyse of Penchaster [Penshurst?] in Kentshire, 26 years, and Lijsbet Meryweder of Ingelby in Lincolnshire, 23 years.
- July 13. Eduard Philip\* of Bedfordshire, bombazine worker, 35 years, and Anna Hutton\* of Boolem [Bollom close to Retford], 24 years.
- September 7. Richard Plater of Bockingham, compositor, 24 years, and Janneke Hodry\* of Nottinghamshire, 28 years.
- November 9. William Bradford of Ostervelde [Austerfield], fustian worker, 23 years, dwelling at Leijden; when asked about the banns he said he was an orphan; and Dorothea May, 16 years, of Witsbutts. Her witness is Henry Mayr.
1615. May 2. Swithunus Grindall of Tunstal in Yorkshire, fustian worker, 22 years, and Margriete Moritz\* of Scheckbye [Scrooby?] in Nottinghamshire, 24 years. [Next day, both were received into membership at the Bakehouse. Hamary their daughter on 21 Dec. 1636. Johannes was deacon 1661-1666.]
- August 29. William Waldern\* of Klokfort and Ruth Walker\* of Marquet Overton in Rottland, 20 years. Witness her father Eduard Walker. [Married again at Leijden 1634.]
- November 9. Alexander Hodgkin\* of Warssoop, damask worker, 25 years, and Ursele Harstaff\* of Gende [Gedney?], widow of Thomas Bywater. [Both received into membership at the Bakehouse on 8 November 1625.]
1616. July 23. Pieter Alkin of Meltenmook, sword cutler, 24 years, and Marijtje Alberts, 28 years.
- October 13. Jan Robberts\* of Nottinghamshire, painter, 25 years, and Maritje Thomas of London, 17 years. Witness her mother, Maritje Jans.
- October 27. William Davids of Derbyshire, embroiderer, 29 years, and Beliken Harmans of Hillegeloo, 24 years.
- [1635. Dec. 16. Samuel Pigot the son of Thomas Pigot joined the church. Thomas succeeded Smyth as pastor in 1612 and died 1639.]

## NOTES

### THE BRIGHT MORNING STARRE

This has been reprinted from a transcript, and collated by the editor with the only known copy of the original, in Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The donor was archbishop William Sancroft, alumnus of the college. The volume is a duodecimo, containing six pages unnumbered, 1-195, and a page of errata; the latter have been incorporated in the reprint. The size is 117 mm. × 65 mm., and a full page contains 24 lines. The side-notes are in the margin. Forty-one other misprints are corrected here; chiefly dropping a letter or a point, or interchange of u and n.

P. 2, l. 6. *Priviledge of the Presse*. The publication of opinions had long been controlled by both Church and State. Henry VIII as Head of the Church assumed the authority over printing asserted by the Pope in 1501. Mary chartered the Stationers' Company and gave it a monopoly of the press; its registers contain a record of all books licensed in London, and these entries have been extracted and published by Professor Arber; they hardly bear out Smyth's charges of a general low tone. Under Elizabeth the Star Chamber recognized the rights of the universities.

P. 2, l. 32. *My style*. The book fails to keep the promises here made. Technical terms of grammar, logic, rhetoric abound, with occasional words of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and rare allusions to commentators. University men were perhaps hardly conscious how remote they were from that plainness of words and sentences which Smyth aimed at. Not till he had read the 1610 book of I.H. did he escape the habits of analyzing and syllogizing, to write straightforwardly in his Last Book.

P. 3. *English version*. The Great Bible, edited by Coverdale in 1539, was still the version authorized by the State, and the extracts in the Book of Common Prayer were from it. The Bishops' Bible of 1568 had been adopted by the Southern Convocation, with orders that a copy be placed in every cathedral and be bought by every church dignitary. But outside church walls these were little used, even by such ecclesiastics as Bishop Andrewes. For example, the University of Cambridge, when it began printing Bibles in 1591, chose the popular Genevan version. A new edition appeared in 1599, containing the O.T. of 1560, the N.T. Englished by Tomson in 1576 from Beza's Latin version of 1565, the Apocalypse being a version of 1592 from the recent Latin of Junius. This is what Smyth used, and some of his notes refer to the notes of the English editors, which in the N.T. were abbreviated from Beza and Camerarius.

P. 3, l. 16. *Bright Morning Starre*. This title was based upon a suggestion by Junius and Tremellius, 1575-1590, in their Latin version, as a

rendering of the Hebrew *Aijeleth hasshachar*, the exact wording being borrowed from Apoc. xxii. 16. See page 16. But if this Hebrew phrase be a subscription to Psalm xxi., not a superscription to Psalm xxii., as Dr Thirle contends on the analogy of Habakkuk iii., the title is badly chosen.

P. 10, l. 9. *The old translatur.* Not Coverdale or Wiclif, but the Aramaic Targumist of the eleventh century.

P. 10, l. 13. Racking was customable in the Tower at this time.

P. 15, ll. 7-11. The development of Smyth's views on congregational singing is worth studying. The reformation in Germany led to the congregational use of vernacular hymns, and hymns in English were published under Henry VIII, his primer of 1545 containing eight versions from the Latin, enjoined for public use. Elizabeth permitted the Venite to be sung, and also that "in such places where they doe sing, there shall the Lesson bee sung in a plain tune." But the people desired more, and in 1562 there was published "The whole booke of psalmes. Collected into English meetre, by Thomas Sternhold, John Hopkins, and others, conferred with the Hebrue, with apt notes to sing them withall. Set forth and allowed to be sung in all churches, of all the people together before and after Morning and Evening praier, &c." In the edition of 1601, metrical versions of the ancient canticles and the commandments are prefixed to the psalms, intermixed with others of the Veni Creator, the Quicunque Vult, the Lord's Prayer, and five modern hymns. But the influence of Calvin was against non-scriptural hymns, and Smyth adopted his view here. As to instrumental music, he fell in with the use of organs, long established in England. The set at Belton was sold about this time by a church-warden to a Councillor at York.

