

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF

SAMUEL AGNEW,

OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter

83-3

4

May 22^d 1861.


No.


COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE



LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9053





profane superstition shall be condemned
by wild. yankings & others of the same
or pharisaical innovation

THE AMERICAN

LIBRARY

OF THE

CONGRESS

OF THE UNITED STATES

IMPRIMATUR,

Jan. 27.
1677-

GUIL. JANE, R. P. D.
Hen. Episc. Lond. a Sacris
Dom.

for

*those who those
are are not for
you*

N.E. 14 84 99 THE

Present Separation

SELF-CONDEMNED,

And Proved to be

SCHISM:

As it is Exemplified in a *Sermon* Preached upon that Subject, by

Mr. W. FENKYN:

And is further attested by divers others of his own Persuasion.

All produced in Answer to a

LETTER from a *FRIEND*.


William Jane

MANTON on JAMES, pag. 404.

True Wisdom, as it will not sin against Faith by Error, so not against Love by Schism.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Edward Croft at the Seven Stars in Little Lumbard Street. 1678.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
310 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
U.S.A.

100-100-100
100-100-100
100-100-100

S I R,

UPon the Discourse that passed not long since betwixt you and me, concerning the present Differences amongst us in this Nation, and the Difficulties you then pressed me with, about the Nature and Reasons of *Schism*, and the Side which the Sin of it would lie upon ; I began to consider of it, and forthwith resolved to see what I could meet with of that Subject amongst that Party you so boldly charge with it, especially before their exclusion, when they might be supposed to speak impartially. And amongst the rest, having procured of a Friend the Notes of a *Sermon* long since preached by Mr. *Fenkin*, I diligently read it over, and thought it a Discourse very well calculated to bring this matter to an issue betwixt us : for which end, having compared it with and corrected it by what he afterward printed upon that Text, I did resolve to send it to you. This, I confess, I the rather pitched upon, as he is yet alive, and is able to justify it ; and because you also urged me with some Objections offered in particular against him, and his proceedings in the case, and did affirm,

B firm,

firm, That he, with the rest of his Brethren, durst not now own what they had formerly preached, or preach what they formerly did about *Separation*, lest they should revive what they hope is by this time forgotten, and disquiet the Ashes of the old *Nonconformists*, whose Followers they profess to be, but herein, as you said, widely differ from.

I must confess my self not to have been a little disturbed at those Passages that you produced out of some of them, and could not but transcribe that from Mr. Calamy, in his *Apologie against an unjust Invektive*, pag. 10. viz. *What will Mr. Burton say to old Mr. Dod, Mr. Hilderham, Mr. Ball, Mr. Rathband, &c? Did not these Reverend Ministers see the Pattern of Gods House? And yet it is well known, that they wrote many Books against those that refused Communion with our Churches (he means the Episcopal), and were their greatest Enemies. And I cannot forget another you shewed me out of the Vindication of the Presbyterial Government, pag. 135. published by the Provincial Assembly of London, 1650. (of whom you told me Mr. Jenkin was one) viz. There were many godly and learned Nonconformists of this last Age, that were persuaded in their Consciences, that they could not hold Communion with the Church of England, in receiving the Sacrament kneeling, without sin; yet did they not separate from her.*

ber. Indeed, in that particular Act they withdrew; but yet so, as that they held Communion with her in the rest; being far from a negative, much more from a positive Separation. Nay, some of them, even when our Churches were full of sinful Mixtures, with great Zeal and Learning defended them so far, as to write against those that did separate from them.

I do acknowledge, that I am not able to reconcile all things of this nature, and that it is very hard to shew where the difference lies betwixt now and then, and to find out what the People have to scare them from Communion with the Church of England now, that they had not in those Times; and why what Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Dod, &c. wrote then in defence of it, will not still so far hold good. But I hope you easily conceive, that the Case is not the same with the Ministers as the People. For the People, it is confessed, and you gave me an undeniable Proof of the general Belief of the present Nonconformists in this matter, viz. That when by the late Act of Parliament every one that was in any Office of Trust was required to receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper according to the usage of the Church of England, they that amongst them were concerned, were generally advised to it by their own Pastors, and few, if any, were found to refuse it; which doubtless they would have done, if

either *they* or their *Pastors* had thought that they had sinned in so doing ; and their own Interest, or the capacity they might be in of doing better Service in their Places, than out of them, would not have made it lawful, if it had not been thought lawful in it self.

And therefore I do very readily grant this. But withal I hope you do perceive, that there is a great difference betwixt the *People* and their *Ministers*, betwixt the Peoples Communicating with, and the Ministers Officiating in the *Church* : for the *Ministers* are in order to this required to renounce the *Covenant*, and to *assent and consent* to the use of the *Liturgie*. And therefore, though the *People* may now Communicate upon the same terms that the *People* did before the Wars (when *Separation* from the *Church of England* was proved to be *Schism* by the great *Nonconformists* of those Times, as is abovesaid), and the *Ministers* may now Communicate upon the same terms as the *People*, yet they cannot do it as *Ministers* ; and what reason is there that they should degrade themselves, who are (as Mr. *Jenkin* saith, on *Jude*, pag. 21.) *Church-Officers* entrusted with the ordering of the *Church*, and for opening the *Doors of the Churches Communion*, by the *Keys of Doctrine and Discipline* ; and be no more than private *Christians*, that have no power

in these matters, as he there observes ? Is this nothing, to be, from *Rulers* of the Flock, turned down amongst the *common Herd* ; and from being keepers of the Keys, to be brought under the power of them ?

But supposing that they could thus far condescend, yet do you make nothing of the *Apostles necessity*, and *woe is me* ? or think you it fit, after so sacred a *Character* as that of *Ordination*, that they can clear themselves if they neglect it ? Consider what is written in a Book called *Sacrilegious Desertion of the Holy Ministry rebuked*, pag. 30. viz. *Is a Vow and Dedication to preach the Gospel, no reason to preach it elsewhere, when it's forbidden in your Assemblies ? Is the alienation of Consecrated Persons no Sacrilege ?* You told me indeed, That supposing they were under the like necessity (which you said they were not), yet, that as *St. Paul's necessity* did not, so neither did theirs confine them to any particular Place, Time, or Number ; that Preaching was not more so, when it was to many, than to few, in publick than in private, in *London* than the *Countrey* ; and that as the Law did permit them to preach to *Five* besides their own *Family*, so it did not forbid them private Conference elsewhere ; a way that the *Nonconformists* do so much recommend, that one of them, in his Advice to the rest,

faith of it , *That Publick hearing without Personal conference , seldom bringeth men to understand well what you say, (Sacrileg. Difert. pag. 93.)* And therefore that you couceived not how *St. Paul's Wo*, or their *Ordination*, did oblige them to flock up to the Capital City , or to betake themselves to the chiefeft Towns, and to draw great numbers together ; no more than it did before *Bartholomew* in 62, to follow the same course.

But, *Sir*, I will onely ask you, whether you think it not better to preach to many, than to few ; and in publick, than in corners ; and in Towns, than Villages ; and in *London*, than the *country* ? In Villages People will jog on in their old way, they have neither much curiosity nor leisure ; or whatever is there taught or learned , spreads no further : But you know , teach *London*, and you teach the whole Nation ; thence the Light before the Wars shone forth into all parts ; and after when *Heresies were hatched and nourished up under her wings, from her they spread all the Kingdom over*, as is observed by the *Provincial Assembly of London*, in their *Vindication*, pag, 119. and the same way doubtless is still to be observed, if any good is to be done. And it is the same as to the Places of eminency in the Country. And therefore whatever becomes of the remote Parts, and the little
Places,

Places, great care is here to be taken, *that the Souls in Cities and Corporations be not deserted*, as the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion* doth hint, p.69. and better leave those to shift for themselves, than to leave these unsupplied. Which gives a very good account, why they flock so much from the *Country* to the *Town*. And if you still persist to demand, why it was not thought so before 62? the Answer is ready; for then *London* was their own, and the Pulpits were safe, when kept by those that were of their own Persuasion: But the case being now otherwise, if they should retire, and not keep up a distinct Party, the *City* would be another thing, and the whole Nation be in danger of Infection. And then what would become of them and their Families? For there are not very many of them that were bred up to the understanding of Trade, or keeping Books of Account, and that can shift for themselves as other Men; and if put by that way of Livelihood, where must they seek for it? As *there cannot be a walking, without a moving* (as Mr. *Jenkin* judiciously observes on *Jude*, pag. 447.) ; so there cannot be an eating without Food: and how Food is to be had on their part, without Preaching, is not easie to imagine.

Do you think, if they had betaken themselves

to instruct their Flocks, that they left, by private Conference (as the Author of the *Address to the Nonconformists* propounds; pag. 199.), that those who now support them in point of *Livelihood* in the way they are in, would do the same in the other way, as that Author conjectures? Nay, if they were left to the mercy of the *Act of Parliament*, which allows *Five* beside their own Family, and did govern themselves by it, can you think that would turn to any account?

Alas, *Sir*, you know Charity is grown cold in these times; and if they put all upon that issue, we may say, *God* help them, for it may be feared the People will not. We know, *Sir*, and you cannot be ignorant of it, that it's a Publick way, and the being followed and admired by Multitudes, when the Members have the reputation of being joyned to a numerous and wealthy Congregation, and where Trade may be promoted, that opens the Purfes, and, shall I say, engages the Hearts of not a few; and therefore if you will not allow them to preach in this way, you must not allow them to live and eat as other Folk.

Methinks your own experience should open your eyes, and let you see what difference is made betwixt him that labours in the Word, and him that doth not; betwixt him that preacheth at such convenient

venient Seasons, that he may resort to the Publick Worship, and is willing to shew, that he and the *Church of England* in effect are one; and him that preacheth in opposition to it, at the same time with the Publick, and thereby proclaimeth, that he and the Church are two. Alas, *Sir*, the City-Mouse did not more excel the Country, than one here doth the other, in the Provisions of his Table, and the Munificence of his Benefactors. The one lives by Preaching, and lives plentifully; the other lives by his Learning, in the sense of the Scholar that sold his Books to maintain himself with, as some of them whom I know you love and reverence are reported to do; and others forced to be beholden to *Conformists*, that have made private Collections for them. These are they that the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 111. is to be understood of, when he saith, *That the French Impression of the Councils is too dear for the Purse of a Nonconformable Minister*. And besides, *Sir*, is it nothing, think you, for a Man to walk disconsolately through the Streets, hardly taken notice of, and his Worth and Learning covered by his Cloak and Modesty; and another in the mean time sailing along, perhaps with two or three Attendants, and ever and anon one or other stepping forth to salute him with a lowly Reverence? And is not this another material

C

difference

difference betwixt him that preacheth, and him that preacheth not; betwixt him that preacheth in the one way, and him that preacheth in the other before spoken of? Nay, is it not come to this, that those they call *moderate yielding* men are scarcely endured, but even their Reputations are clancularly struck at by their Brethren; insomuch that they are fain to carry it with more wariness, and comply more than otherwise they would, that they may not be the Marks of their Reproches? Hence, I believe, it was, that after the Book entituled *The Cure of Church-Divisions* had exasperated the Party, Anno 1670. the *Author*, to lick himself a little whole in their esteem, made some amends for his transgression, in his thundring Book of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, in the Year 1672. And I guess, that it is for the same reason, that when he publickly professed, *That the notorious necessity of the People, who were more than the Parish-Church could hold, moved him to preach at the same hours with the Publick; and that he met not under any colour and pretence of any Religious Exercise in other manner than according to the Liturgie, and the Practise of the Church of England; and were he able, that he would accordingly read himself:* yet that he never had that read; and since his disposal of that Place, doth preach occasionally in the Meeting-places of the

City,

City, at the same hours, where there is none of that necessity before pleaded by him, and where the *Churches* generally rather want *Auditors*, than *Auditors Churches*. And so much are they under the awe of this, that you know, when *Dr. Manton* himself was asked why he used not the *Lords Prayer*, he replied, That he omitted it, not that he thought it unlawful, but lest by the use of it he should give offence to some of his Brethren, and his own People. So that you see, *Sir*, to what a pass things are brought, and that it is as necessary for them thus to do, as it is to retain the esteem of their Party; and as necessary to retain that esteem, as it is to have a Livelihood where it is wanted, or to be accounted Godly and Religious. Now, *Sir*, I know not how you may like this, to suffer disrespect, and want, and discouragement; but if you do, I'll assure you that I know but few that are of your mind. For is not Respect to be valued before Contempt; providing for a Mans House, before neglecting it; and especially, when this is consistent with, and obtained in the *Service of God*?

And now I am fallen upon the thing that I perceive you would bring me to, when you charge them upon *Mr. Jenkin's Principles*, who saith, that *admiration of mens persons, and self-conceit, self-seeking, and pride*, are the most general Causes of

Schifm, as I see that he doth, pag. 26, 27, 28. of this *Sermon*. Causes, you said, as evident among them, as their *Schifm* it self, and by which, with no little art, they bolster it up. Thus they take to themselves the Title of the *Servants of God*; and give to the People that of *the godly* and the *gracious*; and for their encouragement, magnifie their *Numbers*, and which they take all occasions to represent. As, a *Nonconformist* can no sooner die, but it shall be spread through all the *Congregations*, who are told by their *Ministers* the *Lords-day* before his Interment, that such a one is lately dead, and to be buried at such a time, from such a place, where he desires them to be, and to shew their Respects by attending his Corps to its Funeral. In order to which, his Praises are sounded from the Pulpit, and he Sainted by some little Poet, and his *Sayings*, that have either been ordinarily used by him in Discourse, or frequently dropped from him in the Pulpit, are collected; and then *Sermon*, *Poem*, and *Sayings* vented amongst the Multitudes crowding from all Quarters of the Town, and that are as proud to carry one of them home, as the poor Zealots in the Church of *Rome* are to get any Rag that hath but touched the Reliques of their Saint in a solemn Procession. After which rehearsal, you bid me consider, how this would look if done in the *Church of England*.

But,

But, *Sir*, this is a course that seems to me not at all unreasonable, in their circumstances; it being very necessary, that they should, above all things, get the Peoples esteem, and very fit that the People should testify their esteem of them; and why not in this way of Attendance on them? For, *First*, It's a comfort to the *Church* under the loss of their *Pastor*, to see him respected when dead, as he was when alive. *Secondly*, By burying their *Pastor* with honour, and putting themselves into Mourning, and engaging others to follow him to his Burial, they do shew the respect that they had to him in a day of Persecution and Distress, when despised by others; and that they continued constant to him to the death. *Thirdly*, It's good to shew the World that they are not so despicable for Quality or Number, as is pretended. And are not these Reasons sufficient to justify their Practice in this case, and to shew, how it would not so well become you in *your Church*, as it doth *them* in *theirs*?

But, I perceive, this that I said last of all stuck most in your stomach, as you judged it a kind of an open Challenge and Defiance to Authority; and you thought that you had me at a great advantage, when you so readily brought Chapter and Page upon me from Mr. *Jenkin* on *Jude*, pag. 623. viz. *That miserable is that Commonwealth whose Man-*

ners have brought their Laws under their power. For you considered not, that this is spoken of Irreligious Persons, and Civil Affairs; but in the Matters of Religion, I hope, you know better, and that the more contemptible the Laws about those things are made, and the weaker the Authority is to put them into execution, the safer they themselves be whom the Laws are designed against. And besides, do you think, that Men ought not to make as publick a Profession of their Religion as with security they can; and to let *the Power* understand, how much it would be for their Safety and Interest to come over to the strongest Side? And is it not far better for *Authority* to depend upon *Religion*, than *Religion* upon *Authority*? Where have you lived all this while, that are yet to learn in so necessary a Point of Casuistical Divinity?

As for Mr. *Jenkin* himself, when you said, that he made very bold with the Reputation of others, and took as great a liberty to revile, as to commend; and did produce him against himself, on *Jude*, pag. 184. viz. *That it is Seducers policy to asperse the Ministers, to cause a dislike of their Ministry*: and again, pag. 394. *That the great endeavour of Seducers is, to be magnified, or rather omnified, to have all others debased and nullified*: I must confess that I have nothing to say: and that what you pointed me to in
the

the same Book, pag. 521. *Take away this sinful censuring from many Professors, and there will nothing remain to shew them Religious; whereas a just man is severe onely to himself, holds still true.* It is a great fault in them, and what, if he hath miscarried in, as I hope he hath repented of, so by his silence upon that gentle Reproof given him in *The Vindication of the Conforming Clergie*, doth seem to own. I must acknowledge, that my own Temper, as well as my Religion, hath so much endeared me to that most excellent Description of *Charity*, 1 Cor. 13. *Charity envieth not; Charity vaunteth not it self, is not puffed up, doth not behave it self unseemly, &c. beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, &c.* that were all other things in the *Church of England* as agreeable to me, as the Temper of it, it would mightily reconcile me to it. We find no *Martins*, no *Centuries*, no *Gangrana's*, no *Glocester-Coblers*, no Stories or uncertain Reports, pick'd up, and maliciously improved, by which the Reputations of their Adversaries are invaded, and expos'd to the World; notwithstanding the Provocations they have received, and the abundant matter that hath been formerly and of late afford'd for such an History. And there is nothing hath made me more out of love with my old Friend Mr. J. than a certain proneness that he hath discovered,

... of the ...
... which ...
... as being ...
... that other ...
... of the ...
... of the ...

... ..

H. N.

... ..

THE
SERMON.

J U D E, ver. 19.

These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.

IN the 17 *verse Jude* produceth the Testimony of the *Apostles of Jesus Christ*, in confirmation of what he had before said: In which Testimony I note five Particulars.

1. To whom it is commended; to *his beloved*.
2. How it was to be improved; by *remembering it*.
3. From whom it proceeded; *the Apostles of our Lord Jesus*.
4. Wherein it consisted; in a Prediction, That there should be *mockers, walking after their ungodly lusts*.

5. To whom it is opposed, *viz.* to these Seducers : *These are they who separate themselves.*

In which Words the *Apostle* shews, That these who *separate* themselves from the *Church*, were *Scorners*; and that these who were *sensual and void of the Spirit*, did follow their *ungodly lusts*. Or, in the Words *Jude* expresseth,

1. The *Sin* of these *Seducers*, in *separating themselves*.

2. The *Cause* thereof, which was,

1. *Their being sensual* : And,

2. *Their not having the Spirit*.

For the first, their *Separation*; Two things are here to be opened.

1. What the *Apostle* here intends by *separating themselves*.

2. Wherein the *Sinfulness* of it consists.

1. For the first : The *Original* word may signify the unbounding of a thing, and the removing of a thing from those *Bounds and Limits* wherein it was set and placed, &c. Or it imports, the parting and separating of one thing from another, by *Bounds and Limits* put between them; and the putting of *Bounds and Limits*, for distinction and separation, between several things : it being (thus) a *Resemblance* taken from *Fields or Countries*, which are distinguished and parted from each other

ther by certain Boundaries and Land-marks set up to that end: and thus it's commonly taken by Interpreters in this place, wherein these Seducers may be said to *separate themselves*, divide or bound themselves from others, either *first*, Doctrinally; or, *secondly*, Practically.

1. *Doctrinally*, by false and Heretical Doctrines, whereby they divided themselves from the Truth and Faithful, who were guided by the Truth of Scripture, and walked according to the Rule of the Word, &c.

2. *Practically*; they might separate themselves as by Bounds and Limits,

1. By *Prophaneness*, and living in a different way from the Saints; namely, in all looseness and uncleanness.

2. By *Schismaticalness*, and making of separation from, and divisions in the Church: Because they proudly despised the Doctrines or Persons of the *Christians*, as contemptible and unworthy; or because they would not endure the holy severity of the Churches Discipline, they (saith *Calvin*) departed from it. They might make Rents and Divisions in the Church, by Schismatical withdrawing themselves from Fellowship and Communion with it. Their Heresies were perverse and damnable *Opinions*, their Schism was a perverse *separation* from
Church-

Church-communion : The former was in *Doctrinals*, the latter in *Practicals*. The former was opposite to *Faith*, this latter to *Charity*. By *Faith* all the Members are united to the Head ; by *Charity*, one to another : And as the breaking of the former is *Heresie*, so their breaking of the latter was *Schism*. And this *Schism* stands in the dissolving the Spiritual Band of Love and Union among *Christians*, and appears in the withdrawing from the performance of those *Duties* which are both the Signs of, and Helps to *Christian Unity*; as *Prayer, Hearing, Receiving of Sacraments, &c.* For, because the dissolving of *Christian Union* chiefly appears in the undue separation from *Church-communion*, therefore this rending is rightly called *Schism*. It is usually said to be twofold, *Negative*, and *Positive*.

1. *Negative* is when there is onely *simplex secessio*, when there is onely a bare secession, a peaceable and quiet withdrawing from Communion with a Church, without making any head against that Church from which the departure is.

2. *Positive* is when Persons so withdrawing do so confociate and draw themselves into a distinct and opposite Body, setting up a Church against a Church, or, as *Divines* express it, from *Augustine, an Altar against an Altar* : And this it is which in a peculiar manner, and by way of eminency, is called

called by the name of *Schism*, and becomes sinful either in respect, *first*, of the *groundlesness*, or, *secondly*, the *manner* thereof.

1. The *groundlesness*; when there is no casting of Persons out of the Church by an unjust Censure of *Excommunication*, no departure by *unfufferable Persecution*, no *Heresie* nor *Idolatry* in the Church maintained, no necessity (if *Communion* be held with a Church) of communicating in its *Sins* and *Corruptions*.

2. The *manner* of *Separation* makes it unlawful; when 'tis made without due endeavour and waiting for Reformation of the *Church* from which the departure is: and such a rash departure is against *Charity*, which *suffers* both *much and long*, all tolerable things: It is not presently distasted, when the justest occasion is given; it first useth all possible means of remedy. The Chyrurgeon reserves *Dismembring*, as the last remedy. It looks upon a sudden breaking off from *Communion* with a *Church* (which is a *Dismembring*) not as *Chyrurgery*, but *Butchery*; not as *medicinal*, but *cruel*.

2. The Sinfulness of this *Schismatical separation* appears several ways. I shall not spend time to compare it with *Heresie*, though some have said, that *Schism* is the greater Sin of the two. *August. cont. Donat. lib. 2. cap. 6.* tells the *Donatists*, that *Schism*

was

was a greater Sin than that of the *Traditores*, who in time of *Persecution*, through fear, delivered up their *Bibles* to the *Persecutors* to be burnt. (A Sin at which the *Donatists* took so much offence, that it was the ground of their *separation*.) But to pass by these things: By these three Considerations especially the sinfulness of *Schism* shews it self.

In respect of { 1. *Christ*.
2. *The Parties separating*.
3. *Those from whom they separate*.

I. In respect of *Christ*, it is,

1. An horrible Indignity offered to his Body, it *dividing Christ* (as the *Apostle* speaks, *1 Cor. 1. 15.*) and makes him to appear the Head of two Bodies. How monstrous and dishonourable is the very conceit hereof!

2. It's Rebellion against his Command, his great Command of *Love*. The Grace of *Love* is by some called the *Queen of Graces*; and it's greater than *Faith* in respect of its Object, not God onely, but Man; its duration, which is eternal; its manner of working, not in a way of receiving *Christ* (as *Faith*) but of giving out the Soul to him: and the Command of *Love* is the greatest Command, in respect of its *comprehensiveness*, it taking in all the Commandments, the end of them all being *Love*, and it being the fulfilling of them all.

3. It's

3. It's opposite to one great End of *Christ's* greatest Undertaking (his Death), which was, that all his Saints should be one.

4. It tends to frustrate his *Prayer* for Unity among Saints, *John* 17. and endeavours that *Christ* may not be heard by his Father.

5. It opposeth his Example: *By this shall all men* (saith he) *know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.* Love is the Livery and Cognifance which *Christ* gives to every *Christian*. If there be no Fellowship among *Christians*, there's no following of *Christ*. *Let this mind be in you, that was in Christ Jesus*, Phil. 2. 5.

6. It's injurious to his Service and Worship. How can Men pray, if in wrath and division? How can *Christians* fight with Heaven and prevail, when they are in so many divided Troops? What worthiness can be in those *Communicants*, who celebrate a Feast of Love, with Hearts full of rancour and malice?

2. In respect of *the Parties separating*: For,

1. It causeth a *decay of all Grace*. By divisions among our selves, we endeavour to divide our selves from him, in and from whom is all our fulness. All wickedness follows contention. Upon the Stock of *Schism* commonly *Heresie* is grafted. There is no *Schism* (saith *Jerome*) but ordinarily it inventeth and produceth some *Heresie*, that so the Separation

ration may seem the more justifiable. The *Novatians* and *Donatists* from *Schism* fell to *Heresies*. Our Times sadly comment upon this Truth, they equally arising to both. The farther Lines are distanced one from another, the greater is their distance from the Center : And the more divided *Christians* are among themselves, the more they divide themselves from *Christ*. Branches divided from the Tree, receive no Sap from the Root. The Soul gives Life to Members which are joynd together, not pluck'd asunder.

2. *Schism* is the greatest disgrace to the *Schismatics*. A *Schismatičk* is a Name much disowned, because very dishonourable : All Posterity loads the name of *sinful Separatists* with disgrace and abhorrency. He spoke truly, who said, *The sin and misery of Schism cannot be blotted out with the blood of Martyrdom*. He cannot honourably give his Life for *Christ*, who makes divisions in his *Church*, for which *Christ* gave his Life.

3. In respect of *the Church from whom this separation is made*. For,

1. It's injurious to the Honour of the *Church*, whose greatest glory is *Union*. How can a Body be rent and torn, without the impairing of its Beauty ? Besides, how disgraceful an imputation is cast upon any *Church*, when we profess it unworthy for any

any to abide in it ; that *Christ* will not, and therefore that we cannot have Communion with it ?

2. It's injurious to the *peace and quietness* of the *Church*. *Schismaticks* more oppose the Peace of the *Church*, than do *Heathens*. If the natural Body be divided and torn, pain and smart must needs follow. The tearing and rending of the Mystical Body goes to the Heart of all sensible Members. They often cause the Feverish Distempers of *Hatred, Wrath, Seditions, Envyings, Murders*. *Schism* in the *Church*, puts the Members out of joynt ; and disjoynted Bones are painful : *All my bones* (saith *David*) *are out of joynt*. *Church-divisions* cause *sad thoughts of heart*. True Members are sensible of these *Schisms*, though artificial ones feel nothing. None rejoyce but our Enemies. Oh impiety, to make *Satan* musick, and to make mourning for the *Saints* !

3. It's opposite to the *Edification* of the *Church*. Division of Tongues hindred the building of *Babel* ; and doubtless division in Hearts, Tongues, Hands, Heads, must needs hinder the building of *Jerusalem*. While *Parties* are contending, *Churches* and *Commonwealths* suffer. In troublous times the Walls and Temple of *Jerusalem* went but slowly on. Though *Jesus Christ* the Head, be the onely Fountain of Spiritual Life ; yet the usual way of *Christ's*

strengthening it, and perfecting thereof, is the fellowship of the Body, *that by what every joynt supplies, the whole may be encreased.* When Church-members are put out of joynt, they are made unserviceable, and unfit to perform their several Offices : They who were wont to joyn in *Prayer, Sacraments, Fasting,* and were ready to all mutual Offices of *Love,* are now fallen off from all.

4. It's opposite to the future Estate of the *Church* in *Glory.* In *Heaven* the Faithful shall be of one mind : *We shall all meet* (saith the *Apostle*) *in the unity of the faith,* Ephes. 4. 13. when we are come to our Manly age : Wrangling is the work of our Childhood. *Luther* and *Calvin* are of one mind in *Heaven,* though their *Disciples* wrangle here on *Earth.*

Observations.

Obf. 1. *Naturally men love to be boundless;* they will not be kept within any *Spiritual* compass.

Obf. 2. *Our separation from Rome cannot be charged with Schism.* This will evidently appear, if we consider either the *ground,* or the *manner* of our *Separation.*

1. For the *ground* and *cause* thereof : Our *separation* from *Rome* was not for some slight and tolerable *Errours,* but damnable *Heresies,* and gross *Idolatries :*

latries : The *Heresies* Fundamental, and *Idolatries* such, as those who hold Communion with her, cannot but partake of : In respect of both which, the *Church of Rome* was first *apostatized*, before ever we *separated* : Nor was there any *separation* from it, as it had any thing of *Christ*, or as it was *Christian* ; but as it was *ROMAN* and *POPISH*, &c.

2. For the second, the *manner* of our *Separation* ; it was not uncharitable, rash, heady, and unadvised ; nor before all means were used for the Cure and Reformation of the *Romanists*, by the discovery of their Errours, that possibly could be thought of : notwithstanding all which (though some have been enforced to an acknowledgement of them) they still obstinately persist in them. Our famous, godly, and learned *Reformers* would have *healed Babylon*, but *she is not healed* : Many skilful *Physicians* have had her in hand, but (like the *Woman* in the *Gospel*) *she grew so much the worse*. By Prayer, Preaching, Writing, yea by sealing their Doctrine with their Bloods, have sundry eminent Instruments of *Christ* endeavoured to reclaim the *Popish* from their Errours ; but in stead of being reclaimed, they anathematized them with the dreadfulest *Curses*, excommunicated, yea, murdered and destroyed multitudes of those who endeavoured their Reducement, not permitting any to trade, buy or sell, to
have

have either Religious or Civil Communion with them, except they received the *Beasts mark* in their *hands and foreheads*. All which considered, we might safely forsake her; nay, could not safely do otherwise. Since, in stead of our *healing of Babylon*, we could not be preserved from her *destroying of us*, we did deservedly depart from her, and every one go into his own Country: and unless we had done so, we could not have obeyed the clear Precept of the Word, *Apoc. 18. Come out of her my people, &c.* Timothy is commanded to *withdraw himself from perverse and unsound Teachers*, 1 Tim. 6. 3, 5. Though Paul went into the Synagogue, disputing and persuading the things concerning the Kingdom of God; yet when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way, he departed from them, and separated the Disciples, Acts 19. 9. And expressly is Communion with Idolaters forbidden, 2 Cor. 6. 14, 17. *What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what communion hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial? what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? Come out from among them, and be ye separate.* And, *Hos. 4. 15. Though thou Israel play the harlot, yet let not Judah offend; and come ye not unto Gilgal, neither go ye up to Beth-aven.* Though in name that place was *Bethel*, the *House of God*; yet because *Jeroboam's Calf* was set up

up there, it was indeed *Bethaven*, the *House of Vanity*. If *Rome* be a *Bethaven*, for *Idolatry*, and *corrupting of Gods Worship*, our departure from it may be safely acknowledged and justified. In vain, therefore, do the *Romanists*, *Stapleton*, *Sanders*, &c. brand our *separation* from them with the odious name of *Donatism*, and *Schism*; it being evident out of *Augustine*, that the *Donatists* never objected any thing against, nor could blame any thing in the *Church* (from which they separated) either for *Faith* or *Worship*: whereas we have unanswerably proved the *pseudo-Catholick Roman Church* to be notoriously guilty both of *Heresie* and *Idolatry*; and our Adversaries themselves grant, in whatever *Church* either of these depravations are found, *Communion* with it is to be broken off. I shall conclude this Discourse with that Passage out of *Musculus*, concerning *Schism*. *There is* (saith he) *a double Schism; the one bad, the other good: the bad is that whereby a good Union, the good whereby a bad Union is broken asunder*. If ours be a *Schism*, it is of the latter sort.

Obf. 3. *The voluntary and unnecessary dividing and separation from a true Church, is Schismatical*. When we put bounds and partitions between it and our selves, we sin (say some) as did these Seducers here taxed by *Jude*. If the *Church* be not *Heretical*, or *Idolatrous*, or do not by *Excommunication*,

nication, Persecution, &c. thrust us out of its Com-
 munion ; If it be such as *Christ the Head* hath Com-
 munion with, we the *Members* ought not by *sepa-
 ration* to rend and divide the *Body*. To separate
 from *Congregations*, where *the Word of Truth* and
Gospel of Salvation are held forth in an ordinary
 way, as the Proclamations of Princes are held forth
 upon Pillars to which they are affixed ; where the
 Light of the Truth is set up as upon a Candlestick,
 to guide Passengers to Heaven : To separate from
 them to whom belong the *Covenants*, and where
 the *Sacraments*, the *Seals* of the *Covenant*, are for
 substance rightly dispensed ; where *Christ walketh
 in the midst of his golden candlesticks*, and discovers
 his Presence in his *Ordinances*, whereby they are
 made effectual to the Conversion and Edification of
 Souls, in an ordinary way ; where the Members
 are *Saints*, by a professed subjection to *Christ* and
 his *Gospel*, and haply have promised this explicitly
 and openly ; where there are sundry who in the
 judgment of Charity may be conceived to have the
 work of Grace really wrought in their Hearts, by
 walking in some measure answerable to their Pro-
 fession : I say, to separate from these, as those with
 whom *Church-communion* is not to be held and main-
 tained, is unwarrantable, and Schismatical. *Pre-
 tences* for *Separation* (I am not ignorant) are al-
 ledged :

ledged ; frequently, and most plausibly, that of *Mixt Communion*, and of admitting into *Church-fellowship the vile with the precious*, and those who are Chaff, and therefore ought not to lodge with the Wheat.

Answ. 1. Not to insist upon what some have urged, *viz.* That this hath been the *stone at which most Schismatics have stumbled*, and the Pretence which they have of old alledged, as having ever had a *Spiritum Excommunicatorium*, a Spirit rather putting them upon dividing from those who, they say, are unholy, than putting them upon any godly endeavours of making themselves holy ; as is evident in the Examples of the *Audeans, Novatians, Donatists, Anabaptists, Brownists, &c.*

2. Let them consider, Whether the want of the exact purging and reforming of these Abuses, proceed not rather from some *unhappy Obstructions* and political Restrictions (whether or no caused by those who make this Objection, God knows) in the exercise of *Discipline* ; than from the allowance or neglect of the *Church* it self. Nay,

3. Let them consider, Whether when they separate from *sinful mixtures*, the *Church* be not at that very time purging out those *sinful mixtures* : And is that a time to make a *separation* from a *Church*, by departing from it, when the Servants of

Christ are making a *separation* in that *Church*, by reforming it? But,

4. Let it be seriously weighed, That some *sinful mixtures* are not a sufficient cause of *separation* from a *Church*. Hath not God his *Church*, even where *corruption of Manners* hath crept into a *Church*, if *purity of Doctrine* be maintained? And is *separation* from that *Church* lawful, from which God doth not separate? Did the *Apostle*, because of the *sinful mixtures* in the *Church of Corinth*, direct the Faithful to *separate*? Must not he who will forbear *Communion* with a *Church*, till it be altogether freed from *mixtures*, tarry till the day of Judgment? till when, we have no promise, that *Christ* will gather out of his *Church* *whatsoever* doth offend.

5. Let them consider, Whether God hath made *private Christians Stewards* in his *House*, to determine whether those with whom they *Communicate* are fit Members of the *Church*, or not? Or rather, Whether it be not their duty, when they discover *Tares* in the *Church*, in stead of separating from it, to labour that they may be found good *Corn*; that so when God shall come to gather his *Corn* into his *Garner*, they may not be thrown out? *Church-Officers* are ministerially entrusted with the *Ordering* of the *Church*, and for the opening and shutting of the doors of the
Churches

Churches Communion, by the Keys of Doctrine and Discipline : And herein if they shall either be hindred, or negligent, *private Christians* shall not be intangled in the guilt of their Sin, if they be humbled, and use all lawful means for remedy, though they do Communicate.

6. Let them search, Whether there be any *Scripture-warrant* to break off Communion with any Church, when there is no defect in the *Ordinances themselves*, onely upon this ground, because some are admitted to them, who, because of their personal miscarriages, ought to be debarred? The *Jews* of old, though they separated when the Worship it self was corrupted, 2 *Chron.* 11. 14, 16. yet not because wicked men were suffered to be in outward Communion with them, *Jer.* 7. 9, 10. Nor do the Precepts or Patterns of the *Christian Churches*, for casting out of Offenders, give any liberty to *separation*, in case of failing to cast them out; and though the suffering of scandalous Persons be blamed, yet not the Communicating with them. The Command *not to eat with a Brother who is a fornicator, or covetous, &c.* 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. concerns not Religious, but Civil Communion, by a voluntary, familiar, intimate Conversation, either in being invited, or inviting; as is clear by these two Arguments.

1. That Eating which is here forbidden with a Brother, is allowed to be with an *Heathen* : But it's the Civil Eating which is onely allowed to be with an *Heathen* : Therefore, it's the Civil Eating which is forbidden to be with a Brother.

2. The Eating here forbidden, is for the punishment of the *nocent*, not for a punishment to the *innocent*. Now though such Civil Eating was to be forboren, yet it follows not at all, much less much more, that Religious Eating is forbidden.

1. Because Civil Eating is arbitrary, and unnecessary ; not so Religious, which is enjoyed, and a commanded Duty.

2. There is danger of being infected by the wicked in civil, familiar, and arbitrary Eatings ; not so in joyning with them in an holy and commanded Service and Ordinance.

3. Civil Eating is done out of love to the Party inviting or invited ; but Religious is done out of love to *Jesus Christ*, were it not for whom, we would neither eat at *Sacrament* with wicked men, nor at all.

To conclude this ; *Separation* from Churches, from which *Christ* doth not separate, is *Schismatical*. Now it's clear in the *Scripture*, that *Christ* owneth Churches where *Faith* is found for the substance, and their *Worship Gospel-worship*, though there be many defects

defects and *sinful mixtures* among them. And what I have said concerning the *Schismaticalness* of *separation*, because of the *sinful mixtures* of those who are wicked in *practice*, is as true concerning *separation* from them who are erroneous in *judgment*, if the *Errours* of those from whom the *separation* is made, be not *Fundamental*, and hinder *Communion* with *Christ* the *Head*. And much more clear (if clearer can be) is the *Schismaticalness* of those who separate from, and renounce all *Communion* with those *Churches* which are not of their *own manner of constitution*, and modell'd according to the *Platform* of their own particular *Church-order*. To refrain *Fellowship* and *Communion* with such *Churches* who profess *Christ* their *Lord*, whose *Faith* is sound, whose *Worship* is *Gospel-worship*, whose *Lives* are holy, because they come not into that particular way of *Church-Order* which we have pitch'd upon, is a *Schismatical* rending of the *Church* of *Christ* to pieces. Of this the *Church* of *Rome* are most guilty, who do most plainly ἀποδιείξαι ἐαυτοὺς, and circumscribe and bound the *Church* of *Christ* within the *Limits* and *Boundaries* of the *Roman Jurisdiction*, even so, as that they cast off all *Churches* in the *World*, yea and cut them off from all hope of *Salvation*, who subject not themselves to their way. Herein likewise those *Separatists* among our
selves

selves are heinouſly faulty, who cenſure and condemn all other *Churches*, though their *Faith*, *Worſhip*, and *Converſation* be never ſo Scriptural, meerly becauſe they are not gathered into *Church-order* according to their own Patterns. In Scripture, Churches are commended and dignified, according as their fundamental Faith was ſound, and their Lives holy; not according to the regularity of their firſt manner of gathering: And notwithstanding the exacteſt regularity of their firſt gathering, when Churches have once apoſtatized from Faith and Manners, *Chriſt* hath withdrawn Communion from them. And this making of the firſt gathering of People into *Church-fellowſhip*, to be the Rule to direct us with whom we may hold Communion, will make us reſuſe ſome *Churches* upon whom are ſeen the Scripture-characters of *true Churches*, and joyn with others onely upon an Humane testimony, becauſe Men onely tell us they were *orderly gathered*.

Obſ. ult. *It ſhould be our care to ſhun Separation.*
 To this end,

1. Labour to be progreſſive in the work of *Mortification*. The leſs carnal we are, the leſs contenti-
 on and diviſion will be among us. *Are ye not carnal?*
 (ſaith the *Apoſtle*): and he proves it from their divi-
 ſions. *Separation* is uſually, but very abſurdly, ac-
 counted a ſign of an high-grown *Chriſtian*. We
wrangle

wrangle because we are Children, and are *men in malice* because *children in holiness*; Wars among our selves proceed *from the lusts that war in our members*, James 4. 1.