P. 16, l. 37. The Genevan note says bluntly that "this was the name of some common song."

P. 17, l. 20. Text, *an high*; the alteration was made before the editor saw that this agreed with the Genevan text.

P. 18. Smyth had not yet studied Hofmann's doctrine of the person of Christ.

P. 35, l. 10. This identification of the young man mentioned by John Mark, with the John whom Jesus loved, is not due to Beza's notes; these do identify Peter just above.

P. 48, l. 18. There was a healthy reaction at Christ's College against allegorical abuse, led by Chaderton and Perkins.

P. 56, l. 5. The mortality of the soul came to be asserted by Richard Overton, associated in 1615 with Smyth's followers.

P. 64, l. 37. The problem of the salvation of infants was already easy for Smyth; he had not yet considered the question of their baptism.

## A PATERNE OF TRVE PRAYER

This has been reprinted from the copy acquired through the editor for the Baptist College at Regent's Park, lent by the kindness of the Rev. Principal Gould, M.A., D.D. A copy has long been at York Minster, where however the catalogue attributes it to another man. A third specimen has been put together from imperfect copies by the Rev. T. G. Crippen, B.A., and is in the Congregational Library at the Memorial Hall. A fourth is owned by Mr Champlin Burrage, and a fifth was in 1905 acquired by the British Museum.

The book would cost to-day about three guineas. It was sold for sixpence by Master Man, senior, and Thomas Man, junior, who entered it at Stationers' Hall on 22 March, 1604-5. It contains viii and 182 pages. Thomas Man, junior, had it reprinted in 1624 by J.D., a testimony to the devotional character of the book, and its comparative freedom from controversy. The reprint has been mistakenly credited in some catalogues to John Smith of St John's College, Oxford, vicar of Clavering, 1592-1616, who did preach on *The Substance and Pith of Prayer*, printed in *The Essex Dove*, 1629. Copies of this second edition have long been at the British Museum, Sion College, and Trinity College, Dublin; the editor secured another copy for the Baptist Church House.

The typography is good, but the editor has replaced nine letters or points which had dropped, put right eleven more, and corrected the order of two changes.

P. 82, l. 7. Farel had quite disused liturgies, but Calvin compiled one for use at Geneva on Sundays, and his example was widely followed, as by Knox with the *Book of Common Order*.

P. 88, l. 13. *Libbe*. The word meant to maim, especially to geld; compare *Lop*.

P. 112, l. 31. *Pray for the dead*. Lancelot Andrewes, of Pembroke, did adopt the common ancient petition; *Dona eis requiem aeternam, et lux perpetua luceat eis*. Oxford edition of 1675, page 326.

P. 116, l. 25. Text, *seated*. But compare John vi. 27; "for him hath God the father sealed."

P. 119, l. 28. *Mouths*. Probably a slip for *months*; compare 167.

P. 124, l. 32. Compare Jer. viii. 6; "as the horse rusheth into the battell." *Bard*, armoured, was obsolescent, like the custom.

P. 124, l. 38. *Prease*, press.

P. 125, l. 25. Smyth changed his views on 1 Cor. vii. 14.

P. 147, l. 2. This is over-stated; only one verb is apparently in the past, and that is only if one particular punctuation is adopted; all the versions take it as a future.

P. 147, l. 7. Within a few years, Smyth had a new interpretation of the Mark of the beast on the forehead.

P. 151, l. 14. *Simonie*. Smyth would seem to disapprove even the Puritan systems of lecture-ships and of buying up benefices; as also the transaction whereby Bisse of Batcombe bought in 1613 the next presentation to that living, and presented Bernard of Worksop.

P. 154, l. 11. Text, *4*. Comparison with page 137 shows a combination here of 3, 4 and 5 there.

- P. 155, l. 29. Apparent meaning, *good in its own nature*.  
 P. 156, l. 4. Text, *faith*; but query, *forth*.  
 P. 158, l. 40. Text, *substitute*; but query, *institute*.  
 P. 161, l. 11. The exigencies of controversy compelled this defiance of history.  
 P. 225, l. 34. *Callion*. Not registered in the Oxford Dictionary.  
 P. 227, l. 20. *The diuell*. Smyth had not thought of Chrysostom's interpretation, Deliver us from the evil one.  
 P. 233, l. 23. Text, *Alezander*. The form *Apostata* here and in line 33 is Low Latin.  
 P. 237, l. 8. Textual criticism was not yet developed, though the Rheims version and Fulke's edition of it parallel with the Bishops' version had raised this and other problems. This particular point had been discussed by Joannes Maldonatus in his *Commentarii in quatuor evangelia*, 1596, and page 347 suggests that this author was known to him.

## PRINCIPLES AND INFERENCES

This has been reprinted from a transcript by the editor of the only copy known in England, at York Minster Library, and has been read with that original. A second copy once in that library was acquired by Dr Dexter "by the courtesy of its authorities," and is probably now at Yale with the rest of his collection. The copy which he left, once contained two sheets, 32 pages, but the first leaf is now missing. It has been bound with much blank paper into a small volume numbered xx. G. 25, but also numbered xvi. The printing is poor, and suggests Amsterdam as the place. Italic and roman are intermixed on no intelligible principle, even in the same word, and therefore no attempt has been made to reproduce the variety. The spelling however, and the punctuation, however extraordinary, are respected, though nineteen obvious misprints have been corrected in the text. Page 1 may have shown the place and name of author; in any case the Salutation on pages 270-272 of this edition shows that Smyth speedily avowed the work.

## THE DIFFERENCES OF THE CHURCHES

This has been reprinted from a transcript by the editor of the copy at the Bodleian, and has been read with the copy at the British Museum, acquired in October 1898. A third copy is at Sion College, a fourth at Harvard.

Dr Dexter's transcript of the title in his *Congregationalism*, Appendix, page 23, is not accurate in details, as may be seen by comparison. Moreover, the date is clearly given, and the pagination, certainly unusual, is: Title, blank, three unnumbered, 32, three unnumbered. This suggests that the Certayne demaundes after the first FINIS were an after-thought to fill up the fifth sheet. Even so, there was room for a recapitulation of the chapter-headings, here omitted.

The size of the quarto page is 177 mm. × 132 mm., and this is the size of the next two books. Apparently Smyth found a printer who suited him, and gave him the rest of his work. Richard Plater of Buckingham, a compositor, was in Amsterdam by 1613, when he married Janneke Hodry of Nottinghamshire. Helwys however after the rupture adopted a different format, perhaps with another press.

The typography is much better than that of the preceding work, founts are rarely mixed, except for a capital K for a k, and an italic *q*, corrected here without notice. Perhaps that work was sent in advance and printed without Smyth reading, this was read on the spot. There are many signs that w was insisted upon after vv had been set up, and that it had to be borrowed from a larger fount. The long f is often used after the s instead of before, in continental fashion. There are three other cases of wrong fount, twenty-one of u and n interchanged, with nineteen other substitutions, nine errors of points and three of figures; all corrected here. The pages are curiously numbered, with all even numbers on the recto.

P. 276, ll. 32-3. Probably *confortable* is meant, the word *confort* being often used.

P. 290. It is a singular light on the state of antiquarian learning at Cambridge, that the early church of Rome was supposed to have been Latin, incapable of using the Septuagint. Even a tiro might have remembered that Paul wrote to it in Greek. All this chapter assumes that the Septuagint was made for the Gentiles, not noticing that the Jews of the Western Dispersion used Greek.

P. 294. The second objection. Neither Smyth nor Ainsworth had noticed two facts. At Acts xi. 20 the true reading is still disputed, the Bezan manuscript giving *Hellenas*, corrected into *Hellenistas*. Setting that aside, the term *Hellenistai* is used only twice, of the Grecian Jews in Jerusalem, and not of Grecian Jews generally. The objection therefore is badly stated, and the first reply is acute. But the second is very special pleading, and probably most will feel that Ainsworth had the better of the argument.

## PARALLELES, CENSURES, OBSERVATIONS

This is a book of 1609, written as a commentary on a letter of 1607 and some intervening books. It is Smyth's last word in a controversy which was to engage other disputants for a year longer.

It arose by Bernard of Worksop formulating some doubts and objections, to which Smyth made answer on the same sheet, one by one, requesting a continuance of the discussion; see page 332, foot. Bernard however ignored the request, and preferred to send a letter to Helwys, printed here on pages 337-8, attacking the Separation and naming Smyth. He replied after three days in a letter which Bernard criticised in a publication now usually referred to as *Christian Advertisements*, but which is here cited by a later phrase in the title as *The Seperatists Schisme*. This was issued on 18 June 1608, six or seven months after the letter. Hence the letter can be dated about November 1607, and was written before Smyth published *Principles and Inferences*. The letter is here divided into nineteen sections, but otherwise is as sent originally; page 328, foot.



Bernard was replied to by Ainsworth, another Cambridge Separatist at Amsterdam, in *Counterpoysion*. Smyth here takes into account (1) his original letter, to which he adds parallels, (2) Bernard's reply, which he censures, (3) Ainsworth's answer to that, on which he offers observations. And therefore we have the letter of 1607 and the last word of 1609 on the same pages. They afford the means of tracing how far Smyth varied in these respects during the interval.

In other respects he had gone further; for within a few days he put out his first Baptist book. Bernard found it convenient to ignore this set of *Censures* on his first book, and to reply to *Counterpoysion* and to the *Character* in his *Plaine Evidences*. Smyth deliberately dropped all controversy and apologized for having spent so much time on it.

The present reprint is from the copy at the Bodleian, roto-graphed for the purpose, page by page. For the book is rare, and the only other copy Dexter mentioned seems to be a different book, by John Smith, Fellow of Queens'. A second copy is catalogued at Trinity College, Dublin; and an imperfect third at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon St. The editor found a fourth copy in the University Library, Cambridge, where the catalogue entry is out of place, and does not identify the author, while the shelf-mark has been superseded; it can be seen by applying with perseverance for Old Bb. 11. 14.

The typography shows a tendency to space the comma and other stops away from the words, and some intermixture of italic colons, here replaced by roman without notice.

There are 280 misprints corrected, of which 84 are interchanges of u and n, 21 interchanges of r and t, with a few interchanges of c and e, v and y. Anything at all questionable or exceptional is noted separately. The spelling "distinguish" is almost regular with this compositor.