2. Admire no Mans *Person*. The excessive regarding of some, makes us despise others in respect of them. When one Man seems a Gyant, another will seem a Dwarf in comparison of him. This caused the *Corinthian Schism*. Take heed of Man-worship, as well as Image-worship: Let not *Idolatry* be changed, but abolish'd. Of this largely before, upon *having mens persons in admiration*.

3. Labour for *experimental benefit* by the *Ordinances*. Men separate to those *Churches* which they account better, because they never found those where they were before (to them) good. Call not *Ministers good* (as the *young man* in the *Gospel* did *Christ*) complementally onely; for if so, you will soon call them *bad*. Find the setting up of *Christ* in your Hearts by the *Ministry*, and then you will not dare to account it *Antichristian*. If, with *Jacob*, we could say of our *Bethels*, *God is here*, we would set up Pillars, may be such, for our constancy in abiding in them.

4. Neither *give* nor *receive Scandals*. Give them not, to occasion others to separate; nor receive them, to occasion thy own separation: Watch exactly;

actly ; construe doubtful matters charitably. Look not upon Blemishes with Multiplying-glasses, or old Mens Spectacles : Hide them, though not imitate them : Sport not your selves with others nakedness. Turn *separation from*, into *lamentation for the Scandalous*.

5. Be not much taken with *Novelties*. New-Lights have set this *Church* on fire : For the most part they are taken out of the Dark-Lanterns of old *Hereticks*. They are false and Fools-fires, to lead Men into the Precipice of *Separation*. Love Truth in an old dress ; let not Antiquity be a prejudice against, nor Novelty an inducement to the entertainment of Truth.

6. Give not way to lesser differences. A little division will soon rise up to greater : Small Wedges make way for bigger. Our Hearts are like to *Tinder* ; a little Spark will enflame them. Be jealous of your Hearts when Contentions begin, stifle them in the Cradle. *Paul* and *Barnabas* separated about a small matter, the taking of an Associate.

7. Beware of *Pride*, the Mother of Contention and Separation. *Love not the prebeminence*. Rather be fit for, than desirous of Rule. Despise not the meanest ; say not, *I have no need of thee*. All *Schisms* and *Heresies* are mostly grafted upon the Stock of *Pride*. The first rent that was ever made in *God's* Family,

Family, was by the Pride of Angels, *ver.* 14. and that Pride was nothing else but the desire of *Independency*.

8. Avoid *Self-seeking*. He who seeks his own things and profit, will not mind the good and peace of the *Church*. Oh take heed lest thy *Secular Interest* draw thee to a new *Communion*, and thou colour over thy departure with Religion and *Conscience*.

Thus have we spoken of the first, *viz.* What these *Seducers* did, *viz.* *separate themselves*.

2. The Cause of their *separation*, or what they were, in these words, *sensual, not having the Spirit*.

[*This I will onely give the Breviate of (still keeping to his own words) leaving it to his Commentary on Jude, since printed.*]

By the word *φυρεσις* the *Apostle* seems to me to make their *bruitish sensuality* and *propensions* to be the cause of their *separation*: as if he had said, They will not live under the *strict Discipline*, where they must be curb'd and restrain'd from following their *lusts*; no, these *Sensuallists* will be alone by themselves, in *Companies*, where they may have their fill of *sensual pleasures*, and where they may gratifie their *genius* to the utmost.

The *Apostle* seems to add this their *sensuality*,
 G and

and *want of the Spirit*, to their *separating themselves*, not onely to shew, that *sensuality* was the cause of their *separation*, and the *want of the Spirit* the cause of *both*; but as if he intended directly to thwart and cross them in their pretences of having an high and extraordinary measure of *spiritualness* above others, who, as these *Seducers* might pretend, were in so low a Form of *Christianity*, and had so little *spiritualness*, that they were not worthy to keep them company: whereas *Jude* tells these *Christians*, that these *Seducers* were so far from being more *spiritual* than others, that they were meer *Sensuallists*, and had nothing in them of the *Spirit* at all, &c.

Observations.

Obs. 1. *Commonly sensuality lies at the bottom of sinful separation, and making of Sects.* Separate themselves, sensual, &c.

Obs. 2. *It's possible for those who are sensual, and without the Spirit, to boast of Spiritualness.* Of these before.

Obs. 3. *Sanctity and Sensuality cannot agree together.*

Obs. 4. *They who want the Spirit, are easily brought over to Sensuality.*

To his Worthy Friend H. N.

S I R,

I Heartily thank you for putting me in mind of our late Discourse, and for giving me so fair an opportunity to pursue it, by the *Sermon* that you sent me ; which I greedily read, and had no sooner run over, but I bless'd my self to find, that you should put the Cause upon this Issue, and to appeal to *that* for the justification of the present *Separation*. I look'd again, and thought that you might be mistaken, and had sent me a Sermon against Mr. *Fenkin*, rather than one for him. It was a Discourse that I do acknowledge my self not to be altogether a Stranger to, and what I then retained some remembrance of ; but yet wholly to undeceive my self, I sent for the Book which you say you compared it with, and, to my no small satisfaction, found them (as to what concerns the matter of our Dispute) honestly to agree ; and that you may as well bring the one to vouch for the credit

of the other, as he himself may (if there were occasion) Mr. *Brinsley's Arraignment of Schism* (from whence he hath borrowed the substance of this *Sermon*) in the justification of what he hath said here upon that Subject.

And now, *Sir*, I am glad that I have brought you thus far ; for I desire no better advantage than what this *Sermon* will afford me, and shall decline the Order that we observed in our Discourse; on purpose to comply with it.

You may remember, that I then undertook to shew,

1. That the *old Nonconformists* did themselves hold *Lay-Communion* with the *Church of England*, and accounted those that did not, guilty of *Schism*, as by their Writings yet extant doth appear.
2. That the *present Nonconformists*, who are *Presbyterians*, did plead their Practice, and use their Arguments, against the *Independents*, and others, that did in the late Times separate from themselves.
3. That *Lay-Communion* with the *Church of England*, is the same in our Times, that it was in the Times of the *old Nonconformists*; and that the *Church of England* hath as much to say for it self now, as it had then.

4. That

4. That therefore the *new Separation* doth not in reality differ from the *old*, and is truly *Schism*, if either *they*, or the *old Nonconformists* spoke true.

Now this I look upon as a very convenient Method to bring the Case to a Decision; but because I will shew how willing I am to meet you, and how confident I am in the goodness of my Cause, I shall take that course which will more readily lead me to make use of the *Sermon*, though in the pursuing of *that*, I shall also say what will serve for the proof of the *Propositions* before laid down.

In the first place, it will be necessary to shew what *Schism* is. Now, that, as may be collected from Mr. *Jenkin* here, is a *perverse or undue separation from Church-Communion*, pag. 21, 22. or, a *voluntary and unnecessary dividing and separation from a true Church*, pag. 31.

And upon this Definition I shall proceed, and shew,

1. That the Church of England is a true Church.
2. That there is a Separation from it.
3. That this Separation is voluntary and unnecessary.
4. That therefore the present Separation is schismatical.

1. That the Church of England is a true Church.

But

But here we are put to it, to tell what the Church of England is, by the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 35. *We are told* (saith he) *of Schism from the Church of England, when I would give all the Money in my Purse, to make me understand what the Church of England is.* I might here, without any more ado, refer him to Mr. *Baxter* for resolution; of whom, Mr. *Hickman* saith, in his *Bonafus Vapulans*, printed the same Year, pag. 138. *That he has Communion with the Church of England in all Ordinances*; who cannot but certainly know what that Church is, or else how can he hold Communion with it? But because there is so great a Profit like to attend it, and in compassion to him that hath there raised so much dust that he cannot see his own way, I shall for once tell him what it is by Wise Men thought to be, viz. That Company of Persons, in this Nation, that doth joyn together in the Ordinances of God, according to the Laws established amongst us for Ecclesiastical Matters. *It is the joyning together in the Ordinances of God, which makes a Church a True Church*, as Mr. *Brinsley* saith, in his *Arraignment of Schism*, pag. 31. And it's the joyning together in them, according to the Laws established amongst us, that makes such a Church to be the Church of England. I must profess, Sir, to you, That I can hardly forbear to expose. that

Book

Book of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, that as much abounds with Ill-nature, Self-conceit, Confusion, and Self-contradiction, as any that I have met with of that kind; but because the *Author* hath been in many things of good use to the *Church of God*, I shall not treat him with that rigour such a Book deserves; and shall therefore proceed to shew, *That this Church is a True Church*. He indeed, pag. 43. of that Book, when it had been objected against the present *separation*, *That their Members are taken out of True Churches*, replies, *How many Bishops have written, that the Church of Rome is a True Church, &c. and must no Churches therefore be gathered out of them?* [Her, it should be.] thereby disingenuously insinuating, *That the Church of England is no otherwise a true Church than that of Rome*, and may as safely be separated from. Now how the *Church of Rome* is said to be a *true Church*, Mr. *Brinsley* will inform us, pag. 26. of his *Arraignment of Schism*: *There is a twofold Trueness; Natural, the one; Moral, the other: In the former sense, a Cheater, a Thief may be said to be a true Man, and a Whore a true Woman, and (till she be divorced) a true Wife; yea, and the Devil himself, though the Father of Lies, yet a true Spirit. And in this sense we shall not need to grutch the Church of Rome the name of a true Church; if not so, why do we call her a Church? A Church she*
is,

is, in regard of the outward Profession of Christianity; but yet a false Church: true in Existence, but false in Belief, &c. not so a true Church, but that she is also a false Church, an Heretical, Apostatical, Antichristian Synagogue. But whether the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion* hath the same thoughts of the Church of England, let pag. 76. shew, where he saith, *As I constantly joyn in my Parish-Church in Liturgie and Sacraments, so I hope to do while I live (if I live under as honest a Minister) at due times.* And he would by all means have their Assemblies accounted onely as *Chappel-Meetings*, pag. 15. with respect to the Publick. Now God forbid that all this should be, and that in the mean time he should think, that the *Church of England* is no more a true Church than the *Church of Rome*, and not more to be held Communion with. But the contrary is evident from him, and so his abovesaid Insinuation the more blame-worthy. But however, let him think as he pleaseth, it is very obvious, that the constant Opinion of the old *Nonconformists* was, That the *Church of England* was a true Church, and what, as such, they thought that they were oblig'd to hold Communion with. So *Mr. Baxter*, in his *Preface to the Cure of Church-Divisions*, saith of them; *The old Nonconformists, who wrote so much against Separation, were neither blind, nor Temporizers. They saw the*

the danger on that side. Even Brightman on the Revelation, that writeth against the Prelacy and Ceremonies, severely reprehendeth the Separatists. Read but the Writings of Mr. J. Paget, Mr. J. Ball, Mr. Hildersham, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Bains, Mr. Rathband, and many such others, against the Separatists of those Times, and you may read, that our Light is not greater, but less than theirs, &c. So Mr. Crofton, in his Reformation not Separation, (though several of them he evidently wrongs, that were far from any disaffection to the Order and Discipline of the Church, as Ridley, &c.) pag. 43. Tindal, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Farrar, Whitaker, Cartwright, Bains, Sibbs, Preston, Rogers, Gere, J. Ball, Langly, Hind, Nicols, &c. groaning under retained Corruptions, &c. yet lived to their last breath in constant Communion with the Church.. And this they did, upon the supposition of this Truth. Nay, so far were they persuaded of this, that they did prefer it to most Churches in the World. So the Letters betwixt the Ministers of Old and New-England, published by Mr. Ash and Mr. Rathband, 1643. If we deny Communion with such a Church as ours, there hath been no Church this thousand years with which a Christian might lawfully joyn. When the Wars began, there were those indeed that talked otherwise, and then they would persuade the People, that there

was no difference betwixt *that* and *Rome* ; as Mr. *Marshal*, in his *Sermon* upon the *Union of the Two Houses*, Jan. 18. 1647. *All Christendom, except Malignants in England, do now see, that the Question in England is, Whether Christ or Antichrist shall be Lord and King?* Then those that were suspended before the *Long-Parliament* time, were the *Witnesses that were slain*, and the *Prelacy* was an *Antichristian Power* ; and the *taking away of that, and the Ceremonies*, was the *tenth part of the City falling*, as Mr. *Woodcock* did expound it, in his *Sermons of the two Witnesses*, 1643. pag. 83, & 86. Then they were the *Amorites*, and there was the *cup of abomination* amongst them, as you may find it in a Book called *The Principal Acts of the General Assembly convened at Edinburgh*, May 29. 1644. pag. 19. But when the *Tide* began to turn, and *Presbytery* was opposed, and in great danger of being run down by *Independency*, they changed their *Tune*, and began to plead for the *Truth of it*, and their *Propriety in it*. Thus we find *Ordination according to the Church of England* maintained by the *London-Ministers*, in their *Vindication*, pag. 143. *We do not deny, but that the way of Ministers entring into the Ministry by the Bishops, had many defects in it :—But we add, That notwithstanding all the accidental corruptions, yet it is not substantially and essentially*

tially corrupted : By Dr. Seaman, in his *Answer* to the *Diatribes* ; by Mr. Brinsley of *Schism*, page 31. by Mr. Firmin, in his *Separation examined*, page 23. Then we are told, That *Preaching* and *Prayer* were kept pure in the *Episcopal days*, by Mr. Firmin, *ibid.* pag. 29. And to shew you how reverently they spoke of this *Church*, I will onely quote it from one that must be thought to speak out of no affection, and that is J. Goodwin, in his *Sion College visited*, pag. 26. Doubtless the real and true Ministers of the Province of London, having such abundant opportunity of converse with Travellers from all Parts, cannot but be full of the truth of this Information, That there was more of the truth and power of Religion in England, under the late Prelatical Government, than in all the Reformed Churches besides.

But you will say, All this may be granted, and yet nothing said ; for the Case is altered, the *Church of England* not being now what it was then. This, I acknowledge, the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 43. doth suggest ; The love of Peace, and the fear of frightening any further from *Parish-Communion* than I desire, do oblige me to forbear so much as to describe or name the additional Conformity, and that Sin which Nonconformists fear and fly from, which maketh it harder to us that desire it, to draw many good People to Communion with Conformists, than it

was of old. But this *additional Conformity* that the People are concerned in, I am yet to understand; and I fear he had another Reason to forbear the description of it, *viz.* because he could not. However, for once suppose this; yet he grants, that it's onely harder; but that doth not make it unlawful: For then what shall we say to Mr. Corbet, that in his *Discourse of the Religion of England, Anno 1667. pag. 33.* doth declare, *That the Presbyterians generally hold the Church of England to be a true Church, though defective in its Order and Discipline, and frequent the Worship of God in the Publick Assemblies?* (I believe he speaks of those that he converses with, for here it is generally otherwise as to the point of Practice.) What shall we say to Mr. Hickman, that in his *Bonafus Vapulans, page 133.* saith of himself, *I profess, where-ever I come, I make it my business to reconcile People to the Publick Assemblies; my Conscience would fly in my Face, if I should do otherwise?* What shall be said to that of Mr. Baxter, in his *Cure of Church-Divisions, pag. 263, 264, 265.* where he saith, *Thousands of well-meaning People live as if England were almost all the World, and do boldly separate from their Neighbours here; which they durst not do, if they soberly considered, that almost all the Christian World are worse than they?* And that the present State of this Church is far better

ter than almost any in the World, he there doth largely prove. So far as the Profession of these Persons doth hold (who both deserve, and I am confident have your reverence) we are safe.

But still suppose the worst, I will be bold to say, and I question not to prove, that our *Church* is more a *Church*, than what theirs was, when they so briskly assaulted the *Independents*, and charged them with no less than *Schism*, for their *separation* from it. For, if you consider, you will find, that their *Constitution* was not settled, nor the *Church* in any order, when this Controversie began, and was carried on amongst them. How it was in 1642. Sir *Edward Dering*, in his Speeches then made and printed, will inform us, *pag.* 47. “ The Church of *England* (not long since the Glory of the Reformed Religion) is miserably torn and distracted: you can hardly now say, which is the Church of *England*. A little above, in the same *page*, he saith thus: “ *Mr. Speaker*, There is a certain new-born, unseen, ignorant, dangerous, desperate way of *Independency*: Are we, *Sir*, for this *Independent* way? Nay, (*Sir*) are we for the elder Brother of it, the *Presbyterial* Form? I have not yet heard any one Gentleman within these Walls stand up and assert his Thoughts here, for either of these Ways: And yet (*Sir*) we are made the Patrons.
“ and

“ and Protectors of these so different, so repugnant
 “ Innovations, &c. How it was in 1645. you may
 guess, when the Sovereign Argument they had was,
 That they had hopes of a Settlement. So Mr. *Ca-*
lamy, in a *Fast-Sermon* preached that Year, “ did
 “ call upon his People to be ashamed and confound-
 “ ed, as for divers other things, so, amongst the rest,
 “ for this, that whilst the *Parliament* is sitting, and
 “ labouring to settle things, and while the *Assem-*
 “ bly of *Ministers* are studying to settle *Religion*,
 “ and labouring to heal our Breaches, that any
 “ should be separating from us : as we may learn
 out of *The Door of Truth opened*, pag. 5. So again,
 pag. 6. “ They engage themselves into separated
 “ Congregations, and do not wait and tarry to see
 “ what Reformation the *Parliament* will make. So
 it is confessed by the *London-Ministers*, in their *Let-*
ter to the Assembly, pag. 2. *Jan. 1. 1645.* “ That the
 “ Reformation of *Religion* is not yet settled among
 “ us according to the *Covenant* ; and urge it to
 shew, that the Desires and Endeavours of the *Inde-*
pendents for a *Toleration* at that time, were very
 unreasonable. How it was in 1646. you may see
 in Mr. *Brinsley's Arraignment*, pag. 48, 49. “ It is
 “ alledged, That in this Kingdom at present there
 “ is no way laid forth for the Churches to walk in :
 “ And then, why may they not take liberty to set
 “ up

“ up their way, as well as others theirs? *Answ.* Suppose the Church hath not her way laid out, yet
 “ it will not be denied, but that she hath been all
 “ this while seeking it out, &c. Neither can it be
 “ truly said, that the Church is so wholly destitute
 “ of a way to walk in, whether for Worship, or
 “ Government; the former of which is (and for
 “ some good time hath been) fully agreed upon:
 “ the latter, however not fully compleated, yet is
 “ it for substance both determined and held forth.
 How it was 1656. Dr. *Drake*, in his *Bar to Free*
admission, doth acknowledge, pag. 132. “ How ma-
 “ ny Congregations have for ten or twelve Years
 “ together assembled constantly at the Word and
 “ Prayer, without the Lords Supper, yea some of
 “ them haply without Baptism: A great fault, I
 “ grant; but, I hope, not so great as to unchurch
 “ them. To favour whom, he is drove to affirm,
 That “ I dare not say, the Sacraments are essential
 “ Notes of the Church visible. This was that which
 lay hard upon them, and what the *Independents*
 took great advantage of, *viz.* That they were some
 Years without any settled Constitution, and at last
 so defective in such a considerable part as Govern-
 ment and Discipline. So it was urged by the Five
 Dissenting Brethren, in their *Apologetical Narrati-*
on, 1643. pag, 23. When the others charged them
 with

with *Schism*, they thus answer: “ *Schism*, which
 “ yet must either relate to a differing from the
 “ former Ecclesiastical Government of this Church
 “ established; and then, who is not involved in it,
 “ as well as we? or, to the Constitution and Go-
 “ vernment that is yet to come; and until that be
 “ agreed on, established, and declared, and actu-
 “ ally exist, there can be no guilt or imputation of
 “ *Schism* from it. This was what the *Presbyterians*
 themselves lamented; as the *Norwich-Ministers*, in
 their *Hue and Cry after Vox Populi*, Anno 1646.
 pag. 31. “ We could wish some Penal Law were
 “ against the *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, and some
 “ Government settled. And when it is objected
 there, “ The Parliament hath given full Power and
 “ Authority for Ordination, &c. They answer, “ For
 “ what, Sir? to Ordain Pastors for each Congre-
 “ gation? or to chuse Elders? In what Ordinance
 “ is this Power given to any but the City of Lon-
 “ don? The want of this, was what their Adver-
 saries did continually object; and this was what
 they used all their skill to refute, as Mr. *Brinsley*,
 pag. 31. Object. *We want an Ordinance, viz. Dis-*
cipline. So in *Knutton’s Seven Questions about Sepa-*
ration, 1645. And which Mr. *Firmin* is so pester-
 ed with, that he answers it after this sort, in his *Se-*
paration examined, pag. 28, 29. “ But this Objecti-
 “ on

“ on hath no place in these Churches ; for, Prayer,
 “ Preaching, Administration of the Sacraments, yea,
 “ Discipline they had in the Episcopal days, &c. As
 if that were sufficient to vindicate what they want-
 ed in theirs.

The Case then was plainly thus : That they were
 some Years without any settled Constitution ; That
 though the Province of London was by an Ordinance,
 1645. divided into Twelve Classical Elderships, yet
 after all the Ordinances about it, the very Form of
 Government was not ordered to be published till
 29 Aug. 1648. nay, nor the Articles of Religion
 agreed to be printed till about a Month before :
 And yet notwithstanding, then the Cry was, Inde-
 pendency a great Schism, and worse than Popery, (as
 Adam Steuart in his Zerubbabel to Sanballat, p. 53.)
 and Separation from them, Schismatical. Now, if it
 must be so, when no body knew what the Church
 was, nor they themselves knew what Foundation
 to lay it upon (if J. Goodwin, in his Sion College vi-
 sited, pag. 10. or J. L. in his Plain Truth, pag. 6.
 are to be believed, and as Mr. Brinsley, pag. 49. doth
 not deny) ; then what must it not be, when it is
 from a Church that is established, and whose Arti-
 cles, Constitutions, and Orders are, and have been
 time out of mind settled, as ours is ? If in 1647.
 there was a Church, and a Church of England, as the

Ministers sent by the *Parliament* in that Year to *Oxford* did maintain, and as the *Form of Church-Government to be used in the Church of England*, printed by Order of *Parliament*; 1648. doth acknowledge; then certainly such a thing there is now to be found.

To conclude this: If the *old Nonconformists* thought the *Church of England* to be a true Church, and what they did think themselves obliged to hold Communion with; If the present *Nonconformists*, when time was, did declare as much; If the *Church of England* doth not now differ from what it was when they so thought of it; and that it is much more a *Church*, than what that was that the *Independents* were accounted by them *Schismatics* for withdrawing from: Then I hope their *Separation* from us, will be allowed to be *unwarrantable*.

And now I know not what can be said, unless, with the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 33. it be said, that this is onely *local distinction*, not *separation*. But that is the second thing I shall proceed to shew.

2. *There is a Separation from the Church of England*. If there was no more to be said in this Case, than what *Adam Stenart*, in his *Zerubbabel to Sannaballat*, wrote against the *Independents*, 1644. it would be sufficient; viz. “ If ye be not separated
“ from

“ from us , but entertain Union and Communion
 “ with us, what need ye more a *Toleration*, rather
 “ than the rest of the Members of our *Church* ?
 The pains the *Nonconformists* took to compass, and
 the joy which they expressed at obtaining a *Tolera-*
tion, shews that they were not of its Communion.
 But what credit can we give to such a Declarati-
 on? “ For alas, (as Mr. *Brinsley*, pag. 28. saith in the
 “ same case) what meaneth the lowing of the Oxen,
 “ and the bleating of the Sheep? I mean, the con-
 “ fused noise of our lesser and greater Divisions?
 “ —Divisions, not onely without Separations, Sects,
 “ and Factions ; but Divisions of an higher na-
 “ ture, amounting to no less than direct Separati-
 “ on; and that not barely to a negative, but to a
 “ positive Separation, to the setting up of Altars
 “ against Altars, Churches against Churches. That
 “ it is so *de facto*, I think it will not, it cannot be
 “ denied. For, if Mr. *Baxter*, and some others,
 shall profess, That they meet not at the same hour
 with the Publick, *under any colour and pretence, in*
any Religious Exercise, than according to the Liturgie ;
 and yet in the mean time use it not: *the Dividers*
will not see (as the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*
 saith, pag, 20.) *the different Principles on which they*
go, while their Practise seemeth to be the same. But
 if we should grant this, to those that are willing to

hold Communion with us; yet these are very few; to what do wholly decline and deny it. Mr. *Jenkin* here saith, pag. 22. That *Separation* appears “in the withdrawing from the performance of those “Duties which are both the Signs of, and Helps to “*Christian Unity*, as *Prayer, Hearing, Receiving of “Sacraments, &c.* And that “*Schism* is negative, “when there is onely a simple secession, &c. without making head against that *Church* from which “the departure is; or positive, when Persons so “withdrawing do so confociate and draw themselves into a distinct and opposite Body, setting up “a *Church* against a *Church*. Now I dare appeal to all that know them, whether Mr. *Jenkin*, and the far greater part of his Brethren, have been ever seen in our *Congregations* (unless at some times the more adventurous of them have thrust their Heads in at the Door; when, if they heard all, as it is usually but very little of the *Sermon* that they have patience to hear, Mr. *Brinsley* will tell them, That as for *Occasional hearing*, it is agreed on all hands, it is not properly an act of *Church-Communion*, pag. 35.) And I will appeal to your Eyes, whether they do not constantly keep up their *Meetings* in opposition to those of the *Church*. But what need I go so far about, when this is not onely acknowledged, but defended? See Mr. *Wadsworth*, in his *Separation yet*

no Schism, Epist. to the Reader, where he puts the Case of the *Nonconformists* thus: “ There are some
 “ hundreds of true Ministers of *Jesus Christ*,—and
 “ there are many thousands likewise of visible Pro-
 “ fessors of *Christianity*, do willingly hear and joyn
 “ with these *Ministers* in the *Worship* of God, and
 “ in a *participation* of *Sacraments*:—These meet in
 “ *distinct Congregations*, separate from the *legally-*
 “ *established Congregations* in the Land, with whom
 “ they will not, because they cannot hold Commu-
 “ nion. And now it is out, and what you see is
 plainly avowed: So that I have leave to pass to
 the next Head.

3. *That this Separation is voluntary, and unneces-*
sary. The sin of *Schism*, will all say, is very great,
 and *what cannot be blotted out with the blood of*
Martyrdom, as Mr. *Jenkin* here saith, pag. 26. *one*
spoke very well. But, as he observes from *Musculus*,
 pag. 31. *There is a double Schism, the one bad, the*
other good; the bad is that whereby a good Union,
the good whereby a bad Union is broken asunder.
 And of what sort the *present Separation* is, comes
 now to be tried, which I shall do, by making my
 Observations from what this *Sermon* will afford;
 and by shewing from thence, when a *Separation* is
justifiable, and when *not*. From all which, if it ap-
 pears, that the Reasons produced by them fall
 within

within the compass of the Negative, but hold not as to the Affirmative, it will appear, That *their Separation is voluntary, and unnecessary*. Now there are Six Cases, as may be collected from this *Sermon*, in which *Separation is unwarrantable, and schismatical*.

1. It is not to be allowed, when it is by reason of *Mixt-Communion, and admitting into Church-fellowship the vile with the precious*. This he handles at large, from *pag. 33. to pag. 37.* and saith, That it hath *no Scripture-warrant*. And this hath been their constant Opinion. So Mr. *Firmin*, in his *Separation examined, pag. 40.* “Corrupt Members there
 “ were enough in the *Jewish Church*, and so in the
 “ *Christian Churches* soon after, and in the *Apostles*
 “ times; but you have no example of *separating*
 “ from them. So the *Provincial Assembly of London*, in their *Vindication of the Presbyterial Govern-*
ment, pag. 134. “Suppose there were some *sinful*
 “ *mixtures* at our *Sacraments*, yet we conceive this
 “ is not a sufficient ground of a *negative*, much less
 “ of a *positive separation*.—— This they give the
 Reason of, Because “in what *Church* soever there
 “ is *purity of Doctrine*, there *God hath his Church*,
 “ though overwhelmed with *scandals*. And there-
 “ fore whosoever separates from such an *Assembly*,
 “ separates from that place where *God hath his*
 “ *Church*,

“ *Church*, which is *rash and unwarrantable*. Mr. *Vines*,
 in his *Treatise of the Sacrament*, hath a whole Chap-
 ter, *viz. cap. 20.* to shew the unlawfulness of it, and
 faith, *pag. 235.* “ That to excommunicate our selves
 “ from *Gods Ordinances* (if Men of wicked Life be
 “ not excommunicate) for fear of pollution by
 “ them, is *Donatistical*. So Dr. *Manton*, on *Jude*,
pag. 496. “ The Scandals of Professors are ground
 “ of *mourning*, but not of *separation*. And Mr. *Bax-*
ter doth speak fully to it, in his *Cure of Church-Di-*
visions, *pag 81.* “ If you mark all the Texts of the
 “ *Gospel*, you shall find, that all the *separation* which
 “ is commanded in such cases (besides the *separation*
 “ from *Infidels* and the *Idolatrous World*) is but one
 “ of these two sorts: 1. That either the *Church*
 “ cast out impenitent Sinners by the Power of the
 “ Keys; or, 2. That private Men avoid all private
 “ familiarity with them. But that the private Mem-
 “ bers should separate from the *Church*, because such
 “ Persons are not cast out of it, shew me one Text
 “ to Prove it if you can. The consideration of this,
 made the Author of the Book called *Nonconformists*
no Schismaticks, to quit this Argument, concluding,
pag. 16. with good reason, “ That if one Mans sin
 “ defileth another that Communicates with him,
 “ who can assure himself of any Scriptural Com-
 “ munion on this Side Heaven? All which I have
 produced

produced (and could indeed tire you with Quotations of this kind) on purpose to let you see how much the Author of *Separation yet no Schism*, doth run counter to his own Party, and withal, how little acquaintance with this Argument will serve to shew the weakness and inconsistency of that Tract. He puts the case thus, *pag.* 56. “ If Ministers, or “ many of the Members are much corrupted, or the “ Members onely commonly so, but connived at, it “ is a sufficient ground for the sound to withdraw. And for this he gives two Reasons: “ 1. Left under “ the pretence of Peace, they should be guilty of “ the greatest Uncharitableness, and that is the hard- “ ning and encouraging them in their abominable “ Impieties. 2. Because the sound ought, by the Law “ of God and Nature, to provide for their own “ safety,—— for they cannot but be in apparent “ danger by Communicating with such. Now granting the Case so to be, yet *separation* will not be granted lawful by themselves, upon the Reasons which he there gives. I shall refer him for an Answer to the first of the *Letters* that passed betwixt the *Ministers* of *Old* and *New England*, published by Mr. *Asb* and Mr. *Rathband*, 1643. (as thought by them at that time very seasonable). When those of *New England* had said, *That by joyning with an insufficient and unworthy Ministry, they did counte-*

nance

nance them in their Place and Office, pag. 8. it is answered, pag. 11. *The Scripture teacheth evidently, not onely that the People by joyning do not countenance them in their Place and Office; but that they must and ought to joyn with them in the Worship of God: and in separating from the Ordinance, they shall sin against God.* From whence you may observe, That the countenancing of such whom the Word of Truth doth condemn, as not approved Ministers of God, (as it's there said) is no reason to discharge us of our Duty; and if Separation be not otherwise our Duty, the fear of hardning others, by our Communion with them, will never make it to be so. Surely this might have been very well thought to be the effect of the same Practice in the Church of Corinth, where there was (as the *Provincial Assembly of London* observeth, in their *Vindication*, pag. 134.) such a profane mixture at their Sacrament, as we believe few (if any) of our Congregations can be charged withal: And yet the Apostle doth not persuade the godly Party to separate, much less to gather a Church out of a Church: Which yet had been very necessary, if this Author's Reason had been of any force.

And his second Reason, viz. *Care of our own safety*, will also have no place here, if Mr. *Jenkin's* Authority will signifie any thing with him; who speaking in this *Sermon*, p. 36. of that Text, 1 Cor.

5. II. of *not eating with a Brother, &c.* shews very well, that it is to be understood of Civil, and not Religious eating, and gives this as one Reason for it, *viz. That there is danger of being infected by the wicked in civil, familiar, and arbitrary eatings; not so in joyning with them in an holy and commanded Service and Ordinance.* If we follow the Apostles Precept, of having no familiar and ordinary converse with Fornicators, Covetous, Idolaters, Drunkards, &c. we may be assured, that we shall be in no danger of Infection by their Company in Religious Offices and Duties, where there is little or no converse, opportunity; and way for it. The case, I acknowledge, is sad, when such are to be found amongst *Christians*, and that Discipline is not exercised upon them: but I ought not to leave my Place and Duty, because such do joyn with me in it; or to separate from the *Church of God*, because such continue in its Communion: For, this is to tear the *Church* in pieces, and the Doctrine that drives to it is very pernicious. Take the Character of it from the *Provincial Assembly*, in their *Vindication*, pag. 124. *That Doctrine that crieth up Purity, to the ruine of Unity, is contrary to the Doctrine of the Gospel.*

But truly, the case is not so bad with us, as it is represented. I know there are some that do object,

ject, as J. Rogers did in 1653. *The Parish-Churches are not rightly constituted, for there is in them ranting, rewalling,*—To whom I shall reply, as Mr. Crofton did then to him, in his *Bethshemesb clouded*, pag. 103. *O sharp sentence! severe censure! at one word pronounced on all Parishes indefinitely: the Position whence it flows had need be well proved, and the Inference well backed.* For, I must needs say, that what Mr. Firmin, in his *Separation examined*, p. 42. once said of the *Presbyterial*, is true of the *Episcopal*, *That there are many Ministers that have as few wicked at that Ordinance [of the Lords Supper], as ever were in the Church of Corinth.* I must confess, that I was pleased with the ingenuous acknowledgment of the Author of *The Cry of a Stone*, in 1642. who saith, pag. 39. “ I freely acknowledge, that there are many in the Parishes of *England*, which are of a very godly Life and Conversation, and some that go as far therein, as ever I saw any in my life: And if I should prefer any of the Separated before them in Conversation, I should speak against my own Conscience: but in the Church-state and Order, I must prefer the other. And I question not, but that the State of the Church is still as good, in that respect, as it was then; and might have been better, had those kept in it that are run away from it, and that by their Divisions in Religion,

gion, make many to question whether there be any such thing in the World. Certainly, were our endeavours rightly placed and united, there is scarcely any Church in the World whose Temper would promise more success, than that of ours : And if we would deal fairly (as J. G. in his *Cretensis*, pag. 5. once said) in comparing them together, and not set the Head of the one against the Tail of the other, but measure Head with Head, and Tail with Tail ; I will not say of our Church, as he did of *Independency*, That if that hath its Tens, Presbytery hath its Thousands of the Sons of Belial in its Retinue : but I will say, That even the separated Churches, as they now stand, are not without them, as well as we : And if they would as well look out the Extortioner, and Unjust, and Covetous, and Railer, (not to speak of others) amongst themselves, as they do pick out the Fornicator and Drunkard, that are (as they insinuate) with us, they would find their own Churches not so good, and others not so bad as they imagine.

But supposing that such are in the Communion of our Church (as it is not to be altogether denied) yet is not the Church presently to be blamed. Hear what Mr. Brinsley saith, in his *Arraignment of Schism*, pag. 39. “Supposing such unwarrantable Mixtures
 “ have been, and yet are to be found ; yet it can
 “ not properly be put upon the Churches score.

“ What

“ What her Ordinance was touching the keeping
 “ back scandalous Persons from the *Sacrament*, they
 “ which have read her ancient *Rubrick* cannot be
 “ ignorant. And Mr. *Vines* of the *Sacrament*, c. 19.
 p. 233. speaking about the Power which the *Mini-*
ster hath of keeping off unworthy Persons from the
Lords Supper, saith, “ I as little doubt of the Inten-
 “ tion of the *Church of England*, in the Rule given
 “ to the *Minister* before the *Communion*, in the case
 “ of some emergent Scandal at the present time.
 The *Church* hath provided for the correcting of Of-
 fenders; and perhaps there may be as good reason
 why the Censures of it are not now executed, as
 there was in the late Times. Mr. *Crofton* once told
 the *Independents*, in his *Bethshemesb clouded*, p. 110.
 “ The continuance of our disordered *Discipline*, is
 “ the fruit of their disordered *Separation* from us.
 I would fain be resolved in what *Adam Steuart*, in
 his *Zerubbabel to Sanballat*, pag. 70. puts to the *Que-*
rie: “ I would willingly know (saith he) whether
 “ it were not better for them that aim at *Tolerati-*
 “ *on* and *Separation*, to stay in the *Church*, and to
 “ joyn all their endeavours with their Brethren to
 “ reform Abuses; than by their *separation*, to let the
 “ *Church of God* perish in Abuses? Whether they
 “ do not better, that stay in the *Church* to reform
 “ it, when it may be reformed, than to quit it for
 “ fear

“ fear to be deformed in it? If they had taken this course, and had given us their help, in stead of withdrawing from it, doubtless the Censures of the *Church* would have signified more, and the Members of it have been in a much better condition than now they are. I shall conclude this with what is said by a well-experienced Person, in his *Address to the Nonconformists*, pag. 161. “ If, in stead of this “ [Separation], each *Christian* of you had kept to “ *Parochial Communion*, and each *outed Minister* had “ kept their Residence among them, and Commu- “ nion with them, as private Members, in the Pa- “ rish-way; and had also in a *private capacity* joyn- “ ed with those *Ministers* which have succeeded “ them, in doing all the good they could in the Pa- “ rish,—I nothing doubt, but that by so doing, you “ would have taken an unspeakable far better “ course to promote the Power of *Religion* in the “ Nation, than by what you have done. It’s they that have in great measure weakned, if not tied our Hands, and then complain that we do not fight. If all things therefore were considered, I believe that they would have as little reason to condemn our *Churches* for Corruptions in this kind, as I am sure, if they will be constant to themselves, that they have none to separate from us upon account of them.

2. *Separation* is not to be allowed for *slight and tolerable Errors, which are not Fundamental, and hinder Communion with Christ the Head*; as may be collected from *pag. 28. & 37. of this Sermon*. So also say the *old Nonconformists*, in their *Confutation of the Brownists*, published by Mr. Rathband, *pag. 4.* “ We desire the *Reader* to consider, that a People “ may be a *true Church*, though they know not, nor “ hold not every Truth contained in the *Scriptures*, “ but contrarily hold many Errors repugnant to “ them. This was the *Primitive Opinion and Practice*, say the *Provincial Assembly*, in their *Vindication*, *pag. 139.* “ All such who professed *Christianity*, held *Communion together, as one Church*, notwithstanding the difference of *Judgments in lesser things*, and much corruption in *Conversation*. And now, that the *Church of England* doth hold no *Fundamental Errors*, I appeal to themselves. What it was before the Wars, let the Author of *Church-Levellers*, printed for *Tho. Underbil, 1644.* speak: When it was objected, That the *Presbyterians*, whilst persecuted by the *Bishops*, did hold forth a *full Liberty of Conscience*; he answers, This is a *Slander*, — *the difference between them and the Prelates being not in Doctrinals, but Ceremonials*. And therefore after the *Covenant* was taken, whilst the *Lords* had the *Power of Admission to Benefices*, all
Persons.

Persons presented were to read the *Articles* publickly, and profess their consent to them. And that it is the same still, is confessed. So Mr. C. in his *Discourse of the Religion of England*, pag. 43. “The “*Doctrines of Faith and Sacraments by Law* established, is heartily received by the *Nonconformists*. So *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 45. “We differ not “at all from the *Doctrines of the Church of England* “(till the *new Doctrines* about *Infants* was brought “into the *new Rubrick*.) And certainly, that is, if an Error, no dangerous or fundamental one. So Dr. Owen, in his *Peace-offering*, 1667. p. 12. “The “*Confession—of the Church of England*, declared in “the *Articles of Religion*, and herein what is purely “*Doctrinal*, we fully embrace, and constantly adhere unto. Again, pag. 17. “We know full well, “that we differ in nothing from the whole Form of “*Religion* established in *England*, but onely in some “few things in outward Worship. Herein too we have the concurrence of Mr. W. himself, in his *Separation yet no Schism*, p. 60. “If you take it [*the “Church of England*] for such *Christians* onely who “are of the Faith in *Doctrinals* with those that hold “the *Thirty nine Articles*; here the *Nonconformists* “come in for a share also, who are of your Faith “therein: excepting those which respect *Discipline* “and *Ceremonies*. And pag. 62. “It is evident, that “some

“ some sort of Errors in a *Church*, though but tolerated, may be a just ground of withdrawing ;
 “ though I do not charge the *Church of England*
 “ with any such Errors.