P. 335, l. 40. Thomas White was a minister who, in 1603, had joined the Ancient Church in Amsterdam, left it soon and in 1605 published a book in England against it, was arrested for slander therein, and acquitted. Henoeh Clapham in 1598 dedicated a book to "a poor remnant of the ever visible Catholic and Apostolic Church" in Amsterdam, 1598; in 1607 he accepted the vicarage of Northbourne. See Arber, *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, pp. 99, 118.

P. 341, l. 3. Robert Browne was now Rector of Achurch, and was appearing at the archdeacon's visitations in Oundle from 1608 to 1611 without any complaint as to his behaviour; Congregational Historical Society, *Transactions*, iii. 307. Bernard's own conduct was very parallel to Browne's.

P. 342, ll. 2, 3. The third answer was published by Robinson in 1610, *A Iustification of Separation*. It was his maiden work, written at the age of 34. Almost at the same time, in an *Answer to a Censorious Epistle*, he lifted the gauntlet thrown down by Joseph Hall to Smyth and himself, which Smyth declined to notice.

P. 345, ll. 6, 8. Text, *go*. This is evidently a contraction for *ergo*, for it appears often; it is however not registered in the dictionaries.

P. 345, l. 23. In this edition, page 253.

P. 349, l. 31. *Anabaptists* in Smyth's opinion held false views as to the person and offices of Christ. He had not yet had occasion to examine closely the doctrine of that section which worshipped half a mile from him.

When he did, a year later, he gave a general approval, but did put certain queries to them: see pages 681-684.

P. 454, l. 27. Text, *Pagwin*. Pagninus the Dominican made the first modern Latin version from the Hebrew, under the auspices of three Popes, and printed at Lyons 1528. The famous decree of Trent commending the Vulgate, was aimed largely against the general use of such new versions as by him and Erasmus. In 1557 Stephanus reprinted it; it was revised by Arias Montanus and in 1569 was incorporated in the Antwerp polyglot, being published separately, 1584. This passage implies that Smyth and Bernard had heard lectures at Cambridge which took account of the new Catholic version; possibly by Baro.

P. 458, l. 17. Text, *4*. But comparison with Bernard's original, made by the Rev. T. G. Crippen, B.A., at the request of the editor, shows that he gives only these three points, numbered properly.

P. 504, l. 39. Text, *Revellat*. This passage was already being studied in a new connection, and was to prove the key to the problem of a true church, so that it furnished a title to the next book.

Pp. 516-518. The restraint here is wonderful, when Ainsworth tells us that only a few days after this book appeared, his next came out, dealing with baptism from quite other standpoints. It is a good testimony to the value of the logical training, that he kept so strictly to the matter in hand.

## THE CHARACTER OF THE BEAST

This is another composite book, showing three stages in a debate. Written discussion began by Smyth sending Clifton two propositions, each supported by three reasons; the paper is printed on page 574. Clifton answered point by point in writing, dating it March 14, 1608, which we should call 24 March, 1609. Smyth replied equally carefully in writing ten days later, and sent the reply direct. He then set to work to prepare for the press, putting first the Propositions, then Clifton's answer dissected, each section followed at once by the section replying to it; and he prefixed to the whole an Epistle to the Reader. The book came out still during 1609, and so far before the close of the year in March, 1610, that Ainsworth's *Defence of the Holy Scriptures* in the same year refers to it as lately published; page [iii]; and even as only "a few dayes after" the *Paralleles* appeared; page 118. Meanwhile Clifton had almost finished his second answer, and was rather surprised to find the "former private passages" thus made public, though he might by this time have known Smyth's methods. Clifton therefore coated the snowball afresh, and using various types to distinguish the layers, published the four rounds of debate in 1610 with the title *A Plea for Infants*.

All these dates are consistent, but there is one irreconcilable statement hidden in the catalogue of the documents at the Mennonite archives in Amsterdam. Some one translated the preface, making six folio pages in Dutch; catalogued as MS. 1346, where it is dated November 1608. This appears impossible, for the preface was surely written last, and the

discussion did not begin till four months later. It is possible that the translation was executed November 1609, and the serial number in the catalogue suggests as much.

Clifton says that the book was circulated in England, and this is borne out by the speedy appearance of churches on Smyth's lines. But the book is excessively rare, even the British Museum having acquired a copy only this century. The present reprint is from the only copy previously known, at the Bodleian; the authorities there permitted it to be rotographed page by page for the purpose. A page measures 185 mm. × 135 mm., and contains 44 lines.

The editor has corrected 73 changed letters, 36 points, 8 redundant letters, 7 spacings, 5 figures, 4 transpositions, 2 turnings; no letters were dropped.

P. 569, l. 19. This is in the continuation of Eusebius.

P. 570, l. 11. This treatise as to the Covenants was never published, and the manuscript is unknown. Had there been a clear discussion of the historic Covenants in scripture, specially the Old Covenant and the New, connected with Sinai and Calvary, Cocceius might not have led theologians to consider his so-called covenants of works and of grace. Smyth contributed so much to clear thinking on all other questions relating to the church and baptism, that it is very unfortunate we do not possess his thoughts on the Abrahamic covenant, or circumcision, on seals; as to which no clear exposition is current even yet.

P. 617, ll. 32-37. Heinrich Pantaleo published his *Chronographia Christianae Ecclesiae* in 1561. He seems to have missed the point, for according to the 1624 edition at Lyons of the Canon Law, Paschae "tempore celebrandum est catholicum. Sed tamen, si necesse fuerit, ... quocunque loco vel momento... baptizentur." On the statement of Pantaleo, Smyth argued well; he might have found in Gratian other authorities, Socrates regretting that as late as A.D. 440 the Thessalians still baptized only at Easter, so that but for a few, the rest died unbaptized; v. 22: Siricius writing to Himerius of Tarragona about A.D. 300, that at Rome and elsewhere, Easter and Pentecost were the proper days even for infants, except in cases of necessity.

P. 618, l. 5. Again this is not the same Eusebius, but Socrates his continuator.

P. 618, l. 13. The confession adopted at Petrikau in 1557 was drafted by Stanislaus Hosius, then bishop of Ermland, who signalized himself by deliberate depreciation of the scriptures, and exaltation of Church authority.

P. 631, l. 11. This is an ingenious translation which does not seem to have commended itself lately. It could be defended by pointing to Rom. ii. 26-27, iii. 30, iv. 9, and claiming that the article defines the people uncircumcised, the anarthrous noun signifies their state. But a reference to Genesis xvii. 11 will leave the matter open.

P. 638, l. 25. Within three years, Smyth explicitly denied that infants were born in sin.

P. 674, l. 24. March 14, 1608. This seems to be expressed according to Old Style, which was still legal in England, and was still usual in conservative circles in Holland; the Amsterdam Waterlanders appointed a meeting for May 23, stilo novo, which the Leeuwarden church declined to attend, in a letter dated May 5 old style, 1610. When therefore Clifton

and Smyth were corresponding, it seems that they retained the method they were familiar with. Their letters are dated March 14 and 24, 1608, but in Dutch legal style they would be March 24 and April 3, 1609. This is confirmed by the printer's date of 1609 on the title-page, page 563 in this edition.

## APPLICATION FOR UNION

This has been printed from a transcript of the original, a page of foolscap written by Smyth, presented to the Waterlander Mennonite church in Amsterdam, and preserved in the archives of the united Doopsgezinde Gemeente on the Singel in that city, where it is numbered B 1347. A copy by Prof. Müller was printed by Evans in 1862, since when transcripts have been made by Dexter, Whitsitt, Burrage, and the present editor. Since the contractions and the handwriting have combined with the fallibility of transcribers to produce printed variants, the original has been photographed and is published herewith. In this and the documents following, the contractions have been extended in type.

The order of the names testifies to Smyth's modesty. The list is headed by the Bromheads, who were well-connected; that Hugh had been a clergyman was irrelevant in Smyth's present state of mind. Nevill and Jane Southworth were also of the gentry, their families being important enough to attract the attention of the ecclesiastical courts.

## THE FIRST BAPTIST CONFESSION

This is printed from a transcript of manuscript B 1348 in the Singel library, made for this work. It has not been possible to correct proofs with this autograph of Smyth, but there are only two readings at all doubtful. In article 7 the stroke after *postea* may be read as a hyphen; the controversy as to the *post-nati* was still in men's minds and may have momentarily confused Smyth. In article 13 the contraction is so abbreviated that apart from context the word appears to be *verbi*. A version by Müller was printed by Evans in 1862, the original by Scheffer 1881 and Burrage 1912.

The document was almost certainly drafted by Smyth, whose signature indeed is appended; Bromhead was perhaps capable of doing it, but there is nothing to connect him specially with it. It is worth close study, as a complete exposition of faith, no undue emphasis being placed on any topic. Two points would certainly attract attention in English circles; the emphatic assertion of free will with the accompanying denial of original sin; the emphasis laid on the human life of Jesus Christ. The sacraments are defined only as symbols, and no hint is given of any efficacy whatever.

While form and matter are due to Smyth, so that the document deserves its place in his works, yet the whole church adopted it; *Corde credimus et ore confitemur*. From this standpoint it deserves a place which has been occupied by a later confession, altered from Smyth by Helwys. This was

known to Crosby and reprinted badly; Underhill reprinted from Crosby with further distortion and with most erroneous notes; hence arose the idea of its being the first confession. A reprint of Helwys, from a transcript by the present editor of the original pamphlet at York, was printed by McGlothlin in 1911. That edition pointed out that between the 27 English articles of Helwys, and the present 20 Latin articles of Smyth, intervened 19 Latin articles of Helwys; these had been transcribed by the present editor, and have since been published independently by Burrage, II. 182. Comparison will show that Helwys depended on Smyth, though he differed. Hence this document is here entitled, *The First Baptist Confession*.

It may be added, that Baptists have scarcely ever regarded the Confessions of one era as touchstones to test the orthodoxy of later generations; rather they are like the photographs by which we may trace the growth of a community in wisdom as well as in stature. Later General Baptist confessions are those of 1651, 1660, 1678, 1691, 1696, 1704. From 1731 to 1734 there was an agitation as to signing articles, issuing in an emphatic repudiation of the idea. Of the churches surviving to-day, more than two-thirds are now allied with the Baptist Union, the remainder form the General Baptist Assembly. Both bodies, however unequal in other respects, decline to impose any antique test of membership, but declare from time to time what are the chief points which they believe with the heart and confess with the mouth.

## DEFENCE OF RIES' CONFESSION

This is published for the first time, from a transcript of Smyth's autograph, B 1364 in the Singel library, made for this work; it has not been collated with the original, and a few conjectural emendations are noted, obvious slips being corrected silently.