This therefore being thus acknowledged, one would have thought the Argument might be fairly dismissed, and that here could be no reason found for *Separation* : And yet when we are come thus near, it is like the two Mountains spoken of in *Wales*, upon whose tops you may exchange Discourse, and almost come to shaking of Hands ; and notwithstanding all, there is little less than a days Journey betwixt you. We seem to have brought the Matter to a perfect reconciliation ; but when we least thought of it, we are at open War again : For the Author last-mentioned grants as much as we can ask ; but immediately thrusts in a Reason or two, that he thinks will maintain their Ground, and vindicate their Practice notwithstanding. The *Doctrines* he hath nothing against ; but yet the *Preachers* are—— Sometimes he saith, *they are contrary one to another ; some are for the Doctrine of Predestination, others against it, &c. and how shall he then judge of their Faith and Doctrinals ?* pag. 60. Sometimes he saith, *It is conceived, many of them preach contrary to the Articles, ibid.* Sometimes again, *It is conceived, that several of them do not honestly believe*

those Articles that they have professed to believe, p.62. And to make all sure, because it may be objected, That the People have liberty in this case of complaining; he answers, To what purpose? when such Errors are publickly professed in printed Books, and no course taken for correcting or ejecting of the Authors? pag. 61. Things as impertinently, as slanderously suggested. For, what though the Ministers differ among themselves in some Points, as he doth after his Predecessors the *Brownists* affirm, (as you may see in the *Nonconformists* Answer to them, pag. 4.) is that a reason to forsake our Communion? and doth he that forsakes ours for theirs, find the case much amended? Do not the *Nonconformists* as much differ from each other, as any amongst us? If not, from whence proceed all those Disputes about Communion and Non-communication with us, about the Imputation of *Christ's Righteousness*, the nature of justifying Faith, lawfulness and unlawfulness of prescribed Forms of Prayer, of God's Prescience, &c. And why are Mr. How, and Mr. Baxter, &c. so much teased by some of their Fellows, and the latter called *Slanderer*, *Dictator*, *Self-saver*, and accused of *Profaneness*, *Blasphemy*, and what not, as you may see in the *Antidote to his Cure*, 1670? Is it not because they will not swallow down the absurdest of their Principles, or do go further toward an accommodation

modation of our unhappy Differences, than they will allow ?

But what are those Points that our Ministers thus differ among themselves, or from our *Church* in ? Is it about the *mode* in *Imputation*, or about the *Object* of *Predestination* ? &c. These things the *Church of England* is not so minute and positive in. If he will not believe me, I shall turn him over to Mr. *Hickman* (who hath in several Tracts particularly concerned himself in this Argument, and may be supposed to understand it). He, in his *Latin Sermon De Hæresium origine*, 1659. pag. 37. undertaking to answer *Tilenus* about the Doctrine of our *Church* concerning the *Object* of *Predestination*, whether *massa corrupta*, or no, saith, *Apaga nugas ; Non solet Ecclesia Anglicana in mysteriis hujusmodi explicandis vagari in eas quæstiones, quæ nimia subtilitate popularem captum effugiunt*. Is it about the *special Grace* of God in the *conversion* of a *Sinner*, or the *influence* of the *Holy Spirit* in it ? Then I will dare him to produce any that are herein *Nonconformists* to the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, and that teach, That there is no *special Grace* exerted in the *conversion* of a *Sinner* ; or, That the *Holy Ghost* is of no further use in the *conversion* of Men, than as he first inspired those that delivered the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, &c. as he slanderously doth say. He may force,

and scrue, and wrest ; but he cannot do it honestly and fairly. But supposing there were several that did thus teach, and that such Books were Licensed where this is affirmed: Doth this presently make the *Church* Heretical ? Notwithstanding this, I believe that the *Church of England* is in it self as Orthodox, as theirs was in 1646. when *Sblichtingius* his *Comment on the Hebrews*, or what was little better, came out thus attested by Mr. *J. Downname*: *I have perused this Comment ; and finding it to be learned and judicious , plain and very profitable , I allow it to be printed and published.* I doubt they would have taken it very ill, to have been then charged with *Socinianism*, because that Book came out with such an *Imprimatur*, from him that was deputed in those Times to give it: And yet I never heard that Mr. *Downname* was corrected or ejected for so doing. And may they continue Orthodox notwithstanding, and we for such an escape be counted Heretical ? But how far a *Church* is concerned in such Cases, I think will appear from what is said in *The Divine Right of the Presbyterian Government*, pag. 265. “ The *Church of Rome* (setting aside
“ those particular Persons among them that main-
“ tained damnable Errors, which were not of the
“ *Church*, but a predominant Faction in the *Church*)
“ continued to be a true *Church of Christ* until Lu-
“ ther’s

“*ther’s* time, — as the unanimous consent of the
 “Orthodox Divines confess ; yea, as some think,
 “till the cursed Council of *Trent*,—till when, the
 “Errors among them, were not the Errors of the
 “*Church*, but of particular Men. Now I hope they
 will be as favourable to us, and give our *Church* as
 much allowance in this case as that of *Rome*, and
 not count it the Error of the *Church*, till by some
 Decree, Canon, or Article it is owned so to be.

Sir, You may by this time perceive, how hard
 these Persons are put to it, when it makes them so
 quick to espy, and busie to rake all the dirt they
 can together, to make our *Church* deformed, and
 worthy of all that defamation they have branded
 it with, and of that distance they observe and keep
 from it. How do they torture Phrases, hale along
 Expressions, without due Process, to the Gibbet
 and the Stake, and cry out *Pelagianism*, and *Socini-*
anism, nay *Mahometism* ? Mr. *Jenkin* and his Bre-
 thren once said, in *the Vindication of the Presbyterial*
Government, pag. 140. “To make ruptures in the
 “Body of *Christ*, and to divide Church from Church,
 “and to set up Church against Church, and to ga-
 “ther Churches out of true Churches, and because
 “we differ in some things, therefore to hold Com-
 “munion in nothing ; this we think hath no war-
 “rant out of the *Word of God*, and will introduce
 “all

“all manner of Confusion in Churches, — and set
 “open a wide gap to bring in *Atheism, Popery, Heresie*, and all manner of wickedness. And all
 “People would be apt to say the same, and could not
 see into the Reason of this *Separation*, if it came
 to this, Whether the *Righteousness of Christ* be the
meritorious or *formal Cause* of our *Justification*? or,
 Whether *Moral Vertue* and *Grace* differ in their
nature, or onely in their *cause*? It must be some-
 what gross and tangible that they can judge of;
 and therefore charge them home, That they hold
no necessity of the *Righteousness of Christ*; and, That
Moral Vertue, as it was in the *Heathens*, or in *Christians*
 without any *Divine Grace*, will save; and
 you do the work: This is a *Lord have Mercy* wrote
 upon their *Church-doors*; and People will be taught
 by this, to avoid them as they would the *Plague*,
 and to be as wary of trusting their Souls with them,
 as their Bodies with *Tygers, Bears, and Wolves*.
 It is truly and well observed by Mr. *Hickman*, in
 his Sermon *De Haresium origine*, pag. 12. *Ipsa sa-*
lus non seruet eas oves, quæ aque metuunt a pastoribus
& lupis: Once render their Pastors formidable
 to them, and we may know how the day will go.
 Beat up these *Kettle-Drums*, and you may easily
 gather, and securely *Hive the Bees*.

I shall conclude this with what Mr. *Baxter* saith,
 in

in his *Cure of Church-Divisions*, pag. 393, 394. “ As
 “ I have known many unlearned Sots, that had no
 “ other Artifice to keep up the reputation of their
 “ Learning, than in all Companies to cry down
 “ such and such (who were wiser than themselves)
 “ for no Scholars ; — So, many that are, or should
 “ be conscious of the dulness and ignorance of their
 “ fumbling and unfurnish’d Brains, have no way to
 “ keep up the reputation of their Wisdom with
 “ their simple Followers, but to tell them, *O such*
 “ *an one hath dangerous Errors, and such a Book is a*
 “ *dangerous Book, and they hold this, and they hold*
 “ *that* ; and so to make odious the Opinions and
 “ Practices of others. — And if Ignorance get pos-
 “ session of the ancient and gray-headed, it triumph-
 “ eth there, and saith, *Give me a Man, that I may*
 “ *dispute with him* ; or rather, *Away with this He-*
 “ *retick, he is not fit to be disputed with.* How far
 Mr. *Jenkin* is concerned in this Character, I leave
 to his consideration ; but if you have a mind to
 inquire into it, you may repair to his *Exodus*, where
 he comes like another *Samson*, shaking his Locks,
 and rushing forth with his mouth full of Menaces
 against the *uncircumcised Philistims*, those *audacious*
Hereticks that lie sculking in the corners of the
Church of England : but (poor man) meets with
 the misfortune of that Champion, to be led away

in triumph ; and in stead of answering others, is not able to defend himself.

3. *Separation* is not to be allowed for the *manner of Church-constitution*. So saith Mr. J. here, pag. 37. *Much more clear (if clearer can be) is the Schismaticalness of those who separate from, and renounce all Communion with those Churches which are not of their own manner of Constitution*. For which he gives three Reasons, pag. 38. And herein he agrees with Mr. Brinsley, in his *Arraignment*, pag. 32. and in his *Church-Remedy*, pag. 51. Now if this Argument held for *Presbytery* against *Independency*, and that the *separation* of the latter was for that reason *Schismatical*, I see not why it should not be of as equal force to condemn the former, who yet do presume to offer it on their own behalf against us, and think that they have said enough, when they have been able to pick some quarrel with the *present Constitution*.

4. *Separation* is not to be allowed when it is upon those terms which will make us refuse some Churches upon which are seen the *Scripture-characters of true Churches*. This Mr. J. gives as a Reason to confirm the former, pag. 38. Now what those Characters are, he tells us a little before, in the same page, viz. *In Scripture, Churches are commended, according as their fundamental Faith was sound, and their*

their Lives holy. Nay, he seems to resolve it wholly into the former, pag. 34. where he saith, *Hath not God his Church, even where corruption of Manners hath crept into a Church, if purity of Doctrine be maintained?* Now how far our Church hath upon it these Characters, I appeal to what is above-said, to shew; and for which, I question not but it may contend with any Church in the World.

5. It is not to be allowed because other Churches are by them accounted better. So pag. 39. *Men separate to those Churches which they account better, because they never found those where they were before (to them) good.* Which he there condemns, and as a remedy against it, advises to *labour for experimental benefit by the Ordinances.* The reason of this Separation (saith Mr. Vines on the Sacrament, p. 235.) *seems plausible to easie capacities, such as the Apostle calls, Rom. 16. 18. the ἀνατοι, the simple; but if it be urged by the Standard of Scripture, it will be found too light.* But now the case is altered, and it is become a considerable Argument; *A more profitable Ministry, a purer Worship, a stricter Discipline, an holier Society and Fellowship,* are some of the massie Pillars upon which the weight of this *new Separation* is laid. Hither the Author of *Separation yet no Schism* doth with confidence betake himself, pag. 65, 66, 67. *The Reason supposeth that which is*

not to be supposed, i. e. That to withdraw from a Church for the benefit of a more profitable Ministry, is a Crime. Now here I shall consider, whether this Reason will hold, and serve to justify a Separation from a Church ; and, if it were granted, whether yet it is a Reason amongst us.

Whether it is so in it self, let Mr. *Brinsley* speak, in his *Arraignment*, pag. 47. where the Case is put thus ; “ May not People make choice of what Ministers they please, putting themselves under such a Ministry as by which they may edifie most ? ” *Ans^w*. Suppose it, That a People have such a Power and Right to chuse their own Ministers ; yet “ having once chosen them, and God by giving a Blessing to their Ministry having ratified and confirmed that Choice, evidencing that they are the Ministers of God to them ; whether they may now, upon pretext of greater Edification, take a liberty to themselves to chuse new ones as oft as they please : this the moderate Author of the late *Irenicon* [i. e. Mr. *Burroughs*] will by no means allow, but condemns, as the direct way to bring in all kind of disorder and confusion into the Church. This both *Presbyterians* and *Independents* then are agreed in, That *Edification* alone is no sufficient Reason to forsake one Church for another ; and that a Persons own Opinion of his Case in that matter,

matter, will not make that lawful to him, which will be the unavoidable means of bringing in confusion to the *Churches* which he either leaves, or joyns himself to. But the Author of *Separation yet no Schism* thinks he hath sufficient Reason for his Opinion, who doth thus argue, *viz.* “ You call it
 “ a Crime, because you suppose it is a transgression
 “ the Law of visible Communion with some parti-
 “ cular *Church*: But I say, That the Laws of visible
 “ Communion with this or that particular *Church*,
 “ are but *positive*, and therefore subordinate to
 “ Laws more *natural* and *necessary*; such is that
 “ wherein we are commanded to take care of our
 “ Souls and Salvation: So that if *Christians* do shift
 “ particular *Churches*, for the obtaining of very ap-
 “ parent advantages to their Salvation, above what
 “ they have had where they were, I see therein no
 “ Crime at all committed. I grant indeed, that
positive Laws must give way to *natural*; but then
 there must be a plain necessity that must intervene,
 to make them inconsistent: for otherwise, both re-
 main in force, as I conceive they do in the Instance
 here given. If indeed Salvation was inconsistent
 with, or what we run the apparent hazard of, in
 Communion with a particular *Church*, then there
 is sufficient reason for separation from it: but if it
 be onely that I conceive the increase of Knowledge,

or the engaging of my Affections, may be better attained by separation from, than continuance in its Communion, this is far from a *necessity*, and so no sufficient Reason to break it. As it is in a Family, If the Master takes no care to provide for his Children and Servants (who of old were esteemed the Goods of their Master) but that they must starve if they continue with him; or if what he provides, is such as will rather poyson than nourish them, or what is absolutely forbid (as *Swines flesh* under the *Law*): in such a case they may shift for themselves, and refuse to live with him, till he mends their Condition. But if what he provides is lawful, wholesom, and sufficient, though not of so good nourishment as might be wished, they are to content themselves, and to keep within the bounds of Duty and Observance. So it is here; If we were in a *Church* that either denied us what is necessary to Salyation, or that would engage us to do what will bring it into imminent hazard, we have an unquestionable Reason to forbear Communion with her: But when the means of Salvation that we enjoy are sufficient to it, and what we deliberate about is onely the Degree and Measure, [*what is better and fitter*] we cannot quit a *Church* without sin, and our departure is *unnecessary*. And that will further appear, if we consider,

1. *That no further Knowledge or Edification is necessary, than what we can attain to in a lawful way; and what is otherwise lawful in it self, by taking an undue course for it, is made unlawful.* As, *Hearing, Reading, and Christian Converse,* are very fit Means for my Improvement; but if I for it do injure my Family, and neglect my Calling, it is so far from being my duty, that it is my sin. So to edifie myself, and to acquire a greater measure of *Knowledge and Christian Vertues,* is a noble and most excellent End; but if I for it break off Communion with the *Church* whereof I am a Member, I make myself a Transgressor. All which, if well considered, the falacy of our Author's Argument will appear. For, suppose I reason thus: *The Laws of particular Families are but positive, and therefore subordinate to Laws more necessary; such is that wherein we are commanded to take care of our Souls: and therefore if I neglect the former for the good of the latter, I see no Crime therein committed.* Would not this appear very conceited and imaginary? And if it's false here, it is so in the Case that he offers. The grounds of his mistake herein, seem to be,
 1. That he was so intent upon the *positive Laws of particular Churches,* that he had no respect to *Church-communion* in it self, which is highly necessary; by which means he did not consider, that this Principle

ple of shifting Communion for the expectation of further Improvement, is what tends so to the dissolution of a *Church*, that he that holds it is capable of continuing in no *Communion* whatsoever; and what cannot be put in practice, but confusion in, and breaking up of *Churches* will most certainly follow. This was what they of *New-England* had experience of, and therefore provided against, in their *Platform of Church-Discipline*, cap. 3. *Church-Members* (say they) *may not depart from the Church, and so one from another, as they please, nor without just and weighty cause.*—*Such departure tends to the dissolution of the Body.*—*Just Reasons for a Members removal of himself, are,* 1. *If a man cannot continue, without sin.* 2. *In case of Persecution.* But not a word of a *more profitable Ministry, and greater edification.* Now if this be the necessary and constant Effect of this Principle, it cannot be true.

2. Another ground of his mistake seems to be, That the notion of a *particular Church*, led him to think, that their separation into Societies distinct from *our Church*, was no more than to go from one *Parish-Church* to another (which is also the conceit of the Author of *Sacrilegious Desertion*): This he insinuates *pag. 66.* But this is apparently false, as I have shewed in part before; and which will be further evident, if you observe, that their Agree-
ment

ment with us in Thirty six of our *Articles*, makes them to be no more of us (whilst they differ in the others that refer to our *Constitution*, and which they separate from us for, as they profess), than that of the *Independents* made them one with the *Presbyterians*; who in all matters of Faith did freely and fully consent to the Confession published by the Assembly, the things of Church-Government and Discipline onely excepted, as they say in the Preface to the Platform of Church-Discipline in New-England. And much to the same purpose is that of the *Congregational Churches* met at the Savoy, 1658. But yet for all this, they neither of them think themselves one with the other; and the *Independents*, for their separation, were notwithstanding accused of *Schism* by the other.

2. This Course is *unnecessary*, and so *unlawful*, because even in the way in which a Person is (whilst a Member of a *true Church* in the sense all along spoken of), he may attain to all due Improvement. The Author of *Prelatique Preachers none of Christs Teachers*, pag. 31. to encourage People rather to sit at home than hear the *Publick Ministers*, tells them, That they might otherwise help themselves, and that they had Means sufficient without it, as the *Scriptures, mutual Edification and Conference, Prayer, and Meditation, &c.* and that, though never so few or weak,

weak, Christ was amongst them. And if this would be sufficient when wholly destitute of a *Ministry*, I am apt to think it would do as well with one, though not altogether so well qualified as might be desired. I shall conclude this with what the same Author saith, pag. 28. *When God hath vouchsafed a sufficiency of Means, and those unquestionably lawful, though not of so rank flesh, or so highly promising as some others, for the attaining of any good and desirable End, a declining and forsaking of those Means (whether out of a diffidence of the sufficiency of them for the End desired, or upon any other reason whatsoever) to espouse others pretending to more strength and efficacy, hath been still displeasing unto God, and of sad consequence to those that have been no better advised than to make trial of them.*

But is it really thus, that there is any such difference betwixt the Abilities of their and our *Teachers*? and that the obtaining apparent Advantages to their *Salvation* in that respect, above what they could have had with us, is what they separate for? So they would have it thought, as you may see in the *Call to Archippus*, printed 1664. pag. 20, 21. *There is indeed a Ministry, and Preaching (such as it is); but whether such as is likely to answer the Ends of it, judge ye. Are those like to convert Souls, that have neither will nor skill to deal with them*
about

about their Conversion? So again, *When there is no better help than an idle, ignorant, loose-living Ministry, (under which, God knows, we speak it with grief of heart, too many, not to say the most of those that are of late come in, may be reckoned) or than the cold and heartless way that is generally in use, the Coal of Religion doth ever go out.* An high and daring Charge, which he will be concerned to make good, or to suffer under the imputation of a foul Defamer. *Have they neither will nor skill to convert Souls?* From whence then proceed those most excellent and laborious *Sermons* that the *Wiseft* of the Nation do so extol the present Generation for? Whence was it, that when we were bewildred with Phrases, and *Religion* made hard and unintelligible, and *Cases* intricate and perplexed, that the things of it were made easie, and to lie near to Mens Understandings; and that the part of *Casuiſtical Divinity* is not near so cumberſom as it was in the days of some Men? Are they *idle and ignorant*? From whence then is it that their Adverſaries of all ſorts are so well opposed, not to say confuted, that they are made to quit their ground, and to betake themselves to new Principles in their own defence; to fall from the *Infallibility of the Person*, to that of *Tradition*, as they do abroad; from old *Nonconformity*, to *Brownism*; and from *Presbyterianism* to *In-*

dependency, as some do at home? In what Age and Church have the great Truths and Principles of our *Religion* been more effectually considered, more diligently searched into, more clearly stated and explained, or more successfully defended, than in ours; and which I may challenge the whole Party of the *Separation* to shew any thing equal to? From whence comes all this to pass, if our Church did so abound with *uncatechised Upstarts, poor Shrubs, and empty and unaccomplished Predicants*, as Mr. Jenkin, with an *holy indignation*; doth in his *Exodus*, p. 55. complain? Surely if these Men had but duly weighed things, and had been conversant in the Writings of our Church, or looked amongst themselves, they would not have dared thus to reproch the most Learned and Industrious *Ministry* that perhaps *England* ever yet had. Let me recommend to such, what Mr. Baxter saith in the like case, in his *Explication of Passages in the Profession of the Worcestershire Association*, printed 1653. pag. 110. I desire those Brethren that object this, but to search their hearts and ways, and remember what may be said against themselves, and cast the beam first out of their own eye; at least to censure as humble men, that are sensible of their own miscarriages and imperfections. And if they did according to this advice, I am perswaded that they would think there were as good and useful

useful Men in the World as themselves. Do we not find some of themselves forced to acknowledge as much? Consult *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 86. *I really fear, lest meer Nonconformity hath brought some into reputation as consciencious, who by weak Preaching will lose the reputation of being judicious, more than their silence lost it.* And a little after, speaking of their own Ministers, he saith, *Verily the injudiciousness of too many among you, is for a lamentation: And, pag. 88. he adds, Through Gods mercy, some Conformists preach better than many of you can do.* Truly when I consider what a Stock of worthy and accomplished Persons in that Quality, whether for Sobriety and Learning, our Church is at present furnished with, (though it must be confessed, there are that are defective in both; as when were they not?) I look upon Men of this quarrelsome temper, to be such as are described in *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 91. *That having set themselves in a dividing way, secretly do rejoyce at the disparagement of Conformists, and draw as many from them as they can; and that therefore deserve the Character he there gives, That they are but destroyers of the Church of God: Such that to strengthen themselves, and carry on their own Interest, care not what they do or say; but how worthily, let the Author of the Antidote to Mr. Baxter's Cure judge, who*

faith, pag. 20. That to reproch a whole Party, for the miscarriages of some few, without taking notice how many faults are in those whom they would defend, is the usual artifice of such that think themselves concerned, upon any wretched terms whatsoever, to maintain an ill Cause, and have prostituted their Consciences to defend an Argument. I will leave such to consider what Mr. *Watson* saith, in his *Sermon of God's Anatomy upon the Heart*, pag. 167. which is so severe, that I care not to transcribe.

But to proceed: As little reason is there to separate from a Church for remissness of Discipline. This the Author of *Separation yet no Schism* saith that he seeth no sin in, pag. 67. for the Reason given before; and to which my above said Answer, and what I have also said pag. 66. will be sufficient. I shall onely add, That care is taken by our Church and Constitution (as I have already shewed) for the due Administration of Discipline: And if it be objected, That it fails in the exercise and application of it; I will answer with Mr. *Jenkin* here, pag. 33. Let them consider, whether the want of purging and reforming of Abuses, proceed not rather from some unhappy and political restrictions—in the exercise of Discipline, than from the allowance or neglect of the Church it self. If you would see more of their Opinion formerly as to this case, I refer you to

Mr.

Mr. *Brinsley*, in his *Arraignment of Schism*, pag. 32. to Mr. *Firmin*, in his *Separation examined*, pag. 28. the *Confutation of the Brownists*, published by Mr. *Rathband*, pag. 18. and Mr. *Vines on the Sacrament*, pag. 22.

6. We must not separate from a Church as long as Christ holds Communion with it. So Mr. *Jenkin* here, pag. 36. saith; *Separation from Churches from which Christ doth not separate, is Schismatical*. So Mr. *Vines on the Sacrament*, pag. 242. "If God afford his Communion with a Church by his own Ordinances, and his Grace and Spirit, we are not to separate. It would be unnatural and peevish in a Child to forsake his Mother, while his Father owns her for his Wife. Now whether Christ holds not Communion with our Church, I refer you to the several Marks given in this Sermon by Mr. *Jenkin*, p. 32. such as *the having the Gospel of Salvation preached in an ordinary way, &c.* which you may compare with what is said in the *Vindication of the Provincial Assembly*, pag. 141. And so much is expressly granted by T. P. or rather D. (as Mr. *Crofton* unriddles it) in his *Jerubbaal* (wrote in answer to Mr. *Crofton*, 1662.) pag. 18. "The Essentials constitutive of a True Church are, 1. The Head. 2. The Body. 3. The Union that is between them: Which three concurring in the
"Church

“ *Church of England*, *Christ* being the professed
 “ Head, She being *Christ’s* professed Body, and the
 “ *Catholick Faith* being the Union-bond whereby
 “ they are coupled together, She cannot in justice
 “ be denied a True (though, God knows, far from
 “ a pure) *Church*. So much is granted by the Au-
 thor of *Nonconformists no Schismatics*, pag. 13. who
 having started an Objection, viz. “ You own the
 “ *Church of England* to be a true *Church of Christ* ;
 “ and if so, *Christ* is in it, and with it ; and why
 “ will you leave that *Church* from which *Christ* is
 “ not withdrawn ? Replies after this sort : “ We
 “ acknowledge the *Church of England* to be a true
 “ *Church*, and that we are Members of the same
 “ visible *Church* with them ; but it’s one thing to
 “ leave a *Church*, and another thing to leave her
 “ external Communion. To leave a *Church*, is to
 “ disown it, and cease to be a Member of it or with
 “ it, by ceasing to have those Requisites that con-
 “ stitute a Member of it, as Faith and Obedience.
 I will not quarrel at this time with the distinction ;
 but I do not understand what service it can be of
 to them, when after all the accuracy of it, such that
 have nothing more to say, will notwithstanding that
 be *Schismatics*, if his own Definition of *Schism*
 hold true ; for, pag. 12. he saith, That *Schism* is a
causeless separation of one part of the Church from
another

another in external Communion. Now if the *Church of England* is so a *Church*, that *Christ* holds *Communion* with it; and they *Members* of that *Church*, as he acknowledgeth: then they that leave her external *Communion* are guilty of *Schism*: and then it's no matter whether there be any difference betwixt leaving a *Church*, and leaving her external *Communion*, when the least of them makes those that are guilty of it to be *Schismaticks*.

To sum up now what hath been said: Though there be *Errors* in a *Church* (if not *fundamental*); though there be *corruption of Manners*, *mixture in Communion*; though there be not a *perfect Constitution and Order*, and other *Churches* may be thought *better*: yet if it hath the *Scripture-Characters* of a *true Church* upon it, and *Christ* holds *Communion* with it, it is not to be *separated from*, and *Separation* from it is *Schismatical*. So that as far as the *Negative* part holds, we are secure.

2. For what *Reasons* may a *Church* be separated from, and *Persons* be justified in it?

Dr. Manton on *Jude*, pag. 496. saith, *The onely lawful grounds of Separation* are three; viz. *Intolerable Persecution*, *Damnable Heresie*, and *gross Idolatry*. To which *Mr. Jenkin* doth here, pag. 23. add *unjust Excommunication*; and *a necessary Communion with a Church in its Sins*. All which I shall now consider,

consider, and enquire, whether they are Causes existent at the present amongst us, and what they of the *Separation* have reason to plead.

1. *Damnable Heresie*. This I have before sufficiently acquitted our *Church* of, and therefore conceive that I may without more ado proceed.

2. *Gross Idolatry*. I find those that deny the lawfulness of hearing the established *Ministers*, are most forward to charge this upon us. With this the confident Author of *Prelatique Preachers none of Christs Teachers*, that he might possess the unwary Reader betimes, thought safest to begin his Book, viz. "The Idolatrous madness of the Common-Prayer-Book-Worship, hath of late been made so manifest to all the Household of Faith in this Nation,—— As if it was a thing so certain, plain, and notorious, that he must not be one of the Household of Faith that doth not discern it, and abhor the *Church* for it. With the like boldness are we assaulted by the Author of *A Christian and sober Testimony against sinful Compliance, or the unlawfulness of hearing the present Ministers of the Church of England*, pag. 55. printed 1664. An Author of great forwardness, but of intolerable ignorance or malice, that tells you, pag. 44. "That our Church doth own, that Men ought to be made Ministers onely by Lord Bishops; (And then

then what a breach is made upon our *Church* by the *Bishop* of *Soder* in the *Isle of Man*, that takes upon him to Ordain without that Title?) “That the Office of Suffragans, Deans, Canons, Petty-Canons, Prebendaries, Choristers, Organists, Commisaries, Officials, &c. is not onely accounted by us lawful, but necessary to be had in the *Church*: And, pag. 45. That Women may administer Baptism. And, pag. 94. reveals a further Secret, That the Reformed Churches generally renounce the Ministry of the *Church of England*, not admitting any by vertue of it to the Charge of Souls. Now do you not think that such as these are able Champions, and fit to enter the Lists of Controversie, that take up things by hear-say? By this you may guess to what Tribe they belong; and you may learn it from Mr. Baxter, in his *Cure*, pag. 193. “It is an ordinary sound, to hear an ignorant, rash, self-conceited Person, especially a Preacher, to cry out *Idolatry, Idolatry*, against his Brothers Prayers to God. But what occasion hath our *Church* given for this Out-cry? Is it for the Matter, or the Form of its Prayers? Not the Matter: for Mr. D. in his *Jerubbaal*, pag. 35. doth thus say of it, *Most of the Matter I grant to be Divine*. And Mr. Crofton, in his *Reformation no Separation*, pag. 25. speaks more universally; “I confess their *Common-Prayer* is my Burden;—yet

“I must confess, I find in it no Matter to which
 “(on a charitable Interpretation) a sober, serious
 “*Christian* may not say, nay can deny his *Amen*.
 Not for the *Form*: for then it must be either be-
 cause every *Form* is *Idolatrous*, or that *this Form* is
 especially *so*, or because it is *prescribed and imposed*.
 The first of these is affirmed by the angry Author
 of *The Antidote to Mr. Baxter’s Cure*, pag. 11. who
 saith, “We do not think any thing to be *Idolatry*,
 “because it hath something in it to be amended ;
 “but because it is used in the Worship of God,
 “without any Command from God to make it law-
 “ful: and this we must tell our *Dictator*, is a *spe-*
 “*cies* of *Idolatry*, and forbidden in the *Second Com-*
 “*mandment*. But this Author hath warily declined
 the main Argument which Mr. *Baxter* insisted upon
 three Pages before, and falls upon the Rere, and
 picked up an accidental Expression: for you will
 find him, pag. 190. of his *Cure*, to reason after this
 manner; “Where did these Men learn to call their
 “Brethrens Worship *false*, any more than their
 “own, upon the account that God hath not com-
 “manded the *manner* of it; when he hath neither
 “commanded us to use a *Form*, or to forbear it?
 Now I believe it would be as hard for him to find
 a Command for the perpetual use of a *Conceived*
Payer, as he thinks it will be to find one for a *Form*;

and

and then they that pray without a Form, are as much guilty of *Idolatry*, as those that use it : Nay, if the Divine Authority hath left it free, these are the *Superstitious*, that would make that a Duty commanded, and that a Sin forbidden, which is not ; as Mr. Baxter there saith, pag. 282. But if you would see more of this, I shall refer you to the *Confutation of the Brownists*, pag. 12, 13.

It is not *Idolatrous*, as this Form is especially so. This indeed some have ventured to say, as supposing the *Liturgie* to be taken out of the *Mass-Book*. So saith the Author of the *Anatomy of the Service-Book* : And therefore Mr. Robert Baily wrote a Book called *A Parallel of the Liturgie with the Mass-Book*, reprinted 1661. But it shall suffice to say to this, what Mr. Ball, in the Name of the *Nonconformists*, replied, in the *Letters* betwixt the *Ministers of Old and New England*, pag. 14, 15. “ The *Liturgie* was “ not taken out of the *Mass-Book*, in such sense as “ you object ; but rather the *Mass*, and other *Ido-* “ *latrons Prayers*, were added to it : for *Popery* is a “ Scab or Leprosie cleaving to the *Church*. — It is “ no hard Task to shew, that our *Service-Book* was “ reformed in most things, according to the purest “ *Liturgies* which were in use in the *Church* long “ before the *Mass* was heard of in the World. And “ if that could not be shewed, yet forms of Speech “ generally

“ generally taken (we speak not of this or that special Word or Phrase), is no more defiled by *Idolatry*, than the light Air, or Place where *Idolatry* is committed. It is not unlawful to pray, *Lord help*, or *Lord have mercy*; or to give Thanks, *Praised be God*; because the *Papists* say, *Lady help*, or *Praised be God and the Virgin Mary*.

Lastly, It is not *Idolatrous* as it is a *Form imposed*. So much indeed is said in the *Christian and sober Testimony*, pag. 68. *To pray by an imposed Form, is Idolatry*; and therefore doth not spare to say, pag. 70. That *Latimer, Ridley, and Hooper, and many other Martyrs, were Idolaters*: and yet in the mean time grants, That *they were such eminent Witnesses of Christ, that they shall come with him, and sit upon Thrones*. But I cannot understand how *Imposition* can alter the Nature of Things, and make that unlawful which was otherwise in it self lawful; and I see it is as little understood by the better part among themselves. So the *Nonconformists Confutation of the Brownists*, pag. 15. “ If Forms thus
 “ devised by Men be found to be lawful and profitable, what sin can it be for the Governors of
 “ the Church to command that such Forms be used;
 “ or for us, that are perswaded of the lawfulness of
 “ them, to use them, being imposed? unless they
 “ will say, That therefore it is unlawful to hear the
 “ Word,

“ Word, receive the Sacraments, &c. because we
 “ are commanded by the Magistrates so to do.
 “ Whereas indeed we ought the rather to do good
 “ things, that are agreeable unto the Word, when
 “ we know them also to be commanded by the
 “ *Christian Magistrate*. So Mr. *Baxter*, in his *Cure*,
 pag. 186. “ If you command your Child to learn a
 “ Catechism, or Form of Prayer, will you teach him
 “ to say, *Father, or Mother, it had been lawful for*
 “ *me to use this Form, if neither you nor any body had*
 “ *bid me; but because you bid me, it is unlawful*. O,
 “ whither will not partiality lead men! And it will
 be worth your while, to see how Mr. *Brinsley*, in
 his *Church-Remedy*, argues against it, where he con-
 cludes, That *amongst all the monstrous and mis-shapen*
Conceptions which these brooding Times have hatched
and brought forth, I do not know any more prodigious
than this, viz. That things indifferent in themselves,
are made unlawful by being commanded. And then
 much less are they thereby made Idolatrous. If our
Liturgie then is good for the *Matter*, and that the
Matter is not altered by the *Form*; then you may
 see where the Storm will fall, and what they are
 to be thought of that are guilty of these Reproches,
 and how much they distrust the goodness of their
 Cause, that betake themselves to such Arts as these
 to support it.

3. A *Church* may be separated from upon *intolerable Persecution*. Where I should consider, whether it be *Persecution*, before I proceed to enquire whether it be *intolerable*. But because I have no mind to aggravate the Case, by shewing what hath been by them formerly thought *Persecution*, and what not, I shall omit that part of it, and enter upon the other, *viz.* the *intolerableness* of what is suffered, as a Reason for which they suppose themselves compelled to quit Communion. And it must arise to *this degree*, or else it will not justify a *Separation*: *Persecution* alone will not warrant it, unless it comes to be *insufferable*. Now this must be either on the part of the *Ministers*, or on the *People*. Not on the *Ministers*: for all the difference betwixt them and the *People* is, that they are required to lay down the present Exercise of their *Ministry*, till they are satisfied in the submission they must give to the Rules and Orders of the *Church*: But this is no *Persecution*, much less what is *intolerable*. No *Persecution*: for it is a Security required in all *Churches* of the World, that those who are intrusted with that Office, should observe the Order and Discipline that is amongst them. So it was in the *Church of Scotland* whilst *Presbyterian*, where it was resolved, “ That whosoever hath born Office
 “ in the Ministry of the *Kirk*, or that presently
 “ bears,

"bears, or shall hereafter bear Office herein, shall
 "be charged by every particular *Presbytery* where
 "their Residence is, to subscribe the Heads of Di-
 "scipline of the *Kirk*, betwixt this and the next
 "Synodal *Assemblies* of the *Provinces*, under the
 "pain of *Excommunication*; as you may see in the
Doctrin and Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, print-
 ed 1641. pag. 12. And as they there declared the
 Office of a *Bishop* to be unlawful in it self, pag. 19.
 so I find, that the *General Assembly* did require, that
 besides this Subscription to the Book of *Discipline*,
 some Persons (I suppose suspected of affection that
 way) should subscribe a particular Declaration of
 the unlawfulness of *Episcopacy*, as was the Case of
 Mr. *Maxwell* and Mr. *Hay*, in the *Principal Acts of*
the General Assembly, 1644. And thus it was amongst
 us, when all Persons to be Ordained, were to bring
 a Testimonial of their having taken the *Covenant*,
 as you may find it in the *Form of Church-Govern-*
ment, pag. 20. and in all Places required to take it,
 and to read the *Directory* the next *Lords-day* after
 the receipt of it, by an Ordinance, Aug. 23. 1645.
 So that taking Security by Profession and Subscrip-
 tion, that the Order of the *Church* shall be obser-
 ved by Persons intrusted in the Ministrations of it,
 and Suspension in case of refusal, is no *Persecution*.
 But supposing that so it was, yet it is not *intolera-*
ble.

ble. I do grant, that it must needs be a great trouble to a good Man, that he cannot do *God* and the *Church* that Service which he hath devoted himself unto, by reason of some Limitations put upon him; but yet I think, that this is not sufficient to carry him off from Communion with a *Church*, and to set up another, because he is denied this Liberty: for he is still capable of being a private Member of it, and therefore he ought to continue in the latter Capacity, when suspended from the former. So saith Mr. Crofton, in his *Reformation not Separation, Epist. to the Reader: I cannot be perswaded, that I am disbanded from Christs Army, so soon as I am superseded to my Conduct; I must march under his Banner, when I may not be permitted to march at the Head of a Company.* So again, pag. 98. *I conceive, Administration of God's Worship is much different from Attendance on God's Worship; and I stand bound to the last, when I am (justly or unjustly) barred from the first.* And this was the Opinion of the old Nonconformists. But now we find it otherwise; and sometimes these plead the obligation of their Ordination, sometimes the Relation which they have to a peculiar People, and sometimes the necessity of multitudes of Souls. The first we find insisted upon by the Author of *Separation yet no Schism, Epist. to the Reader: If it be asked, May not Supreme Magistrates,*

*strates, within their Dominion, suspend some Ministers from the Exercise of their Office, when they conceive it is for the peace of the rest? It will be answered, That the Lord of Lords, who giveth the Office and the Commission, — hath certainly with the Office designed them to the Exercise thereof, and hath therein placed, not onely the Office, but the Exercise thereof, above the restraint of any Powers whatsoever, so long as the Exercise thereof continues to be regulated by the Laws of Christ. And in this case, nothing is more ordinarily produced than that of the Apostle, *Wo is me, &c.* But is not this to advance every one beyond the cognisance of Superiors, and to fall in with the Church of Rome, whilst they decry it? If indeed theirs was the Apostle's case, the Apostle's resolution of obeying God rather than Man, would become them: But how little it is so, let the old Nonconformists shew, in their Confutation of the Brownists, pag. 41. How unskillfully that speech of the Apostles is alledged, will appear to them that will consider these three differences between their Case and ours. 1. They that inhibited the Apostles, were professed Enemies to the Gospel. 2. The Apostles were charged not to teach in the Name of Christ, nor to publish any part of the Doctrine of the Gospel. 3. The Apostles received not their Calling and Authority from men, nor by the hands of men, but*

P

immediately

immediately from God himself ; and therefore might not be restrained or deposed by men : whereas we, though we exercise a Function whereof God is the Author, and we are also called of God to it, yet we are called and ordained by the ministry of men, and may therefore by men be deposed, and restrained from the exercise of it. I shall conclude this with what Mr. Crofton saith, in his Reformation not Separation, pag. 70. If the Being of Christianity depended upon my Personal Ministry, as the being or appearing a Christian doth on my Communion with the Church visible, the Inference might be of some force : But till that be proved, I think it is of little.