The catalogue of the library implies by its numeration that this document was written after July 1610, and before 1612. The entry sums it up as: Notes to some articles of the confession of faith of Hans de Ries against the opinions therein advanced: Latin, autograph of John Smyth, 12 pages folio; with Dutch translation by Reijnier Wijbrands.

But this description, which probably is quite modern, as has been noted in a previous case, by no means fits the facts. The confession had been censured in many respects, by some members of the Reformed Party, as is stated in the comments on articles 23 and 29 amongst other places, *Vos Reformati*. This document repels the censures and vindicates the confession.

The previous document, and the following one, are signed by John Smyth; this is not. Admitting for the sake of argument that this is in his writing, it is quite possible that the Dutch document by Wijbrands is the original, and that this is a version made by Smyth so that he and his friends might consider it. They had asked for further elucidation, perhaps this was given them in response. Whether Smyth was the author of this defence, or only studied it, he undoubtedly came to agree with it in most respects, as can be verified by the full exposition of his own

views in the 100 articles. And in the absence of decisive evidence against his authorship, it is printed among his works.

There are six letters of April-July 1610 between the Amsterdam church and sister churches at Leeuwarden, Harlingen, Rijnsburg and Hoorn, relative to the proposal from Smyth and his friends to unite. Versions by Müller were printed by Evans, the originals by Burrage, and Burgess has summarised the correspondence. One point in it claims attention here, the position of this confession by Ries.

It seems generally agreed that this had been written by him in or about 1580; according to himself as published in 1744, "This short confession I first wrote on entreaty, and on behalf of several Englishmen fled from England for conscience sake." A friend amplified this in 1676, saying that it was in order that 60 or 70 English people might know what he believed; (Barclay, *Inner Life*, 72, 83). We should suspect confusion of date, and that it was written in 1610 for Smyth's friends, only that these six letters refer to it. In May five other ministers asked for the "short account of the chief articles of your doctrine and the customs of the congregations, which you have pointed out for them, in writing." On 16 July "the confession...according to your desire, is sent to you," and on the 18th it was acknowledged as "the thirty eight articles of creed," clearly identifying it with the 38 articles given to Smyth's friends. But the ministers at Leeuwarden wrote thus: "As regards the request for our advice and approval which you desire about the 38 articles of creed presented to us, this is all in vain. As all men can see them in printed books, we may now expect with you a general opinion of them by all men. Therefore we think it rather impertinent to ask this from us in particular. Time will show; many have had no other opportunity but to see it once and read it once. Moreover, we have something else to do."

That is to say, when the 38 articles came, they were recognized as substantially the 40 articles already in print, which had been available for all men to attend to, and which the Leeuwarden ministers declined to attend to. They declined to regard the views of Ries as deserving any special attention, and decidedly resented being invited to express any opinion in a hurry.

Their decision was proved wise by two distinct episodes. His views had been challenged by some members of the Reformed—whether Dutch or English does not appear—and especially in that they reproduced much from Kaspar Schwenkfelt the Silesian mystic; this document deals with those challenges. They were repeated from within the Waterlanders by Nittert Obbes, who published an attack in 1624, inaugurating a pamphlet war that subsided only with his death in 1630. Barclay sketches this in his tenth chapter, and claims that through Ries the views of Schwenkfelt were passed to Fox and became standard among the Friends; Barclay did not know this document, which would have thrown further light on the sequence.

Then the States of Holland obliged the Mennonites to publish their views, that it might be seen whether they were tolerable. This state demand broke down their reluctance to have any united Confession, and in 1632 one was drawn up in 18 articles, which commanded the assent of several of the groups hitherto divided, then was approved outside the

Netherlands, and is still standard in America. But this is not the confession of Ries, which thenceforward received little further attention.

The articles of Ries were printed in Latin, and may be seen in Schijn, *Historia &c.*, i. 172. An English version is in McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions*, 26. They are not quoted here, for the arguments are intelligible as they stand.

The Biblical quotations are scarcely ever from the Vulgate, nor from any standard version; they may possibly be indebted to Tremellius and Junius, but are apparently original renderings; in discussing Genesis iv. 6, 7, at page 689, minute textual readings are dealt with. Though 13 years had elapsed since Smyth went down from Cambridge, he shows good evidence of the thoroughness of his linguistic and theological training there.

P. 686, ll. 1 and 2. Transcript, *degenetur*.

P. 691, l. 38. Transcript, *palumbae*, a portmanteau word from *palumbi* and *columbae*.

P. 696, l. 26. Transcript, *versus*.

P. 698, last word. Transcript, *externa*.

P. 702, l. 25. Transcript, *quae*.

## ARGUMENTA CONTRA BAPTISMUM INFANTUM

This is published for the first time, from a transcript made for this work of Smyth's autograph, B 1354 in the Singel library, a quarto of twenty pages; a Dutch version by Wijbrands is there preserved with it. There is no memorandum as to the circumstances which called it forth.

This reproduction has not been collated with the original; 57 conjectural emendations have been made in spelling, thanks largely to the proof-readers. The principal variations from the transcript are as follows:

P. 711, l. 31 and often. Transcript, *impteri*.

P. 712, l. 13. Transcript, *siquido*.

P. 715, l. 3. Transcript, *exportant*.

P. 717, l. 26. Transcript, *einandi*.

P. 722, l. 4. Transcript, *mutae accipe verum*.

ll. 26, 29. Transcript, *potenda, potendum*.