But is this really the case? Then what becomes of those that among themselves have taken up wholly with other Professions, and yet were never charged by their Brethren, for so doing, (as Mr. Baxter is by the Author of the *Antidote*, pag. 15.) *with having left the Lord's Work?* Now I question not, but the same Reason that did induce some to take up with other Employments to the neglect of this, and so satisfy the rest, that they acquiesce in it, will also be sufficient to shew, That meer *Ordination* cannot bind to the Exercise of that Office, when the Magistrate and Church forbids ; and consequently, that a *Restraint* is no *intolerable Persecution*.

But the relation that they have to a peculiar People makes

makes this Inhibition *intolerable*. This is indeed pleaded in *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 11. & 45. "I undertake to prove, that Pastors and People are "the constitutive Essentials of a true Church; that "Dr. Seaman, Mr. Calamy, Dr. Manton, &c. with "the People subject to them as Pastors, were true "Churches: Prove you, if you can, that on August "24. 1662. they were degraded, or these true "Churches dissolved. But before he puts others to prove the contrary, he ought to have made good his own Proposition, by proving, *That the Relation betwixt particular Pastors and People is not to be dissolved*. For what though Pastors and People are the Constitutive Essentials of a true Church? what though Dr. Seaman, Mr. Calamy, &c. and the People with them, were true Churches? Can neither Dr. Seaman, &c. remove, or be removed from a People, but all this mischief follows, that Ministers are presently degraded, and Churches dissolved? Could not Mr. Calamy remove from *St. Edmondsbury* to *Rockford*, and from *Rockford* to *Aldermanbury*, as he himself doth declare in his *Apologie*? Could not Mr. Jenkin remove from *Black-Fryers* to *Christ-church*, without all this disorder? What wreck was here made in Churches, if this Relation was indissoluble? But if a Pastor may thus remove himself from one Church, upon invitation to ano-

ther, (as it seems he may) it shews, that the Relation is not so strict as is pretended; and that, consequently, Superiors in Church and State may so far dissolve that Relation, as well as the Pastor himself. But however, what relief will this afford to those that leave those Places where they had any pretence of such a Relation, and busie themselves where they had none? What relief will this be to those that contract a new Relation, and that do gather Churches out of Churches? Surely Dr. *Seaman's*, Dr. *Jacomb's*, and Mr. *Jenkin's* Flocks now, are taken from other Places than *Alhallows Breadstreet*, *Martins Ludgate*, &c.

Lastly, The *necessity of the People* is what doth make their Preaching necessary (as they would have it understood. So *Sacrilegious Desertion*, pag. 59.), and so their Suspension *intolerable Persecution*. But supposing this, (as doubtless there is and ever was Work sufficient for a greater number of skilful and faithful Labourers); yet is there no way to be useful, but by facing a numerous Congregation, and preaching at such Times, and in such Places, as do declare a defiance to the Church, which they thereby make a manifest rupture in, and open separation from? Is there no good to be done by preaching to Five, besides a Mans own Family, and by Personal Conference and Instruction? How came then

then our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* oftentimes to be-
take themselves to this way, as an Author of their
own, in his *Archippus*, doth inform us, pag. 21 ?
But if it be of great advantage, and that it is no
little part of a Ministers Duty, personally to Instruct,
and Preach from House to House, as that Author
saith, how comes it to be so *sadly neglected* by them,
as he there complains? and how comes the Apo-
stles *Wo* to be pleaded for the one, and not to bind
the other? Hear what the Author of *Sacrilegious*
Desertion saith, pag. 93. “Is it not too much Hy-
“pocrisie to cry out against them that forbid us
“Preaching, and in the mean time to neglect that
“which none forbids us, *viz. Christian Conference.*
Certainly, as he saith, pag. 94. *Sincerity inclineth*
men to that way of Duty that hath least Ostentation.”

But if the state of the People be indeed the rea-
son, why do we not find them where there is most
need of their Assistance? Are we not told, in *Sa-*
crilegious Desertion, pag. 10. *That the Nonconformists*
have found, that some Places of many Years past have
had no Ministers at all? Are there no Places in *Eng-*
land and *Wales*, that do much more abound in Ig-
norance, than *London*, and the adjacent Parts? and
are the *Nonconformists* there to be met with? No,
that Work is left to one (good Soul) that having
not a Liberty by the Law to exercise his Office in
the

the more Publick way, doth with unwearied diligence pursue the Ends of it, in travelling over steep Mountains and craggy Rocks, and conversing with the rude and untaught Natives, whilst others do more consult their Ease and Profit.

You see then, upon the whole, that their Suspension is not *intolerable Persecution*, or what will be sufficient to justify their *Separation*; but that still, notwithstanding their Pleas, they are upon the same terms with the People; and what will not justify the Separation of the People, will not justify that of the Minister; and what is sufficient to retain the People in Communion, is sufficient to retain the Minister.

And so we are left to consider the State of the People, and whether there be on their part *intolerable Persecution*. Not to dispute whether what is suffered be *Persecution*, or not; I shall onely consider, whether it be what is sufficient to warrant their *Separation*: And that will appear, if we observe, That their Suffering must be either because they do not at all Communicate with the Church, or that there are some particular things onely which they do not Communicate with us in. If it be for the former, then they did separate before their suffering, and consequently their Suffering can be no reason for their Separation. If it be onely as to particular

ticular things, then, I say, it will be hard to shew, that any Person doth suffer *intolerably* upon that score; the Church proceeding in so great tenderness, where Persons have shewed their readiness to hold Communion with her in what they can, and have so far given satisfaction of their Piety, Peaceableness, and Compliance, that in the Cases where the Laws have been thought severe, they have rarely been executed upon such in their severity. Which I conceive is a sufficient Reply to those that cry out, *Persecution*, and *intolerable*, because of the great Penalties that Offenders in such kind are liable unto. For, the meer supposal and expectation of severity, is no good Reason for Separation, as long as it is not, nor is likely to be actually inflicted. For, as Mr. Bradshaw the *Nonconformist*, in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, printed 1640. pag. 107. doth say, *Though Humane Laws, under never so great Punishments, should bind us to never so great Corruptions in Gods Service; yet so long as we do not actually communicate in those Corruptions, our Communicating is never the worse for the said Laws*: So I say, Though Laws threaten never so great Punishments, yet so long as we do not actually suffer them, our Condition is not the worse for these Laws. And this was thought a good Argument by Mr. Baily, in his *Historical Vindication of the Church of Scotland*, 1646.

pag. 20. who, when charged, That the King and his Family are subject to the *Classical Assembly*, answers, *That any Presbyterian did ever so much as begin a Process with any Prince, when they had the greatest Provocations thereto, it cannot be shewed to this day. The Church of Scotland, notwithstanding all the cross Actions of King James, or King Charles,—yet never did so much as bethink themselves of drawing against them the Sword of Church-Censures.* Where he denies not the Charge of their Churches claiming such a Power ; but thinks it enough to reply, That she had never so used it. So then you see, that it is not the Power that our Superiors have, nor the Penalties that a Law threatens, that will serve in this case ; as long as the Use of that Power, and Execution of those Laws is suspended : and a Person ought not any more to quit the Church, than he will his Country, as long as he may be suffered to abide in it. And that he may do with us, that will hold Communion with our Church in what he can, and doth behave himself with modesty in those things which for the present he cannot Communicate in.

4. *Unjust Excommunication* is another Reason given to make *Separation* warrantable. But that being a *spiritual Persecution* (as *Camero* calls it) doth not really differ from the former, and therefore will receive the same Answer.

5. That

5. That which will warrant a *Separation* from a *Church*, is a *necessary Communion* with it in its *Sins*. Towards the resolution of which, I shall observe,

1. *That bare Communion with a Church, doth not necessarily make a Person to communicate with the Sins of it.* This is granted by all that say, We must not separate from a Church, because of the *ungodly* that are in its *Communion*, or because of some *mixtures* that are in its *Worship*: And if we must not separate from them, it is certain we may continue there, without being guilty of the *Sin* of them. How far the first of these is and ought to be acknowledged, I have shewed above, at pag. 62. And how far the latter, you may see in Mr. *Brinsley's Arraignment of Schism*, pag. 50. *Though toleration of some unwarrantable mixtures in a Church, be an evil; yet it is not so great an evil, as Separation upon that ground.* This was the *Opinion* of the *Five dissenting Brethren*, in their *Apologetical Narration*, pag. 6. *We have always professed, and that in those times when the Churches of England were the most either actually over-spread with defilements, or in the greatest danger thereof,— That we both did and would hold a Communion with them, as the Churches of Christ.* And this they agreed to, upon this consideration, that otherwise there hath been no Church yet, nor will be to the day of Judgment, which Persons
 Q otherwise

otherwise perswaded, could or can hold Communion with ; as you may find it in the *old Nonconformists Letters* to those of *New-England*, pag. 12. *Mr. Firmin's Separation examined*, pag. 25. and the *Vindication of the Provincial Assembly*, pag. 135.

2. I add, *That the imposition of things unlawful, or so thought to be, in a Church, makes a Person in this case no farther concerned, than as they are imposed on him.* For, if Corruptions tolerated are no bar to Communion, then they are not when imposed ; meer *Imposition not altering the Nature*, as *Mr. Crofton* saith, in his *Jerubbaal*, pag. 27.

3. *Imposition in some things unlawful, or supposed so to be, will not justify a separation from what is lawful.* The Author of *Separation yet no Schism*, in his *Epistle to the Reader*, thus pleads for the People :
 “ The People are not always free from such Imposi-
 “ tions which they extremely suspect as sinful ; as
 “ that they cannot enjoy *Baptism* for their Chil-
 “ dren without the *Cross*, nor receive the *Lords*
 “ *Supper* without *Kneeling* ; to name no more, (as
 well he could not). But suppose that these things
 are imposed , and what they extremely suspect ;
 can this be a Reason for their separation in those
 things where nothing of this nature is ? Certainly,
 in obedience to Magistrates, and for Communion
 with a Church, we ought to go as far as we can ;
 and

and what I cannot do, is no excuse for the omission of what I can. Thus did the *old Nonconformists* think and practice, as I observed to you before, from the *Vindication of the Provincial Assembly*, pag. 135. *That though some of them thought it unlawful to receive the Sacrament kneeling, yet they held Communion with the Church in the rest.* And accordingly Mr. *Firmin* argues, in his *Separation examined*, pag. 29. *Suppose there should be some Humane mixtures, are all the Ordinances polluted? Why do you not communicate with them in those Ordinances which are pure?*

Now if this be true, what shall we say to them that have nothing to object against the greatest part of what they are required to communicate with us in; and yet keep up a total and positive Separation from us, as if all Parts were alike infected, and that from the Crown of the Head, to the Sole of the Foot, there was nothing but Wounds and putrifying Sores?

4. *The meer suspicion that a Person may have of the unlawfulness of what is imposed, will not justify his omission of, or separation in that particular.* For, he ought to come to some resolution in it, and in case of Obedience, Communion, and Charity, to go against such his Suspicion. To this purpose speaks Mr. *Geree*, in his *Resolution of Ten Cases*, 1644.

“ Things wherein doubts arise, are of a double na-
 “ ture : 1. Meerly arbitrary , and at my own di-
 “ sposal : 2. That are under command ; as coming
 “ to the Sacrament, Obedience to the Higher Pow-
 “ ers in things lawful. If Scruples arise about these,
 “ and a Man doubts he sins if he acts, and he also
 “ doubts he sins if he forbears, &c. In this case he
 “ must weigh the Scales, and where he apprehends
 “ most weight of Reason, must incline that way,
 “ though the other Scale be not altogether empty.
 “ And this done, after humble and diligent search,
 “ with bewailing our infirmity, that we are no more
 “ discerning, will be accepted by God : God puts
 “ not his People on necessity of sinning, nor can our
 “ Scruples dispense with his Commands. So Mr. *Fal-
 do*, in his *Quakerism no Christianity*, pag. 93. “ In
 “ doubtful and difficult Cases, wherein we cannot
 “ reach the knowledge of our Duty, it’s our Duty
 “ to follow the Examples of the greatest number
 “ of the Saints, &c. And then surely, what will
 “ serve in such a case to let us dispense with our
 “ Doubts, will much more in Obedience to Govern-
 “ ours, and for Communion with a Church. This I
 “ thought to have more largely handled, as it’s
 “ thought a new and late Argument, used by Bishop
 “ *Anderson*, &c. (but what I can prove to be of old
 “ the common Resolution of the Case), and as the
 “ contrary

contrary is pleaded for from Mr. *Hales*: But lighting happily upon a Book called *Mr. Hales's Treatise of Schism examined*, wrote by a Learned Person, I shall refer you to it, where he particularly undertakes this Point, pag. 110, &c.

Having thus made good the Three Propositions abovesaid, and shewed, *That the Church of England is a True Church; That there is a Separation from it; and, That this Separation is voluntary and unnecessary*: that which remains is not to be denied, *viz. That therefore the present Separation is Schismatical*. So that now you may see in what condition those of our dissenting Brethren are, that withdraw from the Communion of our Church; and how little able they will be to reconcile their present Proceedings, to their former Principles and Professions. It was once said by them, in the *Vindication of the Presbyterial Government*, pag. 133. *We dare not make separation from a true Church, by departing from it, as you do, [speaking to the Independents.]* Then *Independency* was what they proved to be *Schism*, because, 1. *Independents do depart from our Churches, being true Churches, and so acknowledged by themselves.* 2. *They draw and seduce Members from our Congregations.* 3. *They erect separate Congregations.* 4. *They refuse Communion with our Churches in the Sacraments.* Now we judge, that no *Schism* is to be tolerated

ted in the Church ; as say the *London-Ministers*, in their *Letter to the Assembly*, pag. 3. Then the inevitable Consequences of it could be discovered and represented, as that by it *Peoples minds would be troubled, and in danger to be subverted ; bitter heart-burning would be fomented and perpetuated ; godly, painful, and orthodox Ministers be discouraged, and despised ; the life and power of Godliness be eaten out, by frivolous Disputes ; and the whole Course of Religion in private Families be interrupted, and undermined ;* as they there say, pag. 4. Then *Church-Division was as great a Sin as Adultery and Theft*, as *Dr. Bryan* maintains, in the *Publick Disputation at Kilingworth*, 1655. pag. 28. Then it was pleaded, That they *Covenanted not onely against Sin, but Schism*, as saith *Mr. Watson*, in his *Anatomy upon the Heart*, pag. 160. But is not that now true, which he there charges upon themselves, *We have gone against the Letter of it ?* For, do not many of them that have said all this, *set up Churches against Churches, exercise the Worship of God, administer Ordinances, the Word, Sacraments, apart, and in a separated Body ? Which in a peculiar manner, and by way of eminency, is called Schism*, saith *Mr. Brinsley*, pag. 16. Is *Schism* all on a sudden grown so innocent a thing, that Persons are to be indulged, and tamely permitted to continue in it ? And is it not as *sad* now, as it was then,

then, that *many that pretend to Religion, make no Conscience of Schism*, as *Dr. Manton on Jude*, pag. 492. doth observe? Certainly, That still remains good which was said by *Mr. Brinsley*, pag. 17. *The Schisms and Divisions which are broken in, and that amongst God's own People, are what I cannot but look upon as one of the blackest Clouds, one of the saddest Judgments which hang over the head of this Kingdom at this day; of sad influence for the present, and, unless they be healed, of dangerous consequence for the future.* Have we not *Atheism*, and *Infidelity*, and *Profaneness* enough to encounter; but must we have more Work found us, by those that have given us Arguments to oppose themselves with? Are we in no danger of being over-run with a Foreign Power, and that *the Romans shall come and take away our Name and Church*; when we, which are at difference amongst our selves, shall without any opposition be swallowed up by them? Are they yet to be taught, that as nothing can, so nothing will sooner make us a prey to them, than mutual Hostilities amongst our selves? And whence is it, that they will run the adventure, and care not what they expose us to? Is it that *Rome* is nearer to them, than they are to us? That will not be supposed. Is it that they expect better Quarter from that, than they meet with from our Church? That let Experience decide. Is

it that by bringing all to confusion, and a common scramble, they may hope to go away with the Supremacy? That their Divisions amongst themselves doth confute. For, can they think, because they agree against us, that they will agree amongst themselves? Or, can they think, if they do not, that one alone can carry the Victory from the Common Enemy? Let a sober Author of their own, in his *Discourse of the Religion of England*, be heard, who saith, pag. 39. *That the common safety and advancement of true Religion cannot stand by a multiplicity of petty Forms; but requires an ample and well-settled State, to defend and propagate it against the amplitude and potency of the Romish Interest.* And are not these the thoughts of the wisest in this Nation? and shall Men yet continue to keep up Feuds and Animosities, and make no scruple of contradicting themselves to feed them? It was once said by Mr. *Brinsley*, pag. 62. *That it's a foul blemish to a Minister of Christ, to speak one thing to day, and another thing to morrow, to say and unsay.* And I will appeal to all the World, whether this be not what our Brethren are guilty of. Surely, if they would but take the pains to review what they have written, and weigh those Arguments against *Schism* and *Separation* that they formerly published, they would return to themselves, and to that *Church* which they have so unadvisedly

advisedly broken off from ; they would then think it their Duty, with the *old Nonconformists*, to come as far as they can, and their Happiness to live in the Communion of that *Church* where they may be as good as they will ; they would then see, that *Schism* is a great Sin, and that their *present Separation* is *Schism*.

I should now conclude, but that I may fear that Mr. *Jenkin* will proclaim ; and others think me a Slanderer, for saying, *pag. 44.* That he hath borrowed the Substance of this *Sermon* from Mr. *Brinsley's Arraignment of Schism*, if I do not make it good : and therefore in my own vindication, and also to shew you how far *holiness and indignation* may be pretended, when indeed it is little better than *hypocrisie and calumny* that prompts Men on, I shall draw the Comparison, and leave you and all others to judge, whether he be not one of those *empty and unaccomplished Predicants* spoken of in his *Exodus*, *pag. 56.* that *preach the Sermons of others*, and, more than that, dare before all the World publish them as his own : the like to which is also done by him, or one of his Brethren, in the *Vindication of the Presbyterian Government*, *pag. 132.* compared with Mr. *Brinsley*, *pag. 16.* and *pag. 134.* with 52. and *pag. 135.* with 41. Nor hath he borrowed from Mr. *Brinsley* alone, but hath rifled divers other Au-
R
thors

thors for the greatest part of his Book, as might easily be proved, were it either requisite, or worth the while. How far he is beholden to others for that kind of Wit and tawdry Eloquence that a gross and bribed Flatterer, in his *Patronus bonæ Fidei*, gives him the Title of *Seneca* for, the Author of *the Vindication of the Conforming Clergie* hath already shewed: And how bold he hath made with others for Argument and Reason, the following Instances will be a sufficient *Specimen*, where he hath scarcely left any thing untouched that he then thought might serve his purpose.

A Sermon preached by W. Jenkin, herewith Printed, and also to be found in his Comment on Jude, printed in Quarto, 1652.

The Arraignment of the present Schism, by *John Brinsley*. LONDON, 1646.

THeir Heresies were perverse and damnable Opinions; their Schism was a perverse Separation from Church-communion: The former was in Doctrinals, the latter in Practicals; the former was opposite to Faith, this latter to Charity. By Faith all the Members are united to the Head, by Charity one to another: and as the breaking of the former is Heresie, so their breaking of the latter was Schism. pag. 21.

Schism is usually said to be twofold, negative, and positive. 1. Negative is, when there is onely *simplex secessio*, when there is onely a bare secession, a peaceable and quiet withdrawing from Communion with a Church, without making any head against that Church from which the departure is. 2. Positive is, when persons so withdrawing do so consociate and draw themselves into a distinct and opposite Body, setting up a Church against a Church, or, as Divines express it, from

Heresie (*saieth Jerome*) is properly a perverse Opinion, Schism is a perverse Separation. *The one a Doctrinal, the other a practical Error. The one opposite to Faith, the other to Charity.* - *By the one (Faith) all the Members are united to the Head; by the other (Charity) they are united to one another. Now the breaking of the first of these Bands is Heresie, the latter Schism.* pag. 14.

There is, to use his terms (Cameron), a negative and a positive Separation. The former is simplex secessio, when one or more do quietly and peaceably withdraw themselves from Communion with a Church, — not making head against that Church from which they are departed: The other, when persons so withdrawing do consociate and draw themselves into a distinct and opposite Body, setting up a Church against a Church. — This is that which Augustine, and other Divines after him, call the setting

Mr. Jenkin.

from *Augustine*, an Altar against an Altar. And this is it which in a peculiar manner, and by way of eminency, is called by the name of Schifin. pag.22.

Schifin becomes sinful, either in respect, 1. of the groundfness; or, 2. the manner thereof. 1. The groundfness; when there is no casting of persons out of the Church by an unjust Censure of Excommunication, no departure by unsufferable Persecution, no Heresie nor Idolatry in the Church maintained. 2. The manner of Separation makes it unlawful; when tis made without due endeavour, and waiting for Reformation of the Church from which the departure is: and such a rash departure is against Charity, which suffers both much and long all tolerable things: It is not presently distasted, when the justest occasion is given; it first useth all possible means of remedy. The Chyrurgeon reserves Dismembring as the last remedy. It looks upon a sudden breaking off from Communion with a Church (which is a dismembering) not as Chyrurgery, but Butchery. pag.23.

I shall not spend time to compare it with Heresie, though some have

Mr. Brinsley.

ting up of an Altar against an Altar. And this is it (saith that judicious Author) which in a peculiar manner, and by way of eminency, is called by the name of Schifm. pag.16.

Unwarrantable, either for ground, or manner; The former an unjust, the latter a rash Separation; each a Schifm. Unjust, when there is no Persecution, no Spreading Error or Heresie, no Idolatry. 2. The manner, which if sudden and heady, without due endeavour and expectance of Reformation in that Church, it may be a rash, and consequently an unwarrantable Separation, inasmuch as it is opposite to Charity, —it being the nature of Charity to suffer much and long, —all things which are sufferable: —It is not presently distasted, so as to fly off upon every small and trivial occasion; no nor yet upon a just and weighty one, without first assaying all possible means of remedy. So deals the wary and careful Chyrurgeon with his Patient; not presently fall to dismembering, —reserving it for the last remedy. So deals Charity by the Church; not presently separate and break off Communion (which is the dismembering of a Church.) No, this (saith Camero) is not Chyrurgia, but Carnificina; which Mr. Cotton — englisheth rightly, not Chyrurgery, but Butchery. pag.24,25.

Musculus informs me of some who in point of sinfulness have compared Schifm

Mr Fenkin.

have said that Schism is the greater sin of the two. *Aug. contr. Don. l. 2. c. 6.* tells the *Donatists*, that Schism was a greater sin than that of the *Traditores*, who in time of Persecution, through fear, delivered their Bibles to Persecutors to be burnt. A sin at which the *Donatists* took so much offence, that it was the ground of their Separation. *pag. 24.*

In respect of Christ, 1. It's an horrible indignity offered to his Body (as the Apostle speaks, *1 Cor. 1. 15.*) and makes him to appear the Head of two Bodies. How monstrous and dishonourable is the very conceit hereof! 2. It's rebellion against his Command, his great Command of Love. The Grace of Love is by some called the Queen of Graces; and it's greater than Faith in respect of its Object, not God onely, but Man; its Duration, which is eternal; its manner of working, not in a way of receiving Christ (as Faith), but of giving the Soul to him. *pag. 24.*

By Divisions among our selves, we endeavour to divide our selves from him, in and from whom is all our fulness.—Upon the Stock of Schism commonly Heresie is grafted. There is no Schism (saith *Jerome*)

Mr Brinsley.

Schism with Heresie, and others who have aggravated it beyond it, as the greater evil of the two. Augustine tells the Donatists, contr. Don. l. 2. c. 6. that their Schism was a greater sin than that which they took such high offence at, and which was the ground of their separation (viz. the sin of the Traditores, such as in time of Persecution had through fear delivered up their Bibles to the Persecutors to be burnt.) pag. 17, 18.

It is injurious to Christ, who seemeth by this means to be as it were divided. So Paul urgeth it, Is Christ divided? — Himself hereby made the Head of two disagreeing Bodies; which is dishonourable, and monstrous to conceive of him. pag. 19.

It's opposite to so great a Grace as Charity. Charity, the Queen of Graces, — greater than Faith, —
 1. *In regard of the Object: — Faith respecteth God onely, but Charity both God and Man. 2. In regard of the manner of working: Faith worketh intramittendo, by receiving and letting in Christ and his Benefits; but Charity extramittendo, by giving out the Soul. — 3. In regard of duration: — Charity is for eternity. p. 18.*

By dividing themselves from the Body, they are in a dangerous way to divide themselves from the Head. — Schism maketh way to Heresie. So Jerome. There is no Schism, but ordinarily it inventeth and broacheth
 some

Mr. Fenkin.

rome) but ordinarily it inventeth and produceth some Heresie, that so the Separation may seem the more justifiable. The *Novatians* and *Donatists* from Schism fell to Heresies. Our Times sadly comment upon this Truth, they equally arising unto both. pag. 25, 26.

Its injurious to the peace and quietness of the Church.—If the natural Body be divided and torn, pain and smart must needs follow. The tearing and rending of the mystical Body, goes to the Heart of all sensible Members: they often cause the Feverish Distempers of Hatred, Wrath, Seditions, Envy, Murders. Schism in the Church puts the Members out of joynt; and disjoynted Bones are painful: *All my bones* (saith David) *are out of joynt.* Church-Divisions cause sad thoughts of Heart. pag. 27.

It's opposite to the Edification of the Church. Division of Tongues hindred the building of *Babel*; and doubtless Division in Hearts, Tongues, Hands, and Heads, must needs hinder the building of *Jerusalem*. While Parties are contending, Churches and Commonwealths suffer. In troublous times the

Mr. Brinsley.

some Heresie, that so the Separation may seem the more justifiable.—A Truth sufficiently experimented in those ancient Schismaticks, the Novatians and Donatists, who from Schism fell to be Authors or Defenders of Heretical Opinions. We have a late and dreadful Instance, &c.

pag. 22.

The Church is hereby disquieted. Even as it is in the natural Body, if there be a solutio continui, so as it be divided, it breedeth smart and pain.—The mystical Body cannot be rent and torn by Divisions, but it goeth to the heart of all the sensible Members. The divisions of Reuben were great thoughts of heart,—oft-times breeding those Feverish distempers of Hatred, Variance, Wrath, Seditions, I and Murders too. p. 21.

Schism in the Church puts the Members out of joynt;—Bones out of joynt are painful. Thence David borrows this expression, All my bones are out of joynt. Such are Schisms in the Church, causing sad thoughts of heart. pag. 67.

The Church is hereby hindred in the Edification of it. We know what it was that hindred the building of Babel, even a Schism in their Tongues, division of Languages.—And surely there is no one thing that can more hinder the building of Jerusalem,—when Christians shall be divided in their Heads, Hearts, Tongues, Hands.

As

Mr. Fenkin.

the Walls and Temple of Jerusalem went but slowly on. pag. 27.

When Church-Members are put out of joynt, they are made unserviceable, and unfit to perform their several Offices. They who were wont to joyn in Prayer, Sacraments, and Fasting, and were ready to all mutual Offices of Love, are now fallen off from all. pag. 28.

Our Separation (from Rome) was not before all means were used for the cure and reformation of the Romanists, by the discovery of their Errours, that possibly could be thought of: notwithstanding all which (though some have been enforced to an acknowledgement of them) they still obstinately persist in them. Our famous, godly, and learned Reformers would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed. Many skilful Physicians have had her in hand, but she grew so much the worse.—In stead of being reclaimed, they anathematized them with the dreadfulest Curses, excommunicated, yea murdered and destroyed multitudes of those who endeavoured their redemption; not permitting any to trade, buy or sell, to have either Religious

Mr. Brinley.

—As it is in Civil Wars, whilst the Parties are contending, the Commonwealth suffers.—The Wall and Temple of Jerusalem went slowly on in troublous Times. pag. 21.

Members of the Church being put out of joynt by Schism, become unuseful to the Body, unapt to those Duties and Services which before they performed.—How is it that those who were wont to joyn with the Churches in Hearing, Prayer, Sacraments, and were so ready to all mutual Offices of Love, are now fallen off from all? pag. 67.

Our Separation was necessitated, through their obstinacy in their Errours; which notwithstanding the discovery of them, and that so clear, as that some of their own have been enforced to an acknowledgement of them, and all ways and means used for their Reformation, they still persist in. What then remains, but a cutting off? We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed. What then followeth? Forsake her, and let us go every one to his own Country. How many Physicians have had her in hand, Luther, &c. and the rest of our pious Reformers? but all to no purpose.—We were enforced—she not permitting any to trade, buy or sell, to have either Religious or Civil Communion with her, except they receive her Mark in their Hands and Foreheads: But, on the other hand,

Mr. Jenkin.

ous or Civil Communion with them, except they received the Beasts Mark in their Hands and Foreheads. All which considered, we might safely forsake her.-- Since in stead of healing *Babylon*, we could not be preserved from her destroying of us, we did deservedly depart from her, and every one go into his own Country: and unless we had done so, we could not have obeyed the clear Precept, *Apoc. 18. Come out of her my people.*

pag 29, 30.

To separate from Congregations where the Word of Truth and Gospel of Salvation are held out in an ordinary way, as the Proclamations of Princes are held forth upon Pillars, to which they are affixed; where the Light of Truth is set up, as it were upon a Candlestick, to guide Passengers to Heaven: to separate from them, to whom belong the Covenants, and where the Sacraments, the Seals of the Covenant, are for substance rightly dispensed; where Christ walketh in the midst of his golden Candlesticks, and discovereth his presence in his Ordinances, whereby they are made effectual to the conversion and edification of Souls in an ordinary way; where the Members are Saints, by a professed subjection to Christ, -- where there are sundry who in the judgement of

Mr. Brinsley.

hand, anathematizing them.--These things considered, let God and the World be judge, whether our Separation from them be voluntary.-- Not unjust, being warranted by Authority of Scripture, commanding this separation, Come out of her my People, Rev. 18. 4. pag. 27, 28.

Are not our Congregations true Churches? What, are not here the Pillars of Truth? Is not the Word of Truth, the Gospel of Salvation here held forth, and that in an ordinary and constant way, even as the Edicts and Proclamations of Princes are wont to be held forth by Pillars to which they are affixed? --where the Light of Gods Truth is set up and held forth, for the guiding of passengers in the way to Eternal Life? Are not here the golden Candlesticks, wherethe Seals of Gods Covenant, the Sacraments of the New Testament, are for substance rightly dispensed; -- where there is the presence of Christ in the midst of his Ordinances, so as in an ordinary way they are made effectual to the conversion and salvation of many; where Christ sitteth, walketh in the midst of his golden Candlesticks;

Mr. Jenkin.

of Charity may be conceived to have the work of Grace really wrought in their hearts, by walking in some measure answerable to their Profession: I say, to separate from these, as those with whom Church Communion is not to be held, is Schismatical. pag. 31, 32.

The voluntary and unnecessary Separation from a true Church, is Schismatical. pag. 31.

Pretences for Separation are alledged; frequently, and most plausibly, Mixt Communion, and of admitting into Church-fellowship the vile with the precious, and those who are Chaff, and therefore ought not to lodge with the Wheat.

Ans. 1. Not to insist upon what some have urged, viz. That this hath been the Stone at which most Schismaticks have stumbled, and the pretence which they have of old alledged,—as is evident in the examples of the *Audeans, Novatians, Donatists, Anabaptists, Brownists.* pag. 33.

2. Let them consider, whether the want of reforming abuses, proceed not from some unhappy obstructions in the exercise of Discipline, rather than from the allowance of the Church.

3. Let them consider, whether when

Mr. Brinsley.

sticks, — where there are Societies of visible Saints, all such by outward profession, and a considerable part of them walking in measure answerable to that profession; can it be questioned, where these are, whether there be true Churches of Christ? pag. 29, 30.

Schism is a voluntary and unwar-rantable Separation from a true Church. pag. 23.

Sinful mixtures are tolerated among you: — There is not that due separation of the Wheat from the Chaff, the precious from the vile; but all sorts are admitted.

Ans. 1. I might here mind them, That this hath been the common Stock whereupon Schism hath been usually grafted, the common pretence taken up by all Schismaticks,—the Novatians, Audæans, Donatists:—from the same Root sprung that later Schism of the Anabaptists:—It was the same Stone at which Brown and his Followers first stumbled. pag. 37, 38, 39.

What though there are some failings in the execution, through some unhappy obstructions in the exercise of Discipline? yet cannot the Church stand charged with them? pag. 40.

Consider the manner in separating
S at

Mr. Jenkin.

when they separate from Sinful mixtures, the Church be not at that very time purging out those Sinful mixtures. pag. 33.

Hath not God his Church, even where corruption of Manners hath crept into a Church, if purity of Doctrine be maintained? And is separation from that Church lawful, from which God doth not separate? pag. 34.

Let them consider, whether God hath made private Christians Stewards in his House, to determine whether those with whom they communicate are fit Members of the Church, or not? or rather, whether it be not their duty, when they discover Tares in the Church, in stead of separating from it, to labour that they may be found good Corn; that so when God shall come to gather his Corn into his Garner, they may not be thrown out? Church-Officers are Ministerially entrusted with the ordering of the Church, and for the opening and shutting of the Doors of the Churches Communion, by the Keys of Doctrine and Discipline; and herein if they shall be either hindred, or negligent, private Christians shall not be intangled in the guilt of their Sin. p. 34, 35.

private Christians should be entangled in the guilt of that sin, it cannot be conceived. pag. 414.

Mr. Brinsley.

at such a time, in a time of Reformation.—What, separate from a reforming Church? pag. 51, 52.

Suppose there may be some, nay many just Scandals amongst us, by reason of corruption of manners; yet is not this a sufficient ground of separation from a Church wherein there is purity of Doctrine. pag. 50.

How dare any forsake that Church which God hath not forsaken? p. 59.

God hath not made all private Christians Stewards, nor yet Surveyors in his House, so as that every one should take an exact notice of the conditions of all those whom they hold Communion with, who are fit to be members of the Church, and who not. It is Cyprian's counsel, What though there be some Tares discovered in the Church,—yet let us, for our parts, labour that we may be found good Corn, that so when God shall come to gather his Crop into his Garner, we may not be cast out. — Ministerially the Church-Officers, whom Christ hath entrusted with the ordering of the Church, them he hath made the Porters in his House, for the opening and shutting the doors of the Churches Communion, by the keys of Doctrine and Discipline. Now, in this case, if either their hands be tied by any humane restrictions, — or if through negligence they let loose the Rains, how

The

Mr. Jenkin.

The Command *not to eat with a Brother, &c.* I Cor. 5. 11. concerns not Religious but Civil Communion, by a voluntary, familiar, intimate Conversation, either in being invited, or inviting. pag. 35.

Now though such Civil eating was to be forbore, yet it follows not at all, much less much more, that Religious eating is forbidden: Because, Civil eating is arbitrary and unnecessary; not so Religious, which is enjoyed, and a commanded Duty. pag. 36.

It should be our care to prevent Separation: To this end,

1. Labour to be progressive in the work of Mortification. pag. 38.

2. Admire no Mans Perton.— This caused the *Corinthian Schism*. Take heed of Man-worship.

3. Labour for Experimental benefit by the Ordinances.— Find the setting up of Christ in your hearts by the Ministry, and then you will not dare to account it Antichristian. If with *Jacob*, we could say of our *Bethels*, *God is here*, we would set up Pillars.

4. Neither give nor receive Scandals. Give them not, to occasion

Mr. Brinsley.

That which Paul prohibits there, is not properly a Religious, but a Civil Communion, not to mingle themselves with such scandalous Livers, by a voluntary, familiar, and intimate Conversation,—in an ordinary way, repairing to their Tables, or inviting them to yours.

If we may not have Civil, much less Religious Communion. Ans. *Not so neither; inasmuch as the one is arbitrary and voluntary, the other a necessary Communion.* pag. 45.

How shall this Unity be attained?

1. *To this end labour after new hearts.*

How may Schism be prevented?

6. *Take heed of having the Persons of Men in admiration. This occasioned all those Divisions in the Church of Corinth.—Take we heed how we look too much at Men.* p. 59.

4. *Labour to see and acknowledge God in our Congregations.—Now if he be here, how dare any withdraw? When Jacob apprehended God present with him at Bethel, (Surely the Lord is in this place.) he sets up his Pillar there.—Have we met with him? why do we not set up our Pillar here?* pag. 58.

3. *Take heed of Scandals, whether of giving or receiving: Of giving,*

Mr. Jenkin.

sion others to separate; nor receive them, to occasion thy own Separation.— Construe doubtful matters charitably. Look not upon Blemishes with Multiplying-glasses, or old Mens Spectacles: Hide them, though not imitate them. Sport not your selves with others nakedness.

5. Be not much taken with Noveltyes. New-Lights have set this Church on fire. For the most part they are taken out of the Dark-Lanthorns of old Hereticks. They are false and Fools-fires, to lead Men into the Precipice of Separation. Love Truth in an old dress; let not Antiquity be a prejudice against, nor Novelty an inducement to the entertainment of Truth.

6. Give not way to lesser differences: A little division will soon rise up to a greater. Small Wedges make way for bigger. Our hearts are like to Tinder, a little spark will enflame them. Be jealous of your hearts.— Paul and Barnabas separated about a small matter, the taking of an Associate. pag. 40, &c.

Mr. Brinsley.

to drive off others; of receiving, to set off our selves.— Doubtful matters still construe them on the better part; So doth Charity; not looking upon Blemishes with Multiplying or Magnifying-glasses.— So far as may be without sin, hide them.— Cursed Cham spies the nakedness of his Father, and makes sport with it.

pag. 56.

2. Be not over-affected with Noveltyes—As for those New Lights which have set this Kingdom on fire at this day, for the most part they are no other than what have been taken out of the Dark-Lanthorns of former Hereticks,—no other but ignes fatui, false fires, useful onely to mislead.—Tr: th is lovely, and ought to be embraced in whatever dress she cometh, whether new or old. As not Antiquity, so neither should Novelty be any prejudice to Verity.

1. Take heed of lesser divisions. Small Wedges make way for great ones. Small differences sometimes rise to Divisions. pag. 57.

4. B: jealous over our own hearts; they being like unto Tinder, ready to take fire by the least spark.—It was no great matter that Paul and Barnabas differed upon, onely about the taking of an Associate. pag. 71, &c.

Now,

Now, *Sir*, by this you may perceive, how some Men do make their Books and Sermons, and by what ways a Man may rise to the reputation of being a considerable Author: he may cull and pick, pilfer and steal, and become Learned to a miracle, an excellent Preacher, and write even to a *Folio*; and if he had but the Art of keeping men from poring into neglected Authors, and prying into Books that are cast into corners, might pass as such: But as long as what is forgotten in one Age, is revived in another, and as long as it is become a Trade to collect *Pamphlets*, I would advise your Friend to be more wary for the future, and keep from writing a *Folio* and a *Comment* again.

And now, *Sir*, it is high time for me to conclude, to whom it is no pleasure to deal in such a way, and to converse with those kind of Books that you see my Design hath put me upon. It is Charity to you and the World that hath led me along; and I hope I have so managed it, as shall be to the offence of none, but those that are Enemies to Truth: I am sure I have so much avoided all that might exasperate, that I have for that reason cast aside Leaves of what some others might be tempted to have taken in. If Mr. *Jenkin* hath been hardly dealt with, he must thank himself, who ha-

(134)

ving, without provocation, defamed others, could not be suffered to run away with that out-cry which he hath made, without a just Rebuke. I am,

(S I R)

Your Servant,

S. R.

F I N I S.