P. 723, l. 25. Transcript, *suo*.

l. 37. Transcript, *coniurendo*.

P. 728, ll. 15, 16. The full stop follows *atque*.

P. 729, l. 3. Transcript, *occepi*.

## PROPOSITIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Only a single copy of this work is known, in the Minster library at York. This reprint is from a transcript by the editor, collated with the original; it incorporates the errata tabulated in the original, and obeys the printer's note "Help thyself by the sense as to the faults in words, letters, points," so far as to correct obvious slips in punctuation and

misprints. Several of the references appear somewhat dubious, and recourse has been made to the manuscript Dutch version at Amsterdam for occasional suggestions.

The work is a blackletter octavo, 143 mm. × 90 mm., 34 lines to the page; and is very composite. First is a half sheet of which only leaves ij and iij survive, containing the Epistle to the reader signed T. P.; the title-page is therefore missing. The *Propositions and Conclusions* follow, occupying sheets A and half B. Then comes the last book of John Smyth, *Retractions and Confirmations*, occupying the second half B and a quarter of C. Next, the *Life and Death*, occupying C 3-7 recto; two pages blank, with some errata to the *Propositions* on C 8 verso. The editor of the whole was evidently Thomas Pigott, recognized leader of the church, soon to be ordained as minister. His account of Smyth's deathbed is not reprinted, but one or two touches have been noted in the introduction.

A Dutch version of the *Propositions and Conclusions* exists in the Mennonite library, in manuscript, occupying 16 folios; a duplicate accompanies in 40 pages quarto; the one contains 102 articles, the other 101. The inter-relation of these two versions with the English here reprinted, would be a valuable exercise in textual criticism. It is reasonable to assume that the English was the work of Smyth, but it is not certain whether the Dutch versions were made from an earlier draft or from the printed edition; nor is it certain whether the variations met with his approval, or whether they were made by Pigott and others when presenting their corporate creed at a later period when again negotiating for union. The catalogue at Amsterdam certainly dates them 1612, but this is not a contemporary note, and apparently dates from after 1862. In that year Dr Evans, of Scarborough, printed a re-translation of the Dutch made by Prof. Müller of the library, no one then seeming to know of the York copy; as the present catalogue at Amsterdam refers to this, the reference must be later than 1862.

The York copy was seen and copied in 1871 by Dexter, who kept his discovery to himself. In 1874 Waddington published long extracts, again without saying whence he obtained them. It was Barclay who in 1876 made its existence generally known, and he also incorporated it after chapter vi in his *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, whence the *Propositions* were reprinted in 1911 by Prof. McGlothlin in his *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. But though Barclay eulogised his collator as careful, yet the spelling was modernized and the parts were transposed, without notice. A more careful reprint from the original was embodied in 1911 by Mr Walter H. Burgess in his *Smith the Se-Baptist*, again with modernized spelling, punctuation, and references. He added also seven notes as to the *Propositions*, assuming, as Prof. McGlothlin was doing independently, that the Dutch version represented an earlier draft. A study of these variations will rather suggest that they were a later modification, after Smyth's death, to adjust the propositions to a Mennonite horizon.

A note on the first proposition will indicate some of the perplexities that await a close student. The first reference was given by Prof. Müller as Job xi. 6; but the English is Heb. xi. 6, which is certainly right. The last reference is given by Prof. Müller as Job xxii. 13 which is quite pertinent. The English text is Esay xxii. 73, which does not exist; if a conjectural



emendation be made to Esay xxii. 13, we get, Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die; which is quite pertinent to the Epicure. So again to the sixth proposition, the English reference is Joh. lxxvii. 3, apparently a misprint for xvii. 3 which is given in the Dutch version; but this, though grazing the question, does not prove the proposition. To the fourteenth proposition the references are Gen. ii. 16, 17 and iii. 16, 17 and 27; Ecclesiastes vii. 31. These are incomprehensible, and the Dutch version offers another unintelligible set. Barclay's edition, followed by Burgess, gives without any notice of change, Gen. ii. 16, 17; iii. 6, 7; Eccles. vii. 29: the emendation is happy. The present edition professes to reproduce the references as printed in text or errata, except in the following cases: Proposition 28: text 2 Peter 2. 2, corrected by the Dutch version to 2 Peter 2. 1. Proposition 59: text Johan. 2. 13, corrected by the Dutch version to Johan. 1. 13. Proposition 65: text 2 P. 2. 23, 27, printed here; Dutch gives Rev. xxi. 2, adopted by Barclay with the conflation of 23. 27; followed by Burgess. Proposition 74: text Pro. 2. 12; errata 10. 12; Dutch version 20. 11; Burgess amends to 20. 12, adopted here. Proposition 90: text 1 Cor. 4. 8 and 9 chap.; Dutch version 2 Cor. viii. 29; Burgess amends to 2 Cor. viii. and chap. ix. which seems substantially right. Proposition 92: the reference is printed 2 Cor. 15. 52, evidently a misprint for 1 Cor. Proposition 95: the reference is printed 1 Cor. 5. 10, but the Dutch version guides to 2 Cor.

## RETRACTATIONS AND CONFIRMATIONS

This is printed by Pigott as one unbroken block. The present editor long ago broke it into paragraphs, and is gratified to see that Burgess independently has made many of the same divisions. The end is curious: after the close of the sentence, the words "concerning the" are centred in the page, then an ornament closes; but a catchword at the foot, "The," leads on naturally to the title on the next page of *The Life and Death of John Smith* published by the brethren. Perhaps Smyth never completed his *Retractions*, and really broke off with an unfinished sentence, which Pigott faithfully reproduced. This book and the *Propositions* are strikingly unlike in form, but the same language is used in both.

# THE BAPTIST STANDARD BEARER, INC.

a non-profit, tax-exempt corporation  
committed to the Publication & Preservation  
of the Baptist Heritage.



## CURRENT TITLES AVAILABLE IN THE BAPTIST *DISTINCTIVES* SERIES

**KIFFIN, WILLIAM**

A Sober Discourse of Right to Church-Communion. Wherein is proved by Scripture, the Example of the Primitive Times, and the Practice of All that have Professed the Christian Religion: That no Unbaptized person may be Regularly admitted to the Lord's Supper. (London: George Larkin, 1681).

**KINGHORN, JOSEPH**

Baptism, A Term of Communion. (Norwich: Bacon, Kinnebrook, and Co., 1816)

**KINGHORN, JOSEPH**

A Defense of "Baptism, A Term of Communion". In Answer To Robert Hall's Reply. (Norwich: Wilkin and Youngman, 1820).

**GILL, JOHN**

Gospel Baptism. A Collection of Sermons, Tracts, etc., on Scriptural Authority, the Nature of the New Testament Church and the Ordinance of Baptism by John Gill. (Paris, AR: The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc., 2006).

- CARSON, ALEXANDER** Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament. (Dublin: William Carson, 1856).
- BOOTH, ABRAHAM** A Defense of the Baptists. A Declaration and Vindication of Three Historically Distinctive Baptist Principles. Compiled and Set Forth in the Republication of Three Books. Revised edition. (Paris, AR: The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc., 2006).
- BOOTH, ABRAHAM** Paedobaptism Examined on the Principles, Concessions, and Reasonings of the Most Learned Paedobaptists. With Replies to the Arguments and Objections of Dr. Williams and Mr. Peter Edwards. 3 volumes. (London: Ebenezer Palmer, 1829).
- CARROLL, B. H.** *Ecclesia* - The Church. With an Appendix. (Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1903).
- CHRISTIAN, JOHN T.** Immersion, The Act of Christian Baptism. (Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1891).
- FROST, J. M.** Pedobaptism: Is It From Heaven Or Of Men? (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1875).
- FULLER, RICHARD** Baptism, and the Terms of Communion; An Argument. (Charleston, SC: Southern Baptist Publication Society, 1854).
- GRAVES, J. R.** Tri-Lemma: or, Death By Three Horns. The Presbyterian General Assembly Not Able To Decide This Question: "Is Baptism In The Romish Church Valid?" 1st Edition.

(Nashville: Southwestern Publishing House, 1861).

**MELL, P.H.**

Baptism In Its Mode and Subjects. (Charleston, SC: Southern Baptist Publications Society, 1853).

**JETER, JEREMIAH B.**

Baptist Principles Reset. Consisting of Articles on Distinctive Baptist Principles by Various Authors. With an Appendix. (Richmond: The Religious Herald Co., 1902).

**PENDLETON, J.M.**

Distinctive Principles of Baptists. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1882).

**THOMAS, JESSE B.**

The Church and the Kingdom. A New Testament Study. (Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1914).

**WALLER, JOHN L.**

Open Communion Shown to be Unscriptural & Deleterious. With an introductory essay by Dr. D. R. Campbell and an Appendix. (Louisville: Baptist Book Concern, 1859).

For a complete list of current authors/titles, visit our internet site at:

[www.standardbearer.org](http://www.standardbearer.org)

or write us at:



**The Baptist Standard Bearer, Inc.**

NUMBER ONE IRON OAKS DRIVE • PARIS, ARKANSAS 72855

TEL # 479-963-3831

FAX # 479-963-8083

EMAIL: [Baptist@centurytel.net](mailto:Baptist@centurytel.net)

<http://www.standardbearer.org>

*Thou hast given a standard to them that fear thee; that it may be displayed because of the truth. — Psalm 60:4*

**“In *The Works of John Smyth*, you will discover examples of Smyth’s Puritan preaching reflective of his training at Cambridge. You will also be intrigued by his discussions with other Separatists and Puritans on the nature of the true church and his understanding of true worship. In his Works, you will be exposed to the first book-length argument for believers’ baptism to be published in English. You can also consider Smyth’s interaction with Mennonite beliefs as well as one of the first statements in English on religious liberty. This reprinting of W. T. Whitley’s *The Works of John Smyth* is the perfect way to acknowledge 400 years of English Baptists.”**

**JASON K. LEE**

Associate Professor of Historical Theology  
Assistant Dean of Theological Studies  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Fort Worth, TX, USA

**“The reprinting of *The Works of John Smyth* is of inestimable value to the scholarly guild that concerns itself with the origins of the modern Baptists. Smyth’s writings in their various phases should be consulted by those who truly desire to understand the Baptist genius. The Baptist Standard Bearer is to be lauded for taking on this long overdue project.”**

**MALCOLM YARNELL**

Associate Professor of Systematic Theology  
Director of the Oxford Study Program  
Director of the Center for Theological Research  
Editor of the Southwestern Journal of Theology  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Fort Worth, TX, USA

---

The Baptist Standard Bearer, Incorporated is a republication society organized in 1984, and is recognized as a nonprofit, tax-exempt charitable organization. It was founded for the primary purpose of republication and preservation of materials reflecting the Baptist heritage.

ISBN 1579782612

90000



9 781579 782610